



BUSINESS & GOVERNMENT

A COMPLEX DANCE

What every CEO and
board need to know about
managing their relationships
with government.

Contents

Our approach	3
Acknowledgement	4
Respondents	4
Introduction	6
The relationship needs to be stronger	8
The opposition is often left out	12
There is mutual lack of understanding	14
Who owns the relationship?	18
CEOs need to build long-term relationships	19
There is a role for chairmen	22
Government affairs strengthens the foundations	22
Lobbyists smooth the path	24
Industry associations present a united view	26
Political donations do not equal policy outcomes	28
Learning the steps	30
Resources from Korn Ferry Institute	31
Contact	31



Our approach

Korn Ferry conducted face-to-face interviews with former Australian politicians, senior public servants and leaders in public policy debate who currently have roles in business. We also spoke to two prominent New Zealanders who have deep knowledge of the intersection between government and business. Our approach was apolitical; our aim solely to learn how big business and government can establish relationships that will improve policy outcomes for industry and society more broadly.

All respondents are business leaders and:

- 1** is a former prime minister
- 5** were state premiers
- 1** was a chief minister
- 3** previously worked as senior public servants
- 1** was a union leader
- 3** were federal government ministers
- 6** lead or have led industry associations.

The interviews were conducted between March and June 2019.

Acknowledgement

The Korn Ferry Institute acknowledges the generosity of those who gave their time and shared their knowledge to assist in the preparation of this report. Their contribution will help inform leaders who wish to improve relationships between business and governments. We note their former government positions and current business roles in the following section. We also acknowledge their broader contribution through policy, board, industry and advocacy work.

Respondents

Hon Anna Bligh AC

Previously: Premier of Queensland (2007–2012)

Currently: CEO Australian Banking Association, various NED roles.

<https://www.ausbanking.org.au/Bligh>

Hon Stephen Bracks AC

Previously: Premier of Victoria (1999–2007)

Currently: Chairman of: Cbus Superannuation Fund, Maurice Blackburn, McKell Institute, MCG Trust. Various NED and consulting roles.

<https://www.stevebracks.com.au/>

Hon John Brumby AO

Previously: Premier of Victoria (2007–2010)

Currently: Chancellor La Trobe University, Chairman of: BioCurate, MTAA Superannuation Fund. Various NED and consulting roles.

<https://www.latrobe.edu.au/Brumby>

Kate Carnell AO

Previously: Chief Minister, ACT (1995–2000)

Currently: Australian Small Business and Family Enterprise Ombudsman.

<https://www.asbfeo.gov.au/Carnell>

Hon Bob Carr

Previously: Foreign Minister of Australia (2012–2013) and Premier of New South Wales (1995–2005)

Currently: Industry Professor (Business and Climate Change), University of Technology. Various NED and consulting roles.

<https://www.uts.edu.au/Carr>

Hon Greg Combet AM

Previously: Cabinet Minister (2010–2013), Secretary, Australian Council of Trade Unions (1999–2007)

Currently: Chairman IFM Investors and Industry SuperFunds. Various NED and consulting roles

<https://www.industrysuper.com/Combet>

Hon Helen Coonan

Previously: Cabinet Minister (2001–2007)

Currently: Chairman Australian Financial Complaints Authority and Minerals Council of Australia. Various NED and consulting roles.

<https://www.afca.org.au/Coonan>

Hon Peter Costello AC

Previously: Treasurer of Australia (1996–2007)

Currently: Chairman Board of Guardians–futurefund, Nine Entertainment and ECG Financial.

<https://www.futurefund.gov.au/Costello>

The Rt Hon Sir Bill English

Previously: Prime Minister of New Zealand (2016–17)

Minister for Finance & Deputy Prime Minister of New Zealand (2008–2016)

Currently: NED of Wesfarmers.

<https://www.wesfarmers.com.au/English>

Hon Nick Greiner AC

Previously: Premier of New South Wales (1988–1992)

Currently: Federal President Liberal Party (2017–), Chairman of QBE Asia Pacific, CHAMP Private Equity. Various NED and consulting roles.

<http://www.nickgreiner.com.au/>

Phil O'Reilly ONZM

Previously: Chief Executive of BusinessNZ (2004–2015)

Currently: Chair of Board of Business at OECD and Managing Director Iron Duke Partners.

<http://www.iron-duke.com/people/phil-oreilly/>

Heather Ridout AO

Previously: CEO Australian Industry Group (2004–2012)

Currently: Chairman Australian Super. Various NED roles.

<https://www.australiansuper.com/about-us>

Tony Shepherd AO

Previously: Federal public servant 1964–1979 and

President Business Council of Australia (2011–2014)

Currently: Chairman, Macquarie Specialised Asset Management, SCG Trust and GWS Giants. Various NED and consulting roles.

<https://www.macquarie.com/mgl/com/gif/about-us/board-members>

Dr Ian Watt AC

Previously: Secretary of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (2011–2014).

Currently: Chair of the International Centre for Democratic Partnerships, former chairman BAE Systems Australia, NED at Smartgroup Corporation and Citibank.

<http://ir.smartgroup.com.au/Board-of-Directors>

Jennifer Westacott AO

Previously: Director-General of the NSW Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources and other senior public service roles in Victoria and NSW.

Currently: CEO Business Council of Australia (2011–). Various chair and NED roles.

<https://www.bca.com.au/Westacott>

Introduction

Convergence, globalisation and digitisation are disrupting and redefining business, government and society. For many industries, uncertain economic and geopolitical conditions have brought increased regulatory interventions and a fluid policy environment that can, with little notice, impact an organisation's performance.

Government relies on business to support and deliver public policy, and for most businesses – their “licence to operate” depends on their ability to work – and comply – with government. Theirs is a complex dance – which favours those skilled in the art of stakeholder management.

It is therefore unsurprising that one of the most important relationships for our prosperity is between business and government. This is particularly so in highly regulated industries, although all businesses – from our biggest employers, to the corner milk bar – have some level of government interaction.

Trust in our institutions has eroded during the past decade, and CEOs working in sectors that rely on policy stability and consumer trust, have had their leadership tested. The very best CEO will falter if he or she cannot navigate an ambiguous public policy environment and negotiate with an ever-broadening field of government stakeholders.

Increasingly, Korn Ferry's work with boards, CEOs and C-suite leaders is informed by the need for an organisation's most senior executives to understand, engage with and respond to government as a key stakeholder. This emphasis on government relations expertise at the top planted the seed for this report and a deeper interrogation of the sometimes fraught relationship between business and government.

How can our business leaders receive the best advice on how to forge a constructive relationship with government? Who better to advise than those with experience on 'both sides of the fence' – people who have worked in and with government, either at ministerial or advisor level – and who have also had careers in business? By speaking to former politicians and those whose careers have closely intersected with government in Australia and New Zealand, this report offers advice for business leaders on how they can improve their relationship with government and better serve their company, their industry and their nation. The first step is to recognise that it needs to be done.

Our report, *Business & Government – A Complex Dance*, examines the relationship between these two important institutions. It is a resource for boards, CEOs, executive teams, and government affairs practitioners. Those serving in government will also be interested in views captured in this report.



The relationship needs to be stronger

The Australian national interest is always best served by a strong, vibrant and outward looking economy generating jobs and opportunities for Australians. It is a prerequisite for social justice. To achieve this, you need a strong, innovative and dynamic business sector and government has to have a relationship with that business sector.

-John Brumby

The value to society of a productive, working relationship between business and government is clear; government creates the policy environment – the levers – for the economy to grow and business uses those levers to create jobs and prosperity.

Yet, despite the interdependent relationship between public policy and prosperity, most respondents to this research felt that in Australia, the relationship with governments – spanning the last decade or so – was poor. Terms such as: “love/hate, necessary evil, average to poor, patchy to bad, at the lowest ebb in my working life” reflect deep frustration with how governments and business interact. While some respondents were slightly more optimistic, “it’s medium at best, but there’s a lot of common ground”, all agreed that over the past decade or more, the relationship between business and government should have been stronger.

Business does the heavy lifting when it comes to growth. That leaves two clear imperatives for government: first, governments have to understand that businesses are going to assemble most of the capital and second that we need confidence and certainty to do that. The economy isn’t a tool to punish wrongdoing because the real losers when the economy stalls aren’t just large businesses, they’re the everyday Australians that rely on them.

-Jennifer Westacott

There are many factors contributing to the tension between government and business: a mutual lack of understanding of how each operates, a 24-hour news cycle that doesn’t allow for considered and careful analysis of issues, a lack of interest by government to engage with business and a lack of expertise by business to engage with government. The rise of the “professional politician” has led to the demise of political candidates who have worked outside the political system and have an understanding of business. Plus, the fragmentation in Australia and New Zealand of the major political parties has broadened the number – and interests – of minor parties and independent politicians, adding further complexity to government relations.

Many in government see business as self-interested and transactional in how it interacts with government by engaging only when there is an issue. Conversely, businesses seeking long-term commitment on policy that will support investment for future innovation and growth are frustrated by the tactical and transactional nature of politics.

There is scope for business and government to improve their relationship. It needs to be deeper and conducted in a less combative political context, which is when engagement tends to happen. Everyone understands that businesses must represent their own interest, but it is best when they’re really focused on the policy changes they want from government and are transparent about the reasoning why governments with good advice can make good judgments.

-Greg Combet

It's not going to be easy to improve the relationship as ministerial offices are very tactical and transactional and their lens is heavily political. Ministerial offices are deeply involved in policy development – while they always had a role, the public service used to own this – and they view the world very differently. This can lead to more short-term and tactical policy-making which is very difficult for business which likes a longer term and more predictable approach. We've seen a number of examples of this in recent times.

-Heather Ridout

Some respondents felt the relationships in Australia were better at state level than federally, yet they mentioned a reticence by business and government to engage with each other. In NSW this was attributed to a fear of being viewed as attempting to influence government to grant favourable outcomes on projects. One respondent noted: “CEOs are reticent to come to political events. Politicians and, even more so, public servants are very risk averse when it comes to being aligned with business.” Another felt business relied too heavily on industry associations to be the conduit into government: “More direct relationships are important and beneficial plus it's better for government to have that direct input.”

Government is sceptical of business because they see business as overwhelmingly self-interested and business is sceptical of the need and quality of regulation, and the quality of the people in government. The perception – or the reality – is that the better people are in business and advising business. We need the people working in government – the regulators, the procurers, and the contract writers – to be of equal ability to people in business and their advisors.

-Nick Greiner

When asked to describe a time when the relationship worked best, almost all Australian interviewees went back to the mid-1980s, the Hawke government and the “accord agreement” where unions accepted some responsibility for Australia's economic prosperity. They also referenced the mid to late 1990s and the early terms of the Howard government when business and government worked well together to implement the GST. The Hawke and Howard governments, while politically on different sides, were reforming governments and shared a willingness to engage with industry for the betterment of Australia. They understood that business needs certainty and confidence if it is to invest in jobs and innovation.

In New Zealand people know that the relationship needs to be respectful because they are going to run into each other. However, it is a relationship that depends on believing the other side has some empathy with your drivers.

-Sir Bill English

There would be few of the big policy and legislative reforms over the last 30 years where business hasn't had a recognised and respected place at the table and I feel like that is less the case now than it has been for quite a long time. There are lot of things driving that; some of the responsibility falls at the feet of business, further complicated when a government has either a one seat majority or no majority.

-Anna Bligh

Australia's economy is different now, as is the shape of the government, however the inclusive policy processes followed by those two administrations provide a blueprint for how effective a constructive relationship between government and business can be.

I saw a great advantage in a cordial relationship between the state government and the business sector. I certainly didn't want to hear it said that you couldn't get to see a minister in my government. Business was entitled to a hearing and if a major business wanted to see me, they didn't have to go through a lobbyist; a call to my office would have got them a meeting.

-Bob Carr

In New Zealand the relationship between

government and business is generally closer than it is in Australia. This is partly due to the smaller size of the population and a government structure that is less complex than the many layers of government – both in the bureaucracy and political office – in Australia.

The relative ease of access to both politicians and senior bureaucrats in New Zealand doesn't mean business can consider relationship building easy. It needs to be done strategically with long-term goals in mind. And business needs to invest time in understanding the business of government.

The core thing that businesses need to do when they are dealing with politicians in New Zealand is to first understand them rather than worry too much about what they are going to say. By understanding the government's motivation businesses can understand how to engage in a persuasive way.

-Phil O'Reilly

If government and business are to meet their obligations to society by creating policy and implementing programs that grow the economy, they must first accept their co-dependency. When they engage on policy, recognise their differences but work to improve their relationship and the outcome, everyone benefits.

Testing the relationship

The relationship between business and government is tested when policy announcements greatly affect the performance of organisations and industries. There have been successful public lobbying campaigns by business that have reversed policies – the campaign against the 2010 mining tax in Australia is one example – however, most respondents to this research advised business not to advocate publicly against governments, but rather to do the work behind the scenes by firstly briefing the bureaucracy and the minister's office. Public criticism should only be used as a last resort.

While not shying away from public comment, particularly if the company or sector is under attack, the best advice I could give is to be privately critical on things that you really don't like and believe are an affront but shut up publicly. Only make public comments if nothing else has worked and the failure of government is so egregious that you have no option. But that is absolutely and completely a last resort – never a first resort.

-Tony Shepherd

Public criticism is a last resort. Try everything else because you never use your best weapon first and the prospect of going public is probably your best weapon to get your way. If you back a government into a corner, it's a risk; you may win but a government might find, for example, that those damaging comments from the CEO are out there and the damage is done so "What do I care?"

-Steve Bracks

It is much harder to have hard-edged fights with politicians and the political process in New Zealand because this is such a small place and so well connected. To deploy the nuclear option is risky. Much riskier than it is in places like Australia, the US or Britain.

-Phil O'Reilly

TAKEAWAYS

BUSINESS LEADERS AT CEO AND BOARD LEVEL, WHO LEAD ORGANISATIONS THAT ARE PROFOUNDLY IMPACTED BY POLICY SHIFTS, NEED TO VIEW GOVERNMENT AS A CORE STAKEHOLDER.

RELATIONSHIPS MUST BE DEEPER AND CONSISTENT. TRANSACTIONAL ENGAGEMENT DOESN'T WORK FOR LONG-TERM MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF CHALLENGES AND ISSUES.

WORK BEHIND THE SCENES TO INFLUENCE POLICY – PUBLIC CRITICISM SHOULD BE A LAST RESORT.

The opposition is often left out

Having a bi-partisan approach to government in a country like Australia where we change governments over time – and nobody is guaranteed a long-term role – is prudent. In fact, if you're doing something in an area that is controversial it is sensible to have a dialogue with the opposition. If they feel they're being engaged and treated with respect they're less likely to poke you in the eye. Or if they do, they may be less strident and more constructive.

-Tony Shepherd.

The relationship with the opposition is important for many reasons. The most obvious is that our political cycle means that opposition parties will at some stage be in government – and ruling parties will be in opposition. Another important consideration is that opposition parties can move amendments, stall or stop legislation.

Try to develop a relationship with the political party in opposition. After the 2004 election, federal Labor was not seen by business as having a chance of winning government. That low time in Labor's fortunes was precisely the time when business should have seen shadow ministers.

-Bob Carr

Investing time with a shadow minister makes commercial sense. The shadow minister may be representing a portfolio, which they have little background or experience in, so there is an opportunity to broaden their knowledge while building a relationship. The deeper their knowledge of an organisation and industry, the more informed their decisions on legislation.

Sometimes the relationship can be strengthened by an invitation to observe the business operations. Site visits can form very effective foundations to a good long-term relationship, and when you've been genuine and given people the opportunity to see what you're doing and understand why you're doing it, over time you'll gain people's confidence.

-Anna Bligh

Several respondents cited the lack of engagement with the opposition in the lead-up to the Australian 2007 election, which was won by a Labor government after four terms served by the Coalition, as a particular failure by business.

In the lead-up to the 2007 election a lot of the business community had not done the work with Labor and there were reasons for that. Some of it was that they

got such a good run out of the Coalition, but the phone was cut off in 2007 and it took years to turn it back on. The negative remarks about business from senior Labor members was not what you wanted to see in a society where we're dependent on the business sector. You pay a price if you don't nurture those relationships. In 2007 business paid a price. The Australian Government paid a price. The Australian economy paid a price, and I think we're all poorer for it. So that's a good example frankly of what doesn't work.

-Dr Ian Watt

Businesses operating in highly regulated industries particularly need a relationship with the opposition and, increasingly, with the crossbench and the backbench.

It starts with building a good relationship with the shadow minister. Relationships are built up over time. It's very hard to come out of nowhere when a new government is formed and – I've been there when that happens and literally people you've never heard of are ringing you.

-Anna Bligh

The crossbench is increasingly powerful

The cross benchers are powerful, and I think business needs to cautiously explore ways of communicating with people we can group as right-wing, populist, small parties, or independents in the Senate and the state parliament.

-Bob Carr

An influential crossbench in Australian politics will most likely continue as major parties experience a fragmentation of their traditional voters to independents and single issue or minor parties. For example, in Australia's 46th parliament there are six crossbench MPs in the House of Representatives and six crossbench senators in the Senate.¹ The importance of the crossbench was evident in the lead-up to the 2018 Royal Commission into the financial services sector, where theirs was an influential voice in support of the Commission.

New Zealand has a multi-party system. The ruling Labour party formed a minority coalition with the NZ First party to govern and requires support on confidence and supply from the Greens.

TAKEAWAYS

ONE CERTAINTY IS THAT OPPOSITION PARTIES BECOME GOVERNMENTS.

BUSINESS IGNORES OPPOSITION PARTIES AT THEIR PERIL. THE OPPOSITION - AND IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES - THE BACKBENCH AND CROSSBENCH, INFLUENCE POLICY AND IN MANY CASES, CAN EITHER SMOOTH ITS PATH OR HALT ITS PROGRESS.

MEET REGULARLY WITH THE RELEVANT SHADOW MINISTER.

START THE RELATIONSHIP WHEN IT IS EASIER TO FORM ONE, WHICH IS WITH SHADOW MINISTERS.

¹ https://www.aph.gov.au/senators_and_members/members

There is mutual lack of understanding

Most people in big business say government doesn't understand business and there is a lot of truth in that. Most people in government say business doesn't understand politics and there's a lot of truth in that. Some business people think they understand politics because they see it in the media, but they don't really have a grasp of the pressures people in government are under and what politicians will find persuasive – or not.

-Peter Costello

It is not difficult in New Zealand to engage with government, but I am surprised how little time business invests to try to understand the process of governing. There are a few too many CEOs who alienate the government because they don't understand the drivers, and it appears, they can't be bothered learning. If a CEO considers government relations an irritating function that they have to put up with, then that doesn't work for anyone.

-Sir Bill English

There is a deep lack of understanding by business of how government operates in Australia, described by one former state premier as “totally mind-boggling”.

This has led to misfires in relationship building and lost opportunities for business to contribute to policy development. The starting point in relationship building is for business to understand that the government is approaching policy from a different perspective – the nation's interest – as opposed to the interests of an organisation. It is also essential to know the political context of policy decisions.

Understand that no matter how passionate you are and how much economic sense or business sense it might make, if it's politically not going to fly, forget it. That's something business doesn't get, yet it is so obvious. If what you're asking for doesn't have political traction, it's silly to keep banging your head against a brick wall.

-Helen Coonan

The important role of the bureaucracy in government policy formation and decision-making is often not understood by business. The deep work of policy development is done by bureaucrats, evidenced by a survey of close to 2,000 public servants that revealed 77% of the time they spend with ministerial staff is on policy development.² Business has an opportunity to participate more fully in policy development by working more closely with the public service. This requires understanding of the process, the key milestones, potential enablers – and barriers – to policy development.

Bureaucrats actively seek out the voice and views of external stakeholders in briefings prepared for the minister and are often informed by the work of industry associations. But business needs direct relationships with the various parties who make up the decision chain on legislation. An idea that is warmly welcomed by a minister in a meeting with business can go cold or be killed off in the bureaucracy. Business should “do the rounds” of the departments and meet with the senior public servants who advise the minister's office.

² <https://theconversation.com/australias-public-servants-dedicated-highly-trained-and-elitist-97691>

I often think that people don't understand two things: the complexity of public policy making and the politics of public policy making. Governments aren't purposefully going to do things that are politically stupid. A strong and diverse business sector is the backbone of a strong Australia and the business community needs to work at making its case as clearly as possible to government. The business community can play a valuable role in assisting government to think through issues.

-Jennifer Westacott.

If your particular organisation is going to be the subject of a piece of legislation or regulation, you have to engage with the process. As the people who are going to have to make it work, you've got a real obligation to alert those who are designing it on where the pitfalls might be.

-Helen Coonan.

Making sure that the public service understands the issues you're trying to raise with the government, taking into account that they're the ones that are going to give the advice. It would seem to me fairly fundamental, but it's fascinating how many people do not do this.

-Kate Carnell

Business also needs to understand the relationship between the bureaucracy and ministers and their staff. One respondent noted: "The public servants are not the staff of the minister's office and do not perceive themselves that way. A minister has no official capacity to tell public servants how high to jump or how to do their job, nor should they." The government of the day and the public service are interdependent partners in creating the policy levers that business relies upon.

Take politics aside and think about where public policy in New Zealand is created and it is in the ministries, the commissions and agencies. If you can describe ideas in terms of good public policy outcomes with officials, then they will engage in conversation with you. However, they will reject arguments that are totally self-interested.

-Phil O'Reilly.

Business often bypasses the bureaucracy because they think they can write to the minister about an issue. What happens to that correspondence is a staffer, probably a departmental liaison officer, sends most correspondence straight to the department for feedback. And then it comes back with departmental advice. So, if the department has no idea about the issue or doesn't understand it, the minister is going to get bad advice and, unless it's a major issue, there's probably nobody in the office that's going to be able to vet that advice.

-Kate Carnell

One respondent noted that many businesses do not understand the structure and timing of public finance. The budget process drives expenditure and therefore the policy cycle. Federally in Australia the annual budget process begins in November or December when the expenditure review committee of cabinet (ERC) considers a portfolio minister's new proposals and expected major pressures and establishes the budget's priorities. From February to April the ERC develops the budget against the background of the government's political, social and economic priorities.³ In New Zealand, there are five key phases to the budget process: strategic phase from June to December, decision phase from January to April, the budget production phase, leading to the budget announcement in May, followed by the legislative and implementation phases.⁴

The timing of a meeting with a minister will depend on what stage you need to interact to get an outcome. And a lot of it depends on the budgetary cycles: a meeting two days before the budget is not going to work.

-Helen Coonan

Others noted that business should study the policy agenda that governments took to an election and understand that governments consider this their mandate. Advocating for change that conflicts with this mandate is unlikely to be successful.

Mutual understanding between business and government is good for the nation. This doesn't mean they will always agree – that is unlikely. However, an environment where both parties understand the drivers for each – and the pitfalls – will create a better pathway to good policy creation and implementation.

It's impossible to generalise but you could argue that the relationship is often like Venus and Mars. The bureaucracy and some elected politicians have no comprehension of how business works, none, zero, none. Similarly, there are not a lot of business leaders who really get government; they either think they're a mob of incompetent idiots or it's just a mystery to them. And so, therein lies the problem.

-Kate Carnell

Mutual understanding is crucial to relationship building so a better understanding on the part of business about the pressures the government faces, ministers face, and the public policy and legislative process is important. By the same token, building a good understanding of the imperatives that business faces, particularly in a globally competitive world, is also extremely important for governments. The senior public servants have a role to play in enhancing this mutual understanding. I would have benefited, as a minister, from senior public service officials that engaged more with business.

-Greg Combet

There is a lot less hard power in New Zealand politics than you might think. A lot of it is soft power and in exercising soft power you need to understand political rhythm. A lot of businesses don't understand the timelines, the specific challenges politicians face and the particular advice that they'll be taking.

-Phil O'Reilly

³ <https://www.finance.gov.au/budget/>

⁴ <https://treasury.govt.nz/publications/budgets/budget-2018>

Politicians' workload is vast

A staggering amount of work crosses a member of parliament's (MP) desk and it takes substantial time to address the myriad of requests that come each day. Most MPs have three roles: parliamentarian, constituency representative, and party member. Ministers have a particularly high workload which they conduct under extreme pressure, combined with an intense travel schedule.

Business doesn't understand the pressures – a minister's whole day can be filled with dealing with complaints from the voting public and stakeholder groups – the whole day or week. And some of the issues are valid and some of them are just totally nutty but that's what they've got to deal with. This puts enormous pressure on ministers in terms of decision-making.

-Tony Shepherd.

You do not go to a minister over a minor matter. Choose your issue carefully because they are busy people – their diaries are bursting.

-Heather Ridout

Backbenchers are involved in parliamentary committee work: studying the topic, taking advice, attending meetings and public hearings.⁵ It is time-consuming work, particularly for large committees that involve travel to hearings.

A lot of CEOs just have no idea about the workings of government and the time involved in a ministerial role and some people, particularly smaller businesses, have no idea of the pressures on ministers and the pressures on their time. When someone says they can't fit them in, it's not "rubbish", it's not like that at all.

-John Brumby.

TAKEAWAYS

LEARN HOW GOVERNMENTS WORK – IT WILL SAVE TIME, RESOURCES AND RESULT IN BETTER POLICY DEVELOPMENT.

THE BUREAUCRACY IS A VERY IMPORTANT STAKEHOLDER. CONTACT THE KEY DEPARTMENTAL HEADS AND ESTABLISH A MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL RELATIONSHIP.

UNDERSTAND THE CONTEXT IN WHICH GOVERNMENTS OPERATE. THIS INCLUDES THE ELECTORAL MANDATE, BUDGETARY CYCLES AND POLITICAL PRESSURES.

⁵https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/House_of_Representatives/Powers_practice_and_procedure/00_-_Infosheets/Infosheet_15_-_The_work_of_a_Member_of_Parliament

Who owns the relationship?

CEOs have a responsibility to actively engage their stakeholders and government is a significant stakeholder for many industries. There is an important role for a CEO from time to time to stand up for their industry and to be prepared to speak out. I think government will respect that if they've otherwise had a good working relationship with the business but if you are only ever throwing bricks then you won't have much influence.

-Anna Bligh

In my experience, if you are dealing with government, and you wish to deal with a minister, it is the responsibility of the CEO or the chairman. If it's important enough to get to a minister's desk it is important enough for the CEO or the chairman to take it. And there is no substitute for that. If it was important enough for me as treasurer to be deliberating on something, then it was important enough for the chairman or CEO to come in and see me. I wouldn't see a lobbyist.

-Peter Costello

Some of the missteps by business in building a relationship with government can be traced to a lack of judgment over who should be representing the company when liaising at ministerial and senior bureaucrat level. All respondents said the CEO needs to own the relationship with some noting the chairman can also play a key role. One mentioned that boards and management are unreasonably internally focussed and that their external focus tends to be short-term and transactional, rather than strategic. The transactional nature of engagement with government by business was noted by several respondents as how not to develop relationships.

I don't think CEOs and chairmen spend enough time on government relationship building; they spend more time worrying about the proxy advisors and AGM-related issues and much less time on government relationships unless and until there is an actual issue where the interests of the corporation are seriously affected.

-Nick Greiner

Large firms will have a relationship with their portfolio minister. The CEO should have met their portfolio minister, be building a collaborative relationship on issues of importance in their sector and will feel that they can contact them. Below ministerial and CEO level, the minister's chief of staff or advisors will maintain the relationships with the government relations person.

-Helen Coonan

CEOs need to build long-term relationships

Waiting for a problem before acting is a common mistake made by busy CEOs for whom government affairs isn't high priority unless there is an immediate problem. But a lack of a strategic, ongoing dialogue increases the risk of not having a voice when there is an issue. As Jennifer Westcott said: "Business needs a continuous approach and a strategic approach. And, it needs to be a senior approach."

It was curious to me that my most formal engagements with the business leadership were over contentious policy matters. It is not surprising that this occurs, but it does not provide a good foundation for longer lasting relationships and deeper consideration of public policy. It's important we have a more formal way for continuing engagement that's outside the immediate political pressures.

-Greg Combet

CEO is the right level for most interaction, and at times, the chairman at senior ministerial level. The worst thing you can do is the quick "in and out". Ministers don't like it; good governments like to build long-term relationships. Consider what you're going to talk about, what your business does today, what it can do in future and how you would like to work with government to do that.

-John Brumby

The need for the CEO's direct engagement with government is particularly relevant when business leaders and boards consider the impact of regulatory risk on their organisation's performance. Sir Bill English cited business and government's response to climate change as an example of an issue that requires CEO action.

People are doing the wrong thing for the right reasons on climate change. The immediate risk for business is not so much the changing climate, but what regulators think about the changing climate. Regulators are increasingly likely to take a moral position and respond with heavy hitting regulation. CEOs are missing this short-term, much higher regulatory risk and managing it can't be delegated.

-Sir Bill English

The way a company works well with the Australian government is when the CEO rolls up his or her sleeves and pitches in and regards a relationship with government as an important part of their key performance indicators."

-Dr Ian Watt

The CEOs that do it well go out of their way to make sure that politicians understand three things: their business, that they know what government's drivers are and they pick their times for engagement carefully. They don't waste the minister's time.

-Sir Bill English

The CEO has to lead the relationship. If a significant politician or bureaucrat says of a major Australian company: “well I’ve never met your CEO”, that would ring alarm bells for me.

-Tony Shepherd.

Most respondents noted that too much of the high-level liaison work is left to government affairs officers and external lobbyists, when it should be the CEO who is managing relationships with ministers and senior members of the bureaucracy. One respondent said the relationship should be sufficiently close that the CEO can pick up the phone and the relevant minister will take their call. Others said taking responsibility for the relationship with government should be a key performance indicator for a CEO.

The relationship needs to be built with the chairman and the CEO and they should view government as important as other stakeholders their business engages with.

-Steve Bracks

You’ve got to put the shoe-leather time in. You’ve got to work regularly on relationships, and you’ve got to be serious about it.

-Dr Ian Watt

Former politicians we spoke to said that when they were in government they preferred to deal with a CEO or chairman, rather than via government affairs or a lobbying firm. However, they acknowledged that while the lead roles in relationship building should be the CEO and chairman, government affairs or corporate affairs executives are a valuable resource for behind-the-scenes engagement, research, intelligence gathering and for briefing the CEO on the current state of play. In certain circumstances, where specialised support may be required, lobbyists will be best placed to help the business reach the right outcome.

CEOs who are from overseas and first-time CEOs who head organisations in issues-rich industries were singled out as needing advice

on understanding our political system. Some respondents mentioned the short-term nature of a foreign CEO’s assignment doesn’t lend itself to deeper relationship building. Others mentioned the challenges of keeping abreast of the shifting roles of ministers and their staff. All suggested that a willingness to engage with our political system is a necessary part of the CEO’s role while acknowledging the challenges.

Last year there were three new ministers for many of the portfolios. That’s a problem for a CEO deciding if they should spend a few nights in Canberra – why would you bother?

-John Brumby

First-time or foreign CEOs were advised to firstly map their management team to discover the internal links to government, and work closely with their government affairs advisors and the board to learn the state of play for the organisation and industry with the government and opposition of the day. This work needs to align with the overall strategy for the business and consider how certain policies impact the business now and in the future.

CEOs new to New Zealand firms were advised to learn from those with intimate understanding of how relationships in New Zealand are conducted but to be cautious of political bias.

Take advice widely, hear what people have to say but be conscious that their political perspective may be partisan. The wisdom of your board will be important, for they are plugged into the economy and how New Zealand operates. Join a business organisation and talk to your fellow CEOs.

-Phil O’Reilly

A relationship framework for CEOs

CEOs who 'roll up their sleeves' and are respected for their government relationships share the following approach to relationship building:

1. Their approach to government relations is aligned with the overall strategy of the organisation.
2. They treat the relationship as long term rather than transactional.
3. They go in person to meet ministers and have constructive meetings about matters that are not only important to their organisation, but important to their industry and the nation.
4. They meet with the shadow minister.
5. They meet with department and agency heads – and understand that the bureaucracy does the deep work of briefings and policy creation.
6. They map and meet influential people in government, or on the periphery, who are important to their industry and organisation. This could include backbenchers, cross-bench MPs and senators, and in certain circumstances, union leaders.
7. They are aware of the politics relating to certain issues, but they don't "play" the politics.
8. They take the time to understand the government's mandate and how this influences decisions.
9. Their discussion with government aligns with statements they make in other forums.
10. They are well-prepared and do not waste the minister's time.

