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HAVE YOU EVER HAD ANTICORRUPTION*-RELATED JOB RESPONSIBILITIES?

* Anticorruption encompasses the FCPA, UK Bribery Act, and other anticorruption laws

A. Yes
B. No
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HAVE YOU EVER HAD ANTICORRUPTION*-RELATED JOB RESPONSIBILITIES?

* Anticorruption encompasses the FCPA, UK Bribery Act, and other anticorruption laws

Here’s what U.S. compliance colleagues said:

A. Yes
B. No

86 Responses
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HAS YOUR COMPANY EVER HAD SIGNIFICANT INTERNAL ANTICORRUPTION INVESTIGATIONS?
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HAS YOUR COMPANY EVER HAD SIGNIFICANT INTERNAL ANTICORRUPTION INVESTIGATIONS?

Here’s what U.S. compliance colleagues said:

A. Yes  38%
B. No  62%

97 Responses
HAS YOUR COMPANY HAD ANTICORRUPTION ISSUES WITH THE GOVERNMENT?
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B. No
Your poll will show here

1. Install the app from pollev.com/app
2. Make sure you are in Slide Show mode

Still not working? Get help at pollev.com/app/help or Open poll in your web browser
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INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

- Panelists
  - Gary Giampetruzzi, Partner (Paul Hastings)
  - Vivian Robinson, Queen’s Counsel, Partner (McGuire Woods)
  - Daniel Schafaghi, Corporate Ethics and Compliance (Boehringer Ingelheim GmbH)
  - Alessandra Hawthorne, Global Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer (Boehringer Ingelheim)

- Workshop Format
  - Hypothetical compliance crisis / internal investigation
  - Questions to prompt discussion throughout (and the questions are for the audience as well)

- Critical to Hypothetical Success – Audience Participation!
HYPOTHETICAL ANTICORRUPTION SITUATION
GOOD Pharma Co. is a publicly traded, multinational pharmaceutical company that engages in research, manufacturing, and sales of pharmaceutical products.

GOOD Pharma Co. has $15 billion in annual sales.

In early 2010, it had a “modest” kickback settlement with the Boston U.S. Attorney’s Office for $75M, and a 5-year Corporate Integrity Agreement (CIA).

Due to the CIA, the company developed a robust global compliance program.

The HHS-OIG forced GOOD Pharma Co. to separate its compliance and legal departments, with the CCO reporting directly to the CEO (rather than GC).

The CIA expired approximately six months ago.

Brimming with confidence and relief that the CIA has expired, GOOD Pharma is in the midst of returning to the pre-CIA compliance organization structure, with the CCO positioned under GC, a very prominent figure in the company.
WAS IT A GOOD IDEA FOR GOOD PHARMA TO RETURN TO THE ‘NEW’ COMPLIANCE / LEGAL STRUCTURE FOLLOWING THE EXPIRATION OF THE CIA?

A. Yes

B. No
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WAS IT A GOOD IDEA FOR GOOD PHARMA TO RETURN TO THE ‘NEW’ COMPLIANCE / LEGAL STRUCTURE FOLLOWING THE EXPIRATION OF THE CIA?

Here’s what U.S. compliance colleagues said:

A. Yes
B. No

116 Responses
Françons Dodd works at GOOD Pharma Co.

- He is a French citizen, who has been working at the Paris affiliate.
- François has made compliance allegations about other offices in the past that, following investigation, have been found to have been unsubstantiated.
- The Company has expended considerable resources conducting investigations into the various allegations that he has made.
- Being a friendly guy, and spending quite a bit of time around the water cooler, François has good reason to believe that the same activity is happening in GOOD Pharma Co.’s offices in France, and perhaps other markets.
- Having seen compliance brochures almost everywhere he seems to look, touting the company’s compliance program and encouraging reporting, François decides to call the GOOD Pharma hotline to report the misconduct.
- But the hotline doesn’t work!
To François’s distress, the misconduct continues.

Three months pass from François’ failed hotline call, and he contemplates leaving the company to protest the ongoing misconduct and to join a family business.

Instead, he decides to report the misconduct again.

The Board, GC and CEO receive an email laying out the alleged wrongdoing in great detail, as if written by an outside lawyer. It’s anonymous.

The email indicates that if the Company doesn’t do the right thing within 120 days, the information will be shared with the U.S. DOJ and SEC in Washington DC and the French authorities.

Upon a careful reading of the email complaint, however, it appears that some of the language used resembles language used in François’ past claims.
IN LIGHT OF THEIR SIMILARITY TO FRANÇOIS’ PAST UNSUBSTANTIATED CLAIMS, THE COMPANY SHOULD DO WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WITH THESE NEWEST CLAIMS?

A. Conduct a full investigation
B. Narrow the scope of any investigation
C. Potentially disregard the newest claims as frivolous
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IN LIGHT OF THEIR SIMILARITY TO FRANÇOIS’ PAST UNSUBSTANTIATED CLAIMS, THE COMPANY SHOULD DO WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WITH THESE NEWEST CLAIMS?

Here’s what U.S. compliance colleagues said:

A. Conduct a full investigation
B. Narrow the scope of any investigation
C. Potentially disregard the newest claims as frivolous

113 Responses
THE LEADERSHIP MEETING

- Gary G., the GC, Alessandra H., the CCO, and Sir Henry Leaks, the CEO, meet to discuss François’ email, and what to do about this sudden mess.
- The whistleblower allegations are the first major legal and compliance issue GOOD Pharma Co. has experienced since the CIA expired six months ago.
- Alessandra thinks the Compliance team should lead the investigation and report the results. Gary thinks that’s absurd, and the Legal team should handle it.
- Sir Henry asks what support outside counsel can provide.
- With budgets slashed quite a bit since the CIA expired, the investigation team needs to be cost efficient because there is no budget for any of this.
- The internal team agrees that there needs to be an investigation.
WHICH FUNCTION – COMPLIANCE OR LEGAL – SHOULD LEAD THIS REVIEW? IF COMPLIANCE WERE TO LEAD IT, COULD THE REVIEW BE LEGALLY PRIVILEGED?

A. Legal, and it’s privileged
B. Compliance, and it’s privileged
C. Compliance, and it’s not privileged
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WHