



Spencer Stuart Switzerland
POINT OF VIEW

WINTER 2007/2008

SpencerStuart

ABOUT SPENCER STUART

Spencer Stuart is one of the world's leading executive search consulting firms. Privately held since 1956, Spencer Stuart applies its extensive knowledge of industries, functions and talent to advise select clients — ranging from major multinationals to emerging companies to nonprofit organisations — and address their leadership requirements. Through 51 offices in 27 countries and a broad range of practice groups, Spencer Stuart consultants focus on senior-level executive search, board director appointments, succession planning and in-depth senior executive management assessments. For more information on Spencer Stuart, please visit www.spencerstuart.com.

Spencer Stuart Switzerland
POINT OF VIEW

WINTER 2007/2008

Table of contents

Editorial *Page 5*

Navigating the barriers to CEO succession

Andreas Hürlimann, Zurich

CEO tenure is getting shorter, and in recent years the task of actively managing the CEO's succession has been recognized as a top priority for Swiss boards. This article examines the barriers that prevent boards from dealing effectively with the issue of CEO succession and suggests how they can be overcome. *Page 6*

Planning your own exit

Phil Le Goff, Zurich

A CEO's decision about whether and when to leave a company is often extremely difficult. This article offers advice on how to accomplish a graceful exit, preserve reputation and prepare for the next step. *Page 15*

Leadership dilemmas in family-owned businesses

Antonio Maturo, Geneva

For family-owned businesses it can be a difficult decision to hire an outside executive to lead the business. This article considers some of the challenges that accompany the decision and suggests strategies for both companies and external executives that ensure a successful outcome. *Page 20*

Talent management and succession planning in the European insurance industry

Maurice Zufferey, Zurich

European insurance companies are starting to recognize the value of talent management and succession planning, but there is a significant gap between intention and reality. Rolling out a succession plan usually involves significant cultural change and requires discipline, sound processes and commitment from all levels of the organisation. This article looks at the trends, attitudes and approaches to succession planning and talent mapping in the industry. [Page 25](#)

Auf dem Gipfel hat der Wind zugenommen: Neue Fähigkeiten sind gefragt

Roger Rytz, Zurich

Eine wesentlich intensivere Zusammenarbeit mit dem VR, die gewachsenen Ansprüche von Aktionären, Mitarbeitenden und Kunden und der gewachsene Druck von Seiten der Behörden und anderen Regulatoren verlangen vom heutigen CEO mehr Zeit und neue zusätzliche Fähigkeiten. Gleichzeitig wird ein autoritärer Führungsstil nicht mehr toleriert, und die Durchsetzung ethischen Geschäftsgebarens bindet weitere Kräfte. Die Aufgabe des CEO ist damit wesentlich anspruchsvoller geworden. [Page 30](#)

From traditional intellectual property to profitable intellectual capital management: effective IP licensing as a new way to generate profits

François Clerc, Geneva

IP licensing is an emerging, albeit embryonic, trend, which is in tune with the new principles set by globalisation and the increasingly complex interdependence of business. This article explores the opportunity that active management of intellectual property offers companies, especially the high-margin revenue that can be generated by IP licensing. *Page 37*

Spencer Stuart publications *Page 45*

We highlight four recent pieces of intellectual capital published by Spencer Stuart.

Spencer Stuart consultants in Switzerland *Page 47*

Spencer Stuart in Switzerland *Page 48*

Editorial

“When you’re dying of thirst, it’s too late to think about digging a well.” — *Japanese proverb*

Companies would do well to heed this Japanese proverb, since it carries a truth about succession planning — it is one of the fundamental responsibilities of management and boards, yet many find it among their most challenging.

In this winter issue of *Switzerland Point of View* we reflect on and provide insights about a number of issues related to planning for the succession of the CEO, top executives and board directors. Andreas Hürlimann considers how boards can overcome the barriers that get in the way of CEO succession. Phil Le Goff examines the CEO’s role in managing his or her own exit. Antonio Maturro writes about the challenges faced by family-owned companies looking externally for their leadership successor. Maurice Zufferey describes the state of talent management and succession planning in the European insurance industry, while Roger Rytz looks at the new skills and characteristics required of today’s CEOs. Finally, François Clerc writes about effective intellectual capital management and its growing contribution to business profitability.

We wish you an enjoyable read and, as always, we appreciate your feedback.

Navigating the barriers to CEO succession

Only in recent years has the task of actively managing the CEO's succession become recognized as a top priority for Swiss boards. With some notable exceptions, many boards are falling short of their responsibility to plan rigorously for a smooth transition at the top.

An examination of the Swiss Leader Index® (SLI®) shows that only around half of all CEO successions ran smoothly — in other words, were planned and executed properly — between 2006 and 2007. Approximately one quarter of succession events were publicly known to be acknowledged as very difficult and/or completely unplanned. For the remainder, the public may not have noticed any hitches, but there were many surprises, both in terms of process and candidates.

A number of factors have combined to bring the issue of leadership succession to the fore. First, corporate governance reforms have raised the level of accountability for executives and independent directors alike, making it harder to survive a period of poor performance. Second, these same reforms have empowered shareholders to take a more active stance against management failings and boards that fail to rectify those failings. Third, the majority of boards of SWX listed companies separate the role of the chairman and the CEO. These factors have made the CEO far more vulnerable than in the past.

CEO tenure is getting shorter, but it is not just the CEO who is vulnerable. The early, unexpected departure of a CEO often has a negative impact on the company's share price, as investors speculate on how effective the replacement will be and whether the board is competent to restore stability to the organisation. A well thought-through succession plan will, however, go a long way toward mitigating the impact of a CEO's departure.

Perhaps surprisingly, there is little governance regulation covering CEO succession. The Swiss Code of Obligations stipulates the tasks of the board, which include the responsibility for management appointment and dismissal (Art. 716a) without going into specifics on process. The Swiss Code of Best Practice for Corporate Governance is explicit about the board's obligation to plan board succession and define the selection criteria. Although CEO succession is not specifically addressed, it is an implicit responsibility of the board.

With the number of CEO departures in Switzerland on the increase, CEO succession has become of paramount importance. Yet our experience is that some boards are still reluctant to face the issue head on; the gap between intention and execution is sometimes conspicuously wide. How, then, should boards respond to the succession planning challenge? The ideal scenario is that of a stable company, performing at or above market expectation, whose board takes a well-planned, long-term view of succession and has created the right environment to identify, develop and retain its future leaders. In reality, this rarely happens, and no company — even one with a sound long-term succession plan — can afford to be complacent or can escape the possibility that short-term, urgent

succession activity may be necessary. A CEO may decide, due to illness or for other personal reasons, to leave earlier than planned, in which case a short-term solution will be needed.

Some boards focus properly on succession only when faced with a performance crisis, in which case it is probably too late — they will almost certainly have to look outside the organisation for a replacement CEO. Whatever the situation, a board's ability to handle succession will depend on a combination of structural and psychological factors. So what are the barriers preventing boards from dealing effectively with the issue of CEO succession?

Barriers to CEO succession

BOARD DISTRACTIONS

Boards have to strike a balance between focusing on things that require immediate attention and considering the long-term goals of the organisation. Priority is inevitably given to what appear to be the most pressing issues, such as corporate governance, financial integrity, strategy development, M&A, performance, shareholder demands and influence and CEO compensation — often at the expense of succession planning.

A SENSITIVE SUBJECT

Communicating the need for succession planning is psychologically complex and requires delicate handling. Many boards are simply uncomfortable raising the issue for a variety of reasons. They may regard it as insensitive to put succession on the agenda when the CEO is relatively new in the role, or they may be reluctant to increase the pressure a CEO is already under, by asking him or her to think about their successor.

THE RELUCTANT CEO

The CEO who exerts an overly powerful influence in the boardroom is likely to make it difficult for other board members to raise the issue of his or her succession. Such a situation calls for a strong chairman or nomination committee lead director to ensure that the topic is not overlooked. The more self-confident and politically smart CEO will embrace the development of a succession plan, and participate actively in securing leadership continuity in the interests of the business and all its stakeholders. However, our experience is that CEOs are sometimes reluctant to raise the topic of their own succession.

The truth is that, as a business evolves, the requirements of its CEO also can change. At some point the experience and ability of the current CEO may not be sufficient to steer the business through its next phase, and so a different set of leadership skills may be needed. This can be hard to accept, especially for someone devoted to the power and prestige that comes with the top job. However, as others have pointed out, a CEO's true legacy is determined by what happens to the company after his or her departure. Those CEOs who recognize that they are not weakening their position by embracing the succession issue are doing themselves a favour, as well as benefiting a broad range of stakeholders.

COMPLACENCY

Many boards think they are doing well, yet their definition of a good succession plan is often inadequate. Board members may find themselves too close to the CEO, lacking a sufficiently independent or objective mindset necessary to tackle the subject effectively. In addition, the board may not have enough experience

in overseeing a succession plan. It is good corporate governance for a board to contain at least one person with firsthand experience of senior-level succession planning.

LACK OF OBJECTIVITY

When boards do turn their attention to CEO succession, it is a mistake for board members to rely solely on their own subjective views of possible candidates. For example, there is a commonly held preconception that internal candidates are saddled with too much baggage, unable to approach the challenge of the CEO's job in a fresh manner, or that external candidates lack crucial product knowledge and credibility with customers. Both views can be grossly unfair to potential contenders.

A good starting point is to undertake an objective assessment of potential succession candidates, both inside and outside the organisation. In case the CEO has not been entirely forthcoming or accurate in his assessment of senior-level reports, many boards find it extremely helpful to retain external advisers who can conduct a thorough benchmarking exercise early on in the process. Benchmarking potential succession candidates against the best leadership talent outside the organisation brings a crucial element of objectivity to the process and ensures that none is overlooked in the search for a new CEO.

LACK OF AGREEMENT ON THE REQUIREMENTS

When succession plans fail, it is often because a board does not understand the characteristics of the ideal candidate. The board cannot make a good decision about the future leader without first agreeing to a clearly defined specification for the future CEO role.

That specification must take into account the vision of the company, its long-term strategy and any developments taking place in the sector. Without a comprehensive specification to work from, the board is going to find it extremely difficult to make the right decision.

LACK OF CEO-READY TALENT ON THE INSIDE

Not all companies will be blessed with a crop of potential successors with the talent and experience to assume the CEO role within the given timeframe. Demands on CEOs are increasing all the time and, as a result, fewer people are qualified to step into the top role. This is particularly true in organisations comprising few lines of business or little diversity of offerings, where the pyramid of potential successors can be quite narrow. Particular effort must be made to nurture and develop talent in an organisation where there are fewer opportunities to put people into general management roles.

Studies show that there is a correlation between the size of a company's revenues and the board's satisfaction with management succession. Also, CEO-ready talent is more easily found inside a multinational, more diversified company. Potential CEO successors tend to learn general management skills in larger and more diversified companies such as ABB, Mettler-Toledo, Nestlé, Novartis, Sulzer and UBS where there are abundant opportunities for high-fliers to run parts of different businesses at an early stage in their careers. Of course, there are no guarantees, even in these larger businesses — many of the leadership skills required of a CEO are unique to the top role and therefore not easily learned.

THE THREAT OF LOSING GOOD PEOPLE

Some boards will ask themselves whether openly executing a succession plan is worth the risk that disappointed candidates may decide to leave. For most organisations the loss of leading managers could be devastating and every effort should be made to avoid this happening. How the board and CEO manage communications with senior executives is critical; if it becomes widely known that there are two or three potential CEO successors, people inside the organisation may split into camps and this can have a negative effect on the culture.

Navigating the barriers

As we have seen, there are a number of barriers that boards must overcome before they are able to develop and implement an effective CEO succession plan. Many of these barriers are psychological, involving perfectly understandable fears, perceptions and sensitivities. The fact that these “soft” factors so often interfere with the task suggests that many boards lack a formal framework for succession planning.

The most effective way to overcome these psychological barriers is to create a mechanism that will enable board directors to apply themselves to the task of succession planning in an objective, emotion-free manner. A robust process matters as much for succession as it does for audit, board nominations and compensation. Indeed, it could be argued that without such a process in place, the board is neglecting its fiduciary responsibility.

One solution is for the board to set up a committee with explicit responsibility for overseeing the CEO succession planning process. With a mandate to look at short-, medium- and long-term scenarios, the committee membership should be well balanced and capable of covering this task effectively.

The more “matter-of-fact” the process, the less alarming it will be for everyone concerned, including the CEO. Ideally, of course, the CEO would participate actively and enthusiastically in finding his successor, but in any case the existence of a committee will ensure that the board is not reliant on the CEO to raise the topic.

No one should be in any doubt that this will involve a serious time commitment. However, the presence of the committee increases the likelihood that board members will invest the time to get to know the pool of potential successors personally. Its value in guiding the board to the right decision, ensuring an orderly transition of power, and keeping all the internal candidates motivated, can be substantial.

Both the current CEO and the senior human resources officer will have a role working alongside the committee, as will outside consultants who can provide benchmarking and assessment services and potentially act as a catalyst or facilitator for board-level discussion on the topic.

Alternatively, some companies may favour a less formal, more ad hoc approach, creating instead a “task force” of interested directors with no charter. The danger with this approach is that an informal task force might be perceived as acting under the radar, perpetuating the stigma associated with succession planning — making it seem like a delicate topic. Whatever its title, the very existence of a formal board entity sends out an important message about the routine nature of the succession planning process, and automatically overcomes any reluctance to raise the issue in the first place.

To avoid rumour and speculation and to minimize the effect on the company's shares, the board should exercise particular discretion over CEO succession planning. If a proper relationship exists between board, management and shareholders, the latter should be satisfied in the knowledge that a well thought-through process is in place and in the hands of qualified board members. Institutional investors need to be confident that the board is taking care of succession but do not need to have any further window on the process. Similarly, the board must communicate whatever process is in place, but should not feel compelled to divulge particulars.

Finally, it is vital that the successor to the post of CEO is suited to lead the company of the future, not the company as it stands today. The first step towards framing a succession plan is likely to be the board retreat, when board members focus on long-term strategy. With the strategy in place, and a vision for what the company will look like in five to ten years, only then is it possible to create the specification for the future CEO and start the identification process with confidence.

Andreas Hürlimann, Zurich

Planning your own exit

It is an issue many CEOs wrestle with: how to do the right thing for one's company, while also doing right by oneself. When it is time to move on? How can a CEO manage his or her transition to the next phase of life in the most responsible way and with the least negative impact on the company?

Methodical planning is not new to experienced CEOs, who should settle for nothing less when it comes to planning for themselves and their future. We recommend a personal “360” as the best place to start before embarking on a new life phase. This exercise begins with some serious self-reflection: What am I passionate about? What do I still want to accomplish? In addition, it may be helpful to get an honest assessment of yourself from a range of those close to you, including friends and business colleagues as well as your spouse. What do they view as your strengths, weaknesses and perhaps untapped skills or talents, traits that you may not even have thought about building on? You may be surprised at what you learn. Keep in mind the need for discretion with current board members and business associates when exploring personal next steps, avoiding even a hint that you might be moving on. We offer more specific suggestions below on how to deal appropriately with the delicate matter of sharing your plans with your own board.

Once you have digested the input from your self assessment and the added views of those who know you best, consider brainstorming — alone and with others — to generate a working list of options for yourself. While certain choices such as Olympic athlete

or astronaut may be foreclosed at this point, aim to be as expansive and inclusive as possible in generating a working list; it can always be whittled down later. So philanthropy, the arts, local government, studying, teaching and coaching definitely belong here, as do economic sectors you may not know, but feel attracted to. In our experience, CEOs tend to underestimate the range of options open to them, looking at only the most obvious extensions of what they have already done.

When in exploration mode, your network of key advisors may sometimes surprise you with interesting, less apparent opportunities. When your contacts know of your interest, they may be able to hold a spot for you or create an opening that fits your time frame. Former CEOs are frequently in demand for a variety of positions, including independent directorships, government and community leadership roles, and board or senior executive roles with high-profile nonprofit groups. Another area where we see increasing demand for CEOs is private equity, which hires retired executives into partner roles, operating positions in portfolio companies, or as deal advisers.

When you have honed your list to real possibilities that would interest you, you will want to spend considerable time building your bridging strategy. Your bridging strategy might include steps for gaining specific experience important to your next phase or developing helpful personal connections.

Common examples of “paving the way” include CEOs taking an external board position with another corporation, or perhaps becoming involved with government committees or projects and charitable or cultural bodies in the final years preceding their planned retirement date. While your bridging strategy should be consciously proactive, it also is built with time and patience.

Most worthwhile opportunities do not develop overnight, as you will know from your own business experience.

Be prepared to work at your personal plan, and regularly and discreetly follow up with those who may be able to open doors for you, just as you would in your role as CEO. The net result of all this activity should be a realistic, desirable choice — or choices — as well as a strategy for nurturing one or more of them to fruition. One important note: especially if you are an older CEO, do not underestimate lifestyle considerations when you are evaluating and pursuing your next move. New paths, including nonprofits and board appointments, can be far more demanding than many experienced CEOs anticipate. Any potential move should be properly evaluated and vetted. Activities you were able to take in your stride over the years as requisites for performing your job and advancing in your career may be unacceptable hardships for you now. If you value quality time with your family or the freedom to travel, for example, be sure to factor them into the equation and make your choices accordingly. This takes on special significance at a time when multinational companies are increasingly interested in appointing boards with global representation, which can be a positive or negative factor to different people.

The better prepared you are personally for your “next career,” the more likely you are to effectively manage the notification of your departure with your board and chairman. The ideal is to provide appropriate time for your board to facilitate effective CEO succession, and for you to assist the chairman and board in this process. Precisely what the period of notice should be may vary widely, depending on how well prepared you and your board are in terms of ready succession contenders. If internal succession is available and likely, nine to 12 months’ notice would typically be sufficient. If external candidates will be required, a minimum of 12

months' notice should be provided to ensure a proper and smooth succession process. Notification to your board typically begins with an informal discussion, leading to formal notice at an appropriate time, which is generally spelled out in employment contracts, long-term incentive plans and the like.

Principles for accomplishing a graceful exit

While everyone's exit plan will be uniquely his or her own, here are several basic principles that can be applied to all:

ENLIST YOUR PERSONAL BOARD. Your own group of advisors and friends — those who know you best — will be helpful as a sounding board and as a source of ideas. Make sure to keep them apprised of your plans.

INVEST THE TIME AND DISCIPLINE. Chances are, you have planned carefully for most of your life. The next phase of your life should be approached in the same thoughtful fashion, even if it is the fulfilment of a personal or non-business dream. Step back and take the long-term view, and weigh the pros and cons of your next move to give it the best chance of success.

CONDUCT CAREFUL DUE DILIGENCE. Next steps that are not carefully planned and vetted can be personally disappointing and professionally embarrassing, and if you are a large company CEO, it is sure to be news. Be sure to explore the positives as well as any potential pitfalls new opportunities may present.

ALLOW POSSIBILITIES TO PERCOLATE. The right opportunity may emerge quickly or it may take some time to take shape. Try not to adhere to too strict a timetable: discuss your interests with those in your network, and then give the possibilities a chance to germinate. On the other hand, there is also a chance that someone

might create an opportunity or adjust the timing if they learn of your availability.

GUARD YOUR REPUTATION. Successful CEOs want to launch their personal plans, confident that they are leaving the company in steady hands. However, it is not unheard of for an attractive opportunity to emerge sooner than expected. When weighing your personal goals against the needs of the company, our advice is to err on doing the right thing for the company. You have built and burnished your reputation over the course of a lifetime, and you never want to put it at risk.

LEAVE ROOM FOR SERENDIPITY. Not to suggest that you ignore prudent planning, but remember, some of the best opportunities in life come out of the blue — if you are open to them. How you met your wife or husband, your best friend or got a great job, may be examples. Even as you carefully plan your next move, periodically look in new places for potentially gratifying opportunities that may have escaped your notice. With their experience and skills in greater demand than ever, and with people living longer, more productive lives, CEOs have the opportunity to reinvent themselves as never before. A combination of careful planning with your own board, and some soul searching and a personal strategy, as we recommend here, can yield a fulfilling second act, or even a third or fourth.

Phil Le Goff, Zurich

Leadership dilemmas in family-owned businesses

Spencer Stuart has advised on leadership dilemma issues within family-owned business for some time, conducting numerous interviews, studies, and analyses on the topic.

These tend to demonstrate that the appointment of an “outside CEO” (or, to be more precise, “non-family CEO”), or any other executive member of the management, has often led to failure. The frequency of such incidents has prompted this article.

Besides excellent business ideas, one needs strong, determined and confident leadership in order to run a company. Only a strong management team will motivate and organise a business efficiently. In a family-owned business loyalty, trust and dedication are the bread and butter of success. A threat to those basic values will not be tolerated. Therefore, managers and directors face various constraints when joining a family company from the outside.

*“In a family-owned company,
business and personal issues are inseparable”*

Senior managers who have gained experience in the real world of tough business are often immune to emotional issues. The saying “It’s nothing personal, it’s just business” is foreign to a family-owned company, where business and personal issues are inseparable.

Senior managers entering a family business have to possess a strong and confident personality without being too interested in recognition or status. It is evident that the incoming executive has to make the greater effort in order to adapt. By the same token, the former family occupant of the position, and other family members involved in the leadership process, have to make a significant contribution to integrating the new outside executive. The know-how and connections of the retiring family member are of value for the new executive.

It is naturally extremely difficult for an outsider to be accepted into the family business — into an image, dream, or legacy that the family has cherished generation after generation. If the non-family executive leader manages to last, the balance of power between senior management and the board becomes more transparent and results in fewer cases of mismanagement.

Sacrifices are necessary on both sides, from the external manager and family members. In particular, the outside manager has to prove his or her substantial managerial experience, whereas an inside manager (family member) has to demonstrate his or her diligence and entrepreneurial skills.

The role played by the executive search firm in the selection process is more critical than ever. While most family companies prefer to search and select a manager through their own network, the right search firm can broaden the search, while meeting the family's expectation that the selected manager will be trustworthy, motivated, aligned with company strategy and able to coexist harmoniously with senior management. The successful outside candidate has to be someone who identifies herself or himself with the company as closely as the family members do.

Not only does the search firm have to convince the family to take a risk and appoint an outsider as the executive manager of the business, but it must also encourage candidates to come forward for the position. Senior leadership positions within a family company are not as sought after as other top-level positions. Some executives might see this as a great professional opportunity as well as a challenge, however most are discouraged by the fact that the position may not carry as much authority and independence as they are used to.

There are positive and negative aspects to the process of professionalisation within the management of family businesses:

Positive

- > Greater tendency to change and innovate
- > Effective decision making
- > Possibility for more efficient checks and balances
- > Roles of the executive are better defined
- > Weaker control of the family
- > Higher legitimacy on the operating market
- > Integration of young leaders
- > Encourages discipline in the family
- > More formal procedures
- > Emotional independence / “no” personal relationships
- > Knowledge and experience of external market
- > Different management and communication style

Negative

- > Weaker control of managerial behaviour
- > Possibility that company’s interest will be disregarded
- > Difficult coexistence with possible tension at higher-level of management

-
- > Complex transitional period
 - > Insufficient authority and independence
 - > Lack of motivation due to poor integration
 - > No strategic sovereignty
 - > Uncoordinated interference from the family
 - > Lack of cultural sensitivity to family values

The recruitment of an external candidate can prove invaluable for the company's future, but at what point should family members look outside for someone to lead the business? The answer is that it depends on the particular state of affairs at each company. In any case, the need for a non-family CEO becomes evident when there is no suitable candidate for the top job from within the family, or when the family is in disagreement on a potential candidate.

It is an intricate decision for a family to appoint its first outside executive manager after many years of exclusive family management. Transitioning to the new regime of an outside manager requires patience from all parties: the company, potential candidates and, where relevant, the executive search firm.

Moreover, once the decision is made to appoint a non-family manager, it has to be communicated to employees and financial partners in order to keep their trust. The family is usually engaged in the business through a supervisory or advisory board. In any case, they have to guide and support the new management. The role of the supervisory board is vital during the period of transition. To avoid unnecessary conflict between management and the family, potential disagreements should always be identified and discussed at an early stage

In addition to the support of an advisory body, it is important that the tasks of management are clearly delineated so that the outside executive does not have to deal with unnecessary interference from family members. To avoid unnecessary conflict between management and the family, potential disagreements should always be identified and discussed at an early stage so that solutions beneficial to all parties can be negotiated.

Conclusion

After reviewing the role, advantages, disadvantages, and importance of an outside executive manager in a family-owned business, it is possible to reach the conclusion that engaging an outsider is not only possible, but often the right decision in the long-run. When it comes to external recruitment, involving a search firm with the right experience can bring great value and assistance in minimising risk, building trust, and of course finding the right candidate. The search firm can also make it easier for the family company to justify what may be a difficult decision to look outside the family for an executive manager. And for the manager coming in from the outside, what matters is receiving substantial assistance and support from the supervisory board.

Antonio Maturo, Geneva.

Sources:

Otto Obermaier: *The delicate balance between power and restraint: The demanding role of the outside CEO in a family company*, 2006.

Bruno Colombo & Umberto Bussolati Dell'Orto: *Senior management in Italian family-owned businesses*, 2007.

Talent management and succession planning in the European insurance industry

In most European insurance companies, formalised talent management and succession planning processes have been introduced relatively recently, i.e. within the last five years.

Based on comparable studies we have conducted in other parts of the financial services industry and in consumer and technology businesses, it is clear that the insurance industry lags behind other industries in this respect. But even for those that have been active in this area for some while, getting people's attention and doing it right remain a challenge.

European insurance companies are starting to recognize the value of talent management and succession planning, although in many cases there appears to be a substantial gulf between intention and reality. Many good programmes exist, but do they deliver?

Approaches to succession planning and talent management

Most companies have prioritised their succession planning by giving greatest emphasis to the top two layers of executives. Many companies are only now beginning to build talent management programmes for high potential middle managers and junior staff. Among the businesses we spoke to, the number of "high potentials" being tracked varied hugely, from as few as 30 to as many as 1,400 in one of the larger companies.

Talent management and succession planning initiatives have to deliver results or they will lose support. Insurance companies have to contend with the reality that assessment procedures are often unpopular or applied inconsistently. The evaluation of individuals can be highly subjective; transparency may be lacking and processes perceived as bureaucratic.

Competency models and performance measurement

Most companies we talked to operate competency models, managing them entirely in-house. These vary in sophistication; some are specifically designed as an internal leadership assessment tool, others are fairly generic. Not all are linked to succession planning, although they often feed into training courses that are devised to fill competency gaps. Competency models are usually directly influenced by strategic plans, but not in every case, which is surprising.

Annual appraisals (increasingly 360 degree appraisals) are becoming more common, although these are not at all popular, especially among brokers. Increasingly, bonuses are being linked directly to appraisals as companies relate compensation models more closely to competency and performance issues. That said, succession planning is not always linked to the competency model, and more could undoubtedly be done to connect the two.

Balancing technical expertise with broader business management skills

The combination of general management and technical skills is highly sought after in the insurance industry. The changing pace and shape of insurance is putting a premium on business and managerial competencies. While technical roles (e.g. risk, finance,

actuarial) remain critical, there is no question that increased emphasis is being placed on the development of managerial skills.

Diversity in the European insurance industry

The insurance industry may not have been an early adopter of diversity policies, but the issue is now being addressed across the board. There remains a shortage of women in leading positions, although there is less gender imbalance at more junior levels.

The value of job rotation

Job rotation is generally recognized as a positive, desirable thing — for some companies it is a prerequisite for taking on senior jobs. Job rotation is most common in the first decade of an insurance career, after which people generally become far less mobile than in other industries. Having encouraged people to move around the organisation it is important that they return to a more senior role.

Secondments — an alternative to job rotation, and a good way to give experience to high potentials — can be expensive to arrange. Business unit accountability can make it difficult for people to move around the company, and more conservative managers are often loath to let good people go. Such attitudes will need to change if insurance companies are to retain and develop talented individuals for the long-term benefit of the organisation.

External benchmarking

Even if a company believes that it is self-sufficient in terms of talent it is often regarded as essential, when a succession event occurs, to benchmark internal candidates against competitors and an even wider potential talent pool.

However, external benchmarking appears to be the exception rather than the rule for insurance companies. Few have a screening or assessment model for potential external candidates, and systematic benchmarking of the competition is extremely unusual.

This lack of external benchmarking may result from the strong sense of self-sufficiency that permeates many insurance companies. In some instances this might be characterised as complacency or even insularity.

Insurance companies prefer to make internal appointments when possible, looking outside only when subsidiary and/or parent companies have not turned up suitable candidates. External hires tend to be more common in financial and other functional roles.

Rewarding people for developing talent

Few companies issue financial or other incentives to employees for developing people with talent or contributing to succession planning programmes. Those that acknowledge the value of rewarding people for developing talent have yet to incorporate this into the assessment process.

Conclusion

Many strong talent management and succession planning programmes have been developed by European insurance companies, but there is a long way to go before most companies catch up with best practice outside the industry.

As the insurance industry becomes more global and business models change, a talent pool will have to evolve that is capable of meeting the challenges facing the industry, one that reflects the global diversity and cultural breadth of its customers.

There has been a noticeable change in the European insurance industry towards a more meritocratic environment. Many excellent programmes are in place throughout Europe, but they have not yet had a lasting impact. It is critical that insurance companies push ahead with the implementation of their human capital programmes, while maintaining a close eye on best practice outside the industry, so that they are receptive to new ideas, innovative solutions and fresh talent.

J. Maurice Zufferey, Zurich

Based on a Spencer Stuart market analysis published in March 2007 and researched by Armen Simon (Frankfurt) and Christine Johnston (London).

Auf dem Gipfel hat der Wind zugenommen: Neue Fähigkeiten sind gefragt

Die idealen Qualifikationen eines CEO haben sich über die Jahre immer wieder geändert. Aber nie haben sich die gefragten Fähigkeiten so stark erweitert wie in den letzten zehn Jahren.

Tatsächlich werden vom heutigen CEO andere Fähigkeiten und breitere Erfahrungen erwartet als noch vor zehn Jahren. Die Zahl der Anspruchsgruppen hat stark zugenommen; Behörden und andere Regulatoren üben einen starken Druck aus, und das gleiche gilt für die Aktionäre; Ethik und Integrität im gesamten Geschäftsgebaren müssen durchgesetzt werden; und ein autoritärer Führungsstil wird weder in der Unternehmensleitung noch von den Mitarbeitenden toleriert.

Frühere Veränderungen betrafen die rasante technische Entwicklung, die Konsolidierung in einzelnen Industrien, die Globalisierung und die wachsenden Ansprüche von der Kundenseite. Aber der stark gewachsene Einfluss des Verwaltungsrates, rigoros umgesetzte und immer noch sich verstärkende regulatorische Einschränkungen und die Null-Toleranz für unethisches Geschäftsgebaren haben die Spielregeln neuerlich nachhaltig verändert.

Die Anforderungen an die oberste Führung waren schon in der Vergangenheit hoch, aber der wachsende Druck, entstanden aus Ereignissen und Umwälzungen in den letzten zehn Jahren, erhöhen den Stress für den CEO massgeblich. China und Indien

haben sich einen früher unvorstellbaren Anteil am Markt der Softwareentwicklung, der Produktion und des Kundendienstes geholt; unternehmerische Katastrophen wie Swissair oder Betrugsfälle wie bei Siemens haben dem öffentlichen Ansehen der Wirtschaft wesentlichen Schaden zugefügt; und Sarbanes-Oxley in den USA — mit guten Absichten als Folge der Zusammenbrüche von Enron und WorldCom geschaffen — hat auch in Europa seine Spuren hinterlassen.

Vom heutigen CEO werden andere Fähigkeiten und breitere Erfahrungen erwartet als noch vor zehn Jahren

Stärkerer Einfluss des Verwaltungsrates

War der Verwaltungsrat früher oft ein allzu passives Kopfnicker-Gremium, hat sich das in den letzten zehn Jahren dramatisch geändert. Der Verwaltungsrat steht in Publikumsgesellschaften viel stärker im Scheinwerferlicht und die Aktionäre stellen in börsenkotierten und in Familiengesellschaften deutlich höhere Ansprüche an seine aktive Einflussnahme. War früher der CEO oft in einer Allmachtsstellung, erwarten Aktionäre und Verwaltungsrat heute ein partnerschaftliches Verhältnis zwischen CEO und Verwaltungsrat. Während der CEO auch weiterhin klare, überzeugende Führungsfähigkeiten mitbringen muss, benötigt er heute mehr Zeit für die Vorbereitung von VR-Sitzungen und für die Pflege der Beziehungen zum Präsidenten des VR und zu den Präsidenten der VR-Ausschüsse. Verwaltungsratsgremien reden heute aktiv mit in Finanzfragen, Personalfragen, Strategie und Nachfolgeplanung — alles Aufgaben, die früher zum grossen Teil im alleinigen Verantwortungsbereich des CEO lagen. Damit muss

der CEO seinem Verwaltungsrat wesentlich mehr Aufmerksamkeit zuwenden.

Natürlich gibt es gute Gründe für die aktivere Beteiligung des VR an der Führung des Unternehmens. Verwaltungsräte stehen vermehrt im Rampenlicht, und ihr Ansehen ebenso wie ihre persönliche Haftung stehen auf dem Spiel, wo sie früher kaum zur Verantwortung gezogen worden waren. Heutige Verwaltungsräte arbeiten wesentlich mehr und intensiver für das Unternehmen.

Aktionäre und Verwaltungsrat erwarten heute ein partnerschaftliches Verhältnis zwischen CEO und VR

War es früher mit vier oder fünf VR-Sitzungen pro Jahr getan, pflegt der heutige CEO regelmässige Beziehungen mindestens zum VRP und zu ausgewählten VR-Mitgliedern. Aber auch andere Geschäftsleitungsmitglieder wie der CFO, der Leiter Human Resources oder der Leiter F&E nehmen situationsabhängig mit ausgewählten Verwaltungsratsmitgliedern Arbeitskontakte wahr. Während dies zur Entlastung des CEO beitragen kann, bedeutet es auch, dass er in der Geschäftsleitung Führungskräfte braucht, die diese Ansprüche erfüllen können. Tatsächlich wird heute z.B. ein Leiter HR regelmässig mit dem „Nomination and Compensation Committee“-Leiter des VR zusammenkommen, um über Nachfolgeplanung und die Entschädigung von Führungskräften zu diskutieren.

Die stärkere Stellung des Verwaltungsrates ist jedoch nicht die einzige wichtige Veränderung im Umfeld des CEO. War die Globalisierung schon seit Jahren ein Thema, erreichen ihre Ansprüche heute eine neue Dimension. CEOs müssen eine sehr solide internationale Perspektive und Erfahrung mitbringen, um die weltweiten Konkurrenzverhältnisse zu verstehen, kommen doch machtvollere Mitbewerber oft von unerwarteter Seite, und gesetzliche sowie regulatorische Ansprüche tauchen an immer neuen Orten auf.

Gleichzeitig wird vom CEO verlangt, dass er immer noch tut, was er schon bisher getan hat. Die neuen Herausforderungen kommen einfach noch dazu. Die Aufgabe des CEO ist damit wesentlich zeitraubender geworden, komplexer, internationaler, technologieabhängiger und einerseits regulatorisch stärker eingeschränkt, andererseits stärker von breiteren Kundenwünschen abhängig.

Gleichzeitig ist es schwieriger geworden, qualifizierte CEOs im Unternehmen zu halten

Zusätzliche Kompetenzen sind gefordert

Eine ausgeprägte Leistungs- und Ergebnisorientierung ist weiterhin unabdingbar. Gleichzeitig aber sind eine Reihe von weniger traditionellen Kompetenzen für den CEO wichtig geworden. Dazu gehören internationale Erfahrungen mit einer globalen Perspektive, Kenntnisse oder Erfahrungen in der Verwaltungsratsaufgabe, strategische Ausrichtung, Team-Bildung, Kommunikationsfähigkeiten und — als Spiegel der neuen Forderung eines globalen Marktes — untadelige professionelle und persönliche Ethik und Charaktereigenschaften.

CEO-Kandidaten mit diesem Idealprofil sind immer schwieriger zu finden. Einige der traditionellen Kandidaten mit primär operationellen, technologischen oder finanziellen Kompetenzen mögen diesen Schritt bewältigen. Gleichzeitig eröffnen sich auch neue Möglichkeiten für Führungskräfte, die die grundlegenden Führungsqualifikationen besitzen, aber auch die Fähigkeit zur Führung mit breiter verteilten Rollen, wo GL-Mitglieder und Verwaltungsräte zusätzliche Aufgaben übernehmen.

Gleichzeitig ist es schwieriger geworden, qualifizierte CEOs im Unternehmen zu halten. Oft verlassen CEOs das Unternehmen nach ungefähr fünf Jahren, weil es dem Unternehmen gut geht und der CEO auf der Spitze der Erfolgskurve gehen will; oder das Unternehmen steckt in Problemen und der CEO ist entweder entlassen worden oder will gehen, bevor die Situation noch schlimmer wird. Oft entdecken CEOs auch lukrative Private Equity-Möglichkeiten, die frei sind vom massiven Druck der Führung einer Publikumsgesellschaft.

Die Komplexität der Aufgabe eines CEO ergibt sich aus der grossen Zahl der unterschiedlichsten Teile eines Unternehmens auf dem Globus, die ständig in Bewegung sind und den Erfolg des Unternehmens positiv oder negativ beeinflussen können. Zu diesen Variablen zählen Niedriglohnländer ebenso wie die veränderten Demographien in Europa oder Amerika und die immer grössere Mobilität der Arbeitskräfte. Ein Überfluss an Finanzierungskapital von Seiten Private Equity, veränderte geopolitische Kräfte und eine Konzentration auf kurzfristige Ergebnisse gehören ebenso hierher. Hinzu kommt die minutiöse externe Überwachung der Publikumsgesellschaften, der beschleunigte Wandel in den Märkten und in den unternehmerischen Randbedingungen, der Zugang aller Marktteilnehmer zu „perfekter“ Information und

die Erkenntnis, dass Durchbrüche wie der iPod einen gesamten Markt über Nacht verändern können.

Kunden, Mitarbeitende und Aktionäre gleichzeitig zu verstehen und zu berücksichtigen ist persönlich aufreibend

Drei wichtige Interessengruppen — nämlich Kunden, Mitarbeitende und Aktionäre — gleichzeitig zu verstehen und zu berücksichtigen ist eine schwierige Aufgabe und persönlich aufreibend. Aber sie werden zur alltäglichen Herausforderung des CEO in der neu angebrochenen Ära. Sie oder er muss die enormen Forderungen dieser Interessengruppen und der regulatorischen Prozesse im Gleichgewicht halten und gleichzeitig alle laufenden Ansprüche einer erfolgreichen operativen und strategischen Führung des Unternehmens erfüllen.

Wo die neuen CEOs herkommen

Die Eintrittsbarriere zum Rang eines CEO ist heute höher denn je, wenn auch nicht unüberwindbar. Ausgezeichnete CEO-Anwärter gibt es. Die ergiebigsten Quellen für diese Talente sind nach wie vor die grossen, überdurchschnittlich professionell geführten Firmen, wo Führungskräfte ihre Führungserfahrung in ihren ersten Jahren der Karriere sammeln können. Diese Firmen geben ihren Kaderleuten Ende 30 die Möglichkeit, grosse Geschäftseinheiten zu führen, und erlauben Ihnen damit auf hervorragende Weise, mehrdimensionale Kompetenzen zu entwickeln.

Selbstverständlich ist niemand vom ersten Tag an in dieser Position ein CEO-Superstar. Die Aufgabe ist viel zu schwer, so talentiert eine Führungskraft auch sein mag. Die heutige Geschäftswelt setzt Durchsetzungsfähigkeit, Disziplin und die tiefgreifende

Die heutige Geschäftswelt setzt die tiefgreifende Vertrautheit mit jedem Geschäftsbereich voraus.

Vertrautheit mit jedem Geschäftsbereich voraus, während früher ein CEO auch mit weniger Verständnis für die einzelnen Komponenten eines Unternehmens überleben konnte.

Was den Einsitz in Verwaltungsräten anderer Firmen angeht, dürfte einem neuen CEO selten erlaubt sein, ein externes Verwaltungsratsmandat zu übernehmen, bevor er oder sie nicht ein oder zwei Jahre die CEO-Aufgabe wahrgenommen hat. Tatsächlich hat die Zahl der externen Verwaltungsratsmandate, die CEOs wahrnehmen, in den letzten Jahren abgenommen. Dies hängt selbstverständlich auch damit zusammen, dass die gewachsene Verantwortung und der grössere zeitliche Aufwand für ein solches Mandat die Annahme mehrerer Mandate zunehmend unmöglich machen. Die Aufgabe des CEO's ist aufwendiger, komplexer, internationaler, technologischer, kundenorientierter und durch Vorschriften und Gesetze stärker eingeschränkt worden. Neue Kompetenzen sind verlangt, während die traditionellen Führungsqualitäten nach wie vor gefordert sind. Die CEO-Aufgabe in einer Publikumsgesellschaft wird damit zu einer herkulischen Herausforderung, die nach einer Metamorphose in den meisten Fähigkeiten ruft. Aber neue Führungskräfte, die den veränderten Anforderungen genügen, gibt es, bereit, ihre Firma unter den neuen Spielregeln in die Zukunft zu führen.

Roger Rytz, Zurich

From traditional intellectual property to profitable intellectual capital management

Effective IP licensing as a new way to generate profits

It is natural for many companies to invest a proportion of their revenues in R&D, which has traditionally been considered the origin — or even the heart — of the company.

Effective R&D is strategic but also expensive, costing money both to develop products and to protect and defend them. Given that only a small percentage of patents are employed to support strategic growth objectives, R&D is also not very productive. The rest serve, in the best case, as asset valorisation instruments or as weapons to defend against competitive action. In this context, it is normal for intellectual property to be considered as “property”, something that can be traded, and not necessarily as potential capital. With the 21st-century emphasis on knowledge sharing, partnering and “win-win” approaches, this mind-set needs to change.

IP licensing is an emerging, albeit embryonic, trend which is in tune with the new principles set by globalisation and the increasingly complex interdependence of business. In a knowledge-based economy supported by sophisticated information technology, marketing existing products often contributes more value than R&D¹.

¹ Between 2000 and 2005, P&G investment in R&D went down from 4.8% of revenues to 3.4%. The R&D function was renamed C&D (Connect & Develop). During those five years, company share price and profit doubled and the company has launched 100 new products in the past two years.

Thoughtful intellectual asset management

For many companies, the past 30 years have seen a change in the currency of competition from machines and factories to employee brainpower and patents. The industrial economy has given ground to the knowledge economy. In 1975, more than 80 per cent of the market value of companies in the S&P 500 comprised tangible assets such as factories, machines and inventory. In 2007 the figure is less than 20 per cent — tangible assets have been replaced by intangible assets, primarily intellectual property.