There is a role for chairmen

The chairman is under-utilised and, given the often-punishing travelling schedule of the CEO, the chairman could take some of the government relationship load.

-Jennifer Westacott

I think a chairman has an opportunity where he or she has got some personal contacts, or where the personality of the chairman lends itself to relationships with politicians. Some love the political process and they've got some sheen to their reputation. A business would be ill-advised to overlook that advantage.

-Bob Carr

While the CEO is expected to take the strategic lead – and most of the heavy lifting – in government relations at the top level, in certain circumstances there is a role for the chairman. This could be particularly relevant when dealing with government on regulatory matters, as the key role of a chairman is governance oversight. Similarly, when there is a significant issue that has the potential for pernicious legislation that will be an issue for the company and shareholders, the chairman as head of governance needs to be involved. This doesn't mean the chairman is acting outside the strategic remit – more that the chairman is able, through their experience, networks, or availability, to take the lead on a particular matter. Utilising the chairman isn't necessarily an either/or decision as there will be issues where having both the chairman and the CEO engaged is the right approach.

It depends on what the issue is. I can think of big transactions that I had to approve that involved a takeover, a corporate restructure or a foreign investor and I would expect the chairman to be more engaged in that. If it was something detailed, like a tax matter, I would expect the CEO to be involved.

-Peter Costello

Perhaps the most important role for a chairman, and other board members, is to recognise the value of a constructive relationship with government, understand best practice in achieving this, and work with the CEO and key executives on creating a continuous, strategic approach. This will be the right outcome for shareholders.

Government affairs strengthens the foundations

It depends on how the business is structured but it's a mix of the CEO and the chairman. It's not the government relations person; their role is to attempt to understand where the government's coming from, what they're after, what they're looking for. They should foster relationships particularly at the staff or public service level so that there is name recognition – but the ministerial relationship must be at senior level.

-Kate Carnell

Outsourcing the relationships at ministerial or senior bureaucrat level to government affairs or external lobbyists is not best practice, however each are an important part of the broader political system where relationship building is multi-layered. In-house government affairs executives understand what the layers mean, who has influence, and how to 'work' within a political structure. They will know ministerial staff – such as the chief of staff, or key advisors and they will have relationships with people in the department and regulatory bodies.

Having a government affairs office or external advisory/lobbying firm doesn't take away the direct responsibility of the CEO, it just means you have somebody advising you on the options and the risks. If something's going off the rails in the public domain, it is important to have experienced people to help you recover the situation. If you do get into trouble or you have a serious issue, then obtaining external expert advice doesn't hurt at all and is something I have benefitted from in my career.

-Tony Shepherd.

The government affairs role

The role of head of government affairs has duties particular to the organisation and industry they work in, however there are responsibilities common to government affairs roles:

- **Lead or participate** in the development and management of government affairs, risk management and public policy strategy.
- **Understanding public policy** processes and politics – without playing the politics.
- **Ability to build relationships** with influencers in government, opposition and crossbench representatives.
- **Key relationship manager** with relevant industry groups.
- **Understanding** how ministerial offices operate.
- **Ability to apply a wider lens** to key business decisions and advise the best approach: the politics, departmental viewpoint, the reaction of the crossbench, or as is a common refrain in Australian politics – “the pub test”.
- **Ability to influence** senior internal stakeholders on response to government and public policy announcements and reforms.
- **Understanding of key regulatory matters** affecting the industry and for those in listed companies, a working knowledge of ASX disclosure rules (or NZX equivalent).
- The **experience and communications skills** required to earn the confidence of the C-suite team and the board.

Government affairs should have a relationship strong enough to pave the way for a meeting with a minister. They need to be able to phone the chief of staff, or minister and say: “we’re not going to waste your time, but we need to see you”.
-Heather Ridout

Lobbyists smooth the path

In Australia there are approximately 200 registered lobbying firms representing clients from every industry.⁶ In New Zealand, the profession, while not regulated, is also mature, with lobbyists playing a role in the political system. Lobbying firms are part of the political process working with large companies that require the resources and relationships they bring, and they work with smaller organisations that may not have an in-house government affairs capability. In New Zealand, where business and government are less hierarchical than in Australia, access to ministers and senior bureaucrats is not reliant upon external lobbying, however lobbyists can play a valuable role in preparing a CEO for meetings with government.

If you are a solid CEO who has a story to tell and you are confident in your own skin, you are more likely to be influential than a paid lobbyist.

-Phil O'Reilly

Most lobbyists are former politicians, senior public servants or political staffers who understand the rules of access to ministers and bureaucrats. Their employment history was viewed both negatively and positively by respondents who, while they acknowledged there is a role for lobbyists, almost exclusively said that when they worked in government at the most senior level, they did not wish to meet with them, preferring a direct approach from business. They did, however, acknowledge there are lobbyists who are viewed as the best in their field for whom that view does not apply. These doyens of lobbying are respected by all sides of politics and enjoy access to those in the corridors of power.

According to most respondents, the main advantages of using a lobbyist are their ability to identify influence and power, gather intelligence, research, advise on policy development and map influence on an issue they specialise in.

When I was the chief minister, I didn't understand why businesses just didn't ring me, rather than bring in a gun-for-hire to sit between a CEO and me. However, there are certain times when lobbyists help, for example when there are ministers you can't get to, having a lobbyist that is trusted by the government of the day is useful.

-Kate Carnell

It is clear from our interviews that while lobbyists are part of the system, they should not be the top-line representative – or voice – of an organisation, for that role belongs to the CEO. However, they can add real value to a CEO who needs to build their understanding of players and issues quickly and who doesn't have the internal resources to do this. A lobbyist can take him or her to meet the appropriate government representative to discuss their specific issues. They can provide context to the issue and advise the right way to influence an outcome.

A lobby group is helpful – but this depends on the lobbying group – and most companies employ them now. But leadership must come from the top.

-Dr Ian Watt

The better lobbyists are experienced in working with business on managing issues related to government and can make the difference in a CEO properly managing an issue that could result in an unfavourable outcome for the organisation.

Lobbyists can be vitally important when you have an issue and while you wouldn't outsource the management of it, you would want advice from someone who has good knowledge and connections with government. They can really help with crisis management, but you must get good people – you don't want hacks.

-Heather Ridout

⁶ <https://lobbyists.ag.gov.au/register>



TAKEAWAYS

CEOS HAVE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE RELATIONSHIP WITH MINISTERS AND SENIOR BUREAUCRATS.

DIRECT ENGAGEMENT IS THE BEST APPROACH.

IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES THE CHAIRMAN CAN PLAY A ROLE.

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS AND LOBBYISTS HAVE A SUPPORTING ROLE AND CAN PAVE THE WAY BY PROVIDING CONTEXT, INTELLIGENCE, AND CONNECTIONS.

LOBBYISTS CAN ASSIST WITH CRISIS MANAGEMENT.

Industry associations present a united view

Public engagement initiatives create legitimacy for their industry, and the industry associations need to be constantly doing it. If you only pop up when issues that impact you blow up, then people don't get a sense of who you are and what you stand for.

-Jennifer Westacott

The most effective industry associations are those that are policy focused, active in engaging with government and constructively inform public policy development. They hold industry-wide data and research and understand the impact of policy on their stakeholders.

A good industry association is one that can negotiate on behalf of its members and shake hands on the deal – not say “we now have to go back to our members”.

-Kate Carnell

Many of our conversations concerning industry associations started with the remark: “It depends on the association.” This observation was three-fold; it concerned the expertise of the people running the association, the real or perceived partisanship of the association and the association’s contribution to policy development. Respondents who had low regard for industry associations conceded that they “have their place” in the political system as representatives of their industry – but they are not the sole representative of business.

The good ones really do engage with their members and government and are attuned to the real issues facing their members. They can provide informal forums where you can meet with ministers and public officials in an environment where you can discuss issues openly. They can also confront government on those important industry issues where the individual company may prefer not to.

-Tony Shepherd

Industry associations have got to take the long-term view. No quick fixes, no side deals, rather, build long-term relationships around strong values that help the economy and our society. Do not try to hoodwink governments, or do short term deals, or mix them up with ‘facts’ that aren’t right. Talk about what the industry does and aspires to do, and how it can work with government to get there.

-John Brumby

The role of an industry association is to advance the interests of the industry and those who participate in it. They develop and advocate for public policy that is good for their industry and benefits the nation. An industry association provides a forum for member interaction with each other and those that can inform or assist them, and importantly, they engage in a way that builds legitimacy. They should engage government and the opposition in their policy work, and this should be done at the formation of policy – coming to the party late in the process doesn’t give them a voice and doesn’t serve their industry.

Industry associations that represent their membership well are invaluable. When governments are working through policy or legislative changes that will impact industries with many players, it is vitally important to have a conduit that can do some of the leg work that is impossible for government to do. An industry that has reached a common position has undergone many robust discussions to reach that consensus.

-Anna Bligh

During my time in the ministry I valued a good relationship with representative bodies. A minister can’t possibly know every opinion and disparate opinion within a sector whereas representative bodies have got an opportunity to try to understand a problem and bring it to a minister with a possible solution.

-Helen Coonan

Businesses that are members of an industry association are encouraged to get involved by working on committees and making sure their voice is heard.

Once you have joined an industry association don't be a passenger. You'll get the most out of it by turning up and joining a committee. That doesn't mean you become an "association guy" but if you're always at the back of the room, then you can't hardly blame the association when it says things you don't agree with.

-Phil O'Reilly

What they shouldn't do, according to respondents, is be the only conduit to government for business – particularly large businesses with the resources to represent themselves. Associations with small to medium sized businesses as members are likely to represent them at government level, but the "big end of town" still needs to engage with government direct. There may be policy issues where advocacy to government is strengthened when coordinated between the industry association and its members.

They can give you the lie of the land such as who's who and introduce you to contacts but if there are any big issues, businesses must engage with government. They can't just leave it to an industry association.

-Peter Costello

Business relies too heavily on its industry associations to be the conduit into government. They have their place, but they're not a replacement for the engagement business needs to have; they're an addition. Direct relationships are important and beneficial, and that's better for government.

-Steve Bracks

Crossbench advocacy requires expertise and resources

Industry associations can play a valuable role in understanding and mapping the disparate views and positions of the crossbench. Two respondents cited successful advocacy campaigns that involved discussions between members of industry association with the crossbench. The common element of these campaigns was the deep work done on mapping each crossbench member, matching them to industry representatives that were either known to them or most likely to gain access, crafting targeted messaging for each conversation and negotiating with all parties.

TAKEAWAYS

INDUSTRY ASSOCIATIONS CAN PROVIDE A WHOLE-OF-INDUSTRY POSITION TO GOVERNMENT

THEY DO NOT REPLACE DIRECT CONTACT – BIG BUSINESS NEEDS TO DEVELOPMENT RELATIONSHIPS WITH GOVERNMENT

INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION EVENTS AND BUSINESS FORUMS ARE USEFUL MEANS OF NETWORKING BETWEEN BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT.

Political donations do not equal policy outcomes

Political donations are not important for access and shouldn't be.

-Greg Combet

Businesses that donate to governments for a policy outcome are wasting their money. Moreover, the consensus among respondents was that there is a trend away from business donations to government and at best, they may provide access.

If you donate, quite frankly it makes no difference how you're treated by government. You may be considered a "friend" but I don't know of any company which gets an advantage out of donating - perhaps they gain some access but in this age of probity and ICAC they do not get a better outcome which is a good thing. Of course, a company is well within its rights to donate to a political party whose policies appear to be more supportive of the industry they are in.

-Tony Shepherd

While donations for policy outcomes were discounted as a good government affairs strategy, attending business forums and events held by industry associations and governments was considered worthwhile. The forums bring together stakeholders from various industries and levels of government and can help organisations lift their profile, build networks and gain insight into the priorities of government.

I don't think businesses should rely upon donations. If I was a CEO, I would pay to send my government affairs head to the forums which won't make, break or solve problems, but are a good thing to do. The more people engage, the better, but they - and the community - shouldn't delude themselves - that this is where deals are done for it is simply not the case.

-Nick Greiner

It can be useful to invest in a dinner where you sit at a table with a minister for an hour or two so that they know who you are. That may have some impact, but these days political donations more broadly cause more harm than good to most companies.

-Kate Carnell

Some respondents noted that connections made with donors lead to ministers gaining vital knowledge about business. Fundraising events can also provide opportunities for governments to learn more about the issues impacting business.

I learnt a lot about business and potential investors in NSW at political fundraisers, without compromising my integrity or that of the government. I didn't have favourites in the business sector. I saw giving people access as my job.