Rather unsurprisingly this has coincided with the transition of intellectual assets from a rather dreary legal necessity to a frequent discussion point at corporate board meetings. Intellectual property (IP) — such as patents and trademarks — has emerged as one of the key bargaining chips of the global economy. Depending on ownership, IP can facilitate or impede companies' ability to compete in particular countries and market sectors. By providing control over technologies that correspond to product features, or even products themselves, they can in turn have a fundamental impact on profit, as many companies have seen to their benefit — and cost.

Historically IP, and patents in particular, were deemed important because they represented a tangible and protectable outcome from the research function, as well as providing a way to measure the success of research. By protecting key innovations, IP was also able to help provide market differentiation and help create additional income. By cross-licensing with other companies, IP could also be used to settle patent disputes or to gain access to new innovations.

A number of issues have combined to bring the area of intellectual property to the fore. First, globalisation has increased the need for market access, and along with it the importance and value of

patent protection to both the patent owner and would-be exporter. Second, the sheer number of patents being granted has escalated dramatically over the past 10 years, meaning that IP has become difficult to ignore, even in a defensive sense. Third, the fanfare that has accompanied those companies, such as IBM, which have successful intellectual property licensing strategies, has created a greater awareness of the opportunities and threats which IP, and particularly patents, represent.

This fanfare over successful IP licensing strategies has frequently been with a good reason. The Ocean Tomo 300® Patent Index represents a diversified portfolio of 300 companies that own valuable patents. The Index, which would have outperformed the S&P® 500 by 313 basis points annualised for the ten years ended April 2007, provides a clue as to the importance of IP in achieving not only income growth but also sustainable shareholder value.

There is also a growing focus on IP as a tradable asset, with an increasingly liquid market generated by more buyers and trading mechanisms such as the first European patent auction held by IPB AG in Frankfurt in May 2007.

As a result of this increasing interest in IP and the realisation of its potential impact on company performance, the technical, commercial and management skills required to get the most out of this asset have been brought into sharp focus. The IP function itself can be viewed in a host of different ways, ranging from the purely defensive use of IP through to putting it at the centre of the organisation and using IP to ensure that the organisation is correctly positioned to meet emerging challenges. These different levels also reflect whether the licensing function is seen just as a cost centre, or as a P&L in its own right. Of course, the way IP is

viewed within an organisation will profoundly affect the nature and implementation of the function itself. What is true in the majority of organisations, however, is that IP flows across most business functions. This usually means that effective IP management is thought of in many organisations as requiring two skills sets — one legal and one managerial/commercial.

Mirroring the relationship between a company CEO and its general counsel, it is usual for the legal and managerial/commercial aspects of IP management to be handled by different people. The legal role is usually staffed by IP attorneys responsible for working with inventors to file patents, and then managing the patents throughout their lifetime. This can include managing patent disputes with third parties and playing an active role in detecting and correcting patent infringement. The focus of this role is risk and cost containment and achieving legal best practice, both in patent filings and dispute resolution.

The managerial/commercial role deals with converting the legal instruments, which are in many ways the output of the legal process, into tangible, measurable business assets and advantages. This function relies less on specialised legal knowledge (that is provided by the general counsel and IP attorney) and more on commercial, business and management savvy. Typically this role will involve a blend of strategic and tactical decisions taken in conjunction with owners of the P&L's business lines. Questions needing decisions include:

- > Is it more profitable to license rather than sell a product line and close down the associated line?
- > Should we refuse to freely provide servicing documentation and charge a license fee?

-
- > Should we license our brand in a market in which we may want to compete ourselves in five years time?

Ensuring that these questions attract the right answers needs a careful blend of business acumen and commitment from the whole organisation to actively manage and profit from its IP portfolio. This may include the licensing in of new IP as well as active management of the existing portfolio. Active management usually occurs in three ways: ensuring that a company's competitive advantage is optimised through good use of existing IP and new filings; generating additional revenue-creating opportunities through licensing activities; and finally, generating additional business advantages by licensing in relevant IP. As a result it should be no surprise that tactical IP management and product management are often closely associated, and indeed IP can be an effective tool in executing these functions. It is common for licensing personnel to be embedded into product management/marketing groups which have both the technical and market insight to identify potential licensing opportunities.

The overall licensing team — comprising both legal and business licensing professionals — will often be managed by a central licensing function to ensure alignment of objectives and the necessary coordination. In certain situations it can also be advantageous to form a separate legal entity into which patents and other IP may be transferred.

Reflecting the increasing importance of licensing in organisations, reporting lines are changing. Companies with well evolved approaches to IP management have direct contact with the CEO or board member with commercial responsibility. It is not uncommon for the CEO to be involved in key licensing decisions,

particularly where these form part of the implicit and everyday business of the organisation. The visibility and support this provides assists in gaining crucial wider support in the organisation. This can be essential in achieving the cultural change, which is frequently an integral part of creating a more licensing-centric organisation.

A case study

Our client was a diversified technology and manufacturing conglomerate with multi-billion-dollar revenues and operations in one hundred countries worldwide. The company had recently formed a business unit dedicated to intellectual property with the aim of engaging in business development activities in order to generate attractive royalty or revenues streams.

The company was looking for an intellectual property licensing director in Europe to assess the commercial potential of its IP technology portfolio who would be able to seek out and negotiate deals. Responsibilities included developing a strategy based on both an in-depth knowledge of the company's portfolio and on market intelligence.

To fulfil his mission the IP licensing director was expected to:

- > work and communicate closely with chief technology officers and explore their technology assets;
- > develop policies procedures and guidelines which would assist external parties in identifying attractive technologies in the portfolio of the company;
- > identify opportunities for the company, screening and championing them cross the organisation.

The successful candidate had broad technical experience together with some legal training. He was able to work easily in a matrixed environment. He had been widely exposed to technology transfers, divestitures, assertion-based and carrot licensing, trademark/brand licensing, and IP marketing.

After a year in the role he managed to generate a business portfolio in Europe worth US\$30 million. Deal types included product line and non-strategic business divestitures as well as more conventional technology, patent and trademark licensing.

Changing mentalities

IP licensing is a relatively new profession. Its contribution is recognized within the most innovative corporations and less advanced companies are making steps to understand its benefits.

Without doubt, for IP licensing to be effective it needs to be a good blend of commercial and technical ingredients.

Since approaches to intellectual property have for so long been predominantly defensive, it will take a while to shift attitudes to the point where it is considered a revenue-generating engine.

Proper IP licensing implementation puts the client at the centre of the IP business. IP is then part of an open architecture business programme where knowledge becomes capital.

Intellectual property has a pervasive effect on the entire organisation since it not only touches R&D but also the chief technology officer, the legal director and ultimately the CEO. IP is in fact one of the most effective tools to trigger innovative growth.

Conclusion

Intellectual property is not just about patents. It is about virtually everything that the human brain can create, from brands to software. The collective value of worldwide intellectual property is increasing at an accelerating pace.

For some companies, active management means giving third parties access to their IP store through the execution of strategic and operational licensing plans.

When handled strategically and effectively, IP licensing can generate high-margin revenue. With its wide array of applications, an effective IP licensing program can be a lucrative opportunity to all industrial sectors from fast moving consumer goods to financial services, from pharmaceuticals to media. It can be applied to products, services, processes and more. To date, this unprecedented revenue opportunity hasn't been exploited to its full potential.

With the continuous pressure to reinvent businesses at minimum cost, it should not be a surprise if most companies soon put in place a proper IP licensing business or, better still, a profitable intellectual capital management programme.

François Clerc, Geneva

Spencer Stuart publications



Private banking in Switzerland: a talent market analysis

Observers of private banking in Switzerland agree that the market is presently going through an extremely positive phase, characterised by sustainable growth, historically high revenues and an extremely attractive profit/risk ratio. This rapid growth however has resulted in a growing shortage of talent, which, when combined with the complex regulatory environment makes searching for and finding the right people with the right skills an increasingly difficult task. We look at what leading organisations are doing to combat this talent shortage.



Information technology: Shaping the future of private banking

Over the past decade, wealth management and in particular private banking, has grown through the development of on-shore business. Information technology, by contrast, has evolved through increased off-shore activities.

As markets diversify and become more complex, private banking companies are finding they have to centralise their operations to provide a consistent service to clients, wherever they are in the world. IT leaders find themselves at the heart of this shift in service levels. Whether defining an outsourcing contract, rolling out a standard application worldwide, or providing information to ultra high net worth individuals clients, IT is having to adapt to the changing structure and culture of the business, becoming a critical enabler of change along the way.



The Spencer Stuart Wealth Management Forum 2007

The second annual Wealth Management Forum featured two distinguished groups of panelists and generated a lively discussion about the skill-sets required for top producers and how wealth management firms are positioning their organisations to differentiate themselves from the competition. From their unique vantage points, the panelists shared their observations about the qualities that define a top producer and the strategies for attracting and retaining such talent.



Spencer Stuart US Board Index 2007

The Spencer Stuart Board Index is an annual study that examines the state of corporate governance among the S&P 500. The 2007 Board Index looks at the way governance has changed since the Sarbanes-Oxley Act five years ago. Among other findings, this year's study points to a change in how boards are approaching new director recruitment and identifying director candidates.

To read these and other Spencer Stuart publications, visit www.spencerstuart.com/research.

Spencer Stuart consultants in Switzerland



François E. Clerc
fclerc@spencerstuart.com



Andreas Hürlimann
ahuerlimann@spencerstuart.com



Phil Le Goff
plegoff@spencerstuart.com



Antonio Maturo
amatur@spencerstuart.com



Roger Rytz
rrytz@spencerstuart.com



J. Maurice Zufferey
mzufferey@spencerstuart.com

Spencer Stuart in Switzerland

Spencer Stuart was established in Switzerland in 1959. Today we operate from offices in Zurich and Geneva and employ six consultants and seven research associates. We have conducted more than 700 assignments in Switzerland since 2000. Over 80 per cent of our placements are still with the client organisation four years after joining.

Spencer Stuart applies its extensive knowledge of industries, functions and talent to advise select clients — ranging from major multinationals to emerging companies to nonprofit organisations — and address their leadership requirements.

Spencer Stuart consultants focus on senior-level executive search, board director appointments, succession planning and in-depth senior executive management assessments.

Geneva office

Spencer Stuart
2 Boulevard Jaques Dalcroze
1204 Geneva
Switzerland

T +41.22.312.36.38

F +41.22.312.36.39

Zurich office

Spencer Stuart
Hottingerstrasse 21
8032 Zurich
Switzerland

T +41.44.257.17.17

F +41.44.257.17.18

WORLDWIDE OFFICES

Amsterdam

T 31 (0) 20.305.73.05
F 31 (0) 20.305.73.50

Atlanta

T 1.404.504.4400
F 1.404.504.4401

Barcelona

T 34.93.487.23.36
F 34.93.487.09.44

Beijing

T 86.10.6505.1031
F 86.10.6505.1032

Bogota

T 571.618.2488
F 571.618.2317

Boston

T 1.617.531.5731
F 1.617.531.5732

Brussels

T 32.2.732.26.25
F 32.2.732.19.39

Budapest

T 36.1.200.08.50
F 36.1.394.10.97

Buenos Aires

T 54.11.4313.2233
F 54.11.4313.2299

Chicago

T 1.312.822.0080
F 1.312.822.0116

Dallas

T 1.214.672.5200
F 1.214.672.5299

Dubai

T 971.4.426.6500
F 971.4.365.0226

Frankfurt

T 49 (0) 69.61.09.27.0
F 49 (0) 69.61.09.27.50

Geneva

T 41.22.312.36.38
F 41.22.312.36.39

Hong Kong

T 852.2521.8373
F 852.2810.5246

Houston

T 1.713.225.1621
F 1.713.658.8336

Johannesburg

T 27 (0) 11 707.9460
F 27 (0) 11 463.3371

Leeds

T 44 (0) 1937.547700
F 44 (0) 1937.547710

London

T 44 (0) 20 7298.3333
F 44 (0) 20 7298.3388

Los Angeles

T 1.310.209.0610
F 1.310.209.0912

Madrid

T 34.91.745.85.00
F 34.91.561.42.75

Manchester

T 44 (0) 161 499.6700
F 44 (0) 161 499.6710

Melbourne

T 61.3.9654.2155
F 61.3.9654.4730

Mexico City

T 5255.5281.4050
F 5255.5281.4184

Miami

T 1.305.443.9911
F 1.305.443.2180

Milan

T 39.02.771251
F 39.02.782452

Minneapolis/St. Paul

T 1.612.313.2000
F 1.612.313.2001

Montreal

T 1.514.288.3377
F 1.514.288.4626

Mumbai

T 91.22.6616.1414
F 91.22.6616.1444

Munich

T 49 (0) 89.45.55.53.0
F 49 (0) 89.45.55.53.33

New York

T 1.212.336.0200
F 1.212.336.0296

Orange County

T 1.949.930.8000
F 1.949.930.8001

Paris

T 33 (0) 1.53.57.81.23
F 33 (0) 1.53.57.81.00

Philadelphia

T 1.215.814.1600
F 1.215.814.1681

Prague

T 420.221.411.341
F 420.222.233.087

Rome

T 39.06.802071
F 39.06.80207200

San Francisco

T 1.415.495.4141
F 1.415.495.7524

Santiago

T 56.2.940.2700
F 56.2.249.7883

Sao Paulo

T 55.11.3759.7700
F 55.11.3759.7736

Shanghai

T 86.21.6288.8989
F 86.21.6288.7100

Silicon Valley

T 1.650.356.5500
F 1.650.356.5501

Singapore

T 65.6586.1186
F 65.6438.3136

Stamford

T 1.203.324.6333
F 1.203.326.3737

Stockholm

T 46.8.534.801.50
F 46.8.534.801.69

Sydney

T 61.2.9240.0100
F 61.2.9240.0180

Tokyo

T 81.3.3238.8901
F 81.3.3238.8902

Toronto

T 1.416.361.0311
F 1.416.361.6118

Vienna

T 43.1.36.88.700.0
F 43.1.36.88.777

Warsaw

T 48.22.620.80.87
F 48.22.620.81.87

Washington, D.C.

T 1.202.639.8111
F 1.202.639.8222

Zurich

T 41.44.257.17.17
F 41.44.257.17.18

©2007 Spencer Stuart.
All rights reserved. For
information about copying,
distributing and displaying this
work, contact permissions@
spencerstuart.com.

For copies of this publication,
please contact Joanne Ebener
jebener@spencerstuart.com.

www.spencerstuart.com

SpencerStuart