-Bob Carr

If you've got a legitimate business, why wouldn't elected representatives want to know how that business is doing and whether there are unnecessary regulatory burdens holding back the prosperity of business sectors. It is a legitimate part of keeping informed about business impacts more broadly than just for an individual business. Either you make political donations illegal or you make the system work as well as it can.

-Helen Coonan

Many former politicians we spoke to said donations are not as influential as people think they are, and give little more than preferred access and invitations to the forums ministers or senior bureaucrats will be attending. They advised big business to look for other ways to put their case to government, or if they wanted to have a stake in government via donations, (which is their right) to do so to foster good government.

I don't know that donations are important but being seen at events is helpful – you are getting to know people, developing long-term relationships and showing people that you've got a stake in the whole thing. Having a stake in the country is important.

-Peter Costello

If you want to make a donation, do so by all means, but do it in order to get good policy outcomes by supporting the election process. The idea of giving one political party a lot of money just so you can gain access is very wrong footed in New Zealand. It is far better to gain access because you've got a good policy idea that is good for New Zealand and aligned to your strategy.

-Phil O'Reilly

TAKEAWAYS

DONATIONS ARE NOT AS INFLUENTIAL AS SOME PEOPLE THINK THEY ARE.

POLITICAL DONATIONS DO NOT EQUAL POLICY OUTCOMES.

FORUMS AND FUNDRAISING EVENTS ARE A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY TO NETWORK WITH POLITICIANS.

Learning the steps

Government relationships bring together many players: members of the ruling party, the opposition and minor parties, independent politicians, the bureaucracy, regulators, industry associations, media, advocacy groups, lobbyists and – our primary audience for this research – business, which often has its own layers of people involved in government engagement. Those involved must learn a complex dance – where the steps are rich with ambiguity, nuance and conflict, and where progress is delicately negotiated, often contested and hard won.

Relationships are complicated. To succeed, they rely on mutual understanding, goodwill and respect. To thrive, they must share longevity, common purpose and trust. The relationship between business and government is one that will work, and thrive, if both parties are guided by one principle: to act in the national interest first. When self-interest, perceived or real, is the motivation for negotiating the relationship, it will falter.

Business leaders who have developed and fostered productive relationships with governments understand this. They are advocates for their industry, good corporate citizens and respect that they need to earn their “social licence to operate”. They also know that understanding the nuance and complexity of stakeholder relations is the difference between success and failure – perhaps none more so than government.

The business leaders who build productive relationships with government take responsibility for engaging with both the bureaucracy and politicians while being aware of the influence of other stakeholders. They are well informed and understand the electoral context of politicians, the policy creation environment the bureaucracy works within and, the benefits of seeking alignment between the two with their business opportunities.

They are skilled communicators who are adept at building a case for change, or proposing a partnership with government that benefits society, their industry and their organisation – *in that order*. They are also agile and deal well with ambiguity. This is particularly important in Australia given the immense change and churn at the federal government level over recent years, which brought about uncertainty to the policy environment. Business craves certainty but accepts that the most stable of governments will make changes; a cabinet reshuffle will result in new ministers, new staff, changes in the bureaucracy and new relationships to be established.

Boards are also key performers in this dance. Their first role is to understand the importance of government in the organisation’s stakeholder engagement and its potential for disruption. This will influence how directors evaluate and select leaders, and how they approach what is, arguably, their greatest responsibility – the selection of the CEO.

Korn Ferry hopes this report offers insight into the nuance and complexity of engaging with governments and provides guidance to leaders who will learn from the advice shared by those with experience on both sides of the relationship. The business case for productive engagement between government and business is clear and confirmed by the findings in this report.

Skilful management of the relationship needs to be a key performance indicator for our business and government leaders, for when they work together constructively, everyone benefits. Learning the steps of this complex dance involves commitment to a long-term strategy and accepting that the rules of this dance aren’t always easy or fair. But those in the business community who learn the steps – and are prepared to re-learn steps every time the rules change – will have the best chance of managing a professional and productive relationship with government.

Resources from Korn Ferry Institute

The Self-Disruptive Leader (2019)

<https://www.kornferry.com/self-disrupt>

Rising to the Challenge – Defining Success in Corporate Affairs Leadership

Rising to the challenge_defining success in corporate affairs leadership

A Boardroom Guide to CEO Progression (2019)

A Boardroom Guide to CEO-Progression_Korn-Ferry.pdf

Australian Women CEOs Speak (2018)

<https://www.kornferry.com/institute/australian-women-ceos-speak>

The C-suite: Moving Up and Moving In (2017)

The-c-suite-moving-up-and-moving-in_Australasia

The Future of Work (2017)

<https://www.kornferry.com/institute/2030-the-very-human-future-of-work>

The Tone from the Top: Taking Responsibility for Corporate Culture (2016)

The-tone-from-the-top-taking-responsibility-for-corporate-culture_Australasia

The Risky Business of CEO Succession (2015)

The-risky-business-ceo-succession_Australasia

Korn Ferry research team

Interviewers

Patrizia Anzellotti

Therese Doupe

Katie Lahey AM

Peter MacCauley

Tim Nelson

Annika Streefland

Hon Robert Webster

Project leader and writer

Dr Kerry Little

Contact

Korn Ferry, Australia

Level 12, 410 Queen Street, Brisbane Qld 4000

Tel: +617 3015 3700

Level 20, 120 Collins Street, Melbourne VIC 3000

Tel: +613 9631 0300

Level 18, Aurora Place, 88 Phillip Street, Sydney

NSW 2000 Tel: +612 9006 3400

Level 1, 5 Mill Street, Perth WA 6000

Tel: +61 8 9217 3900

Korn Ferry, New Zealand

Walker Wayland Centre, Level 6, 68 Shortland Street, Auckland 1010

Tel: +64 9 921 5900

Level 1, Free Ambulance Building, 5 Cable Street, Wellington 6011

Tel: +64 4 460 4900

About Korn Ferry

Korn Ferry is a global organisational consulting firm. We help clients synchronise strategy and talent to drive superior performance. We work with organisations to design their structures, roles, and responsibilities. We help them hire the right people to bring their strategy to life. And we advise them on how to reward, develop, and motivate their people.

About the Korn Ferry Institute

The Korn Ferry Institute, our research and analytics arm, was established to share intelligence and expert points of view on talent and leadership. Through studies, books and a quarterly magazine, Briefings, we aim to increase understanding of how strategic talent decisions contribute to competitive advantage, growth, and success.

Visit www.kornferry.com for more information on Korn Ferry, and www.kornferryinstitute.com for articles, research and insights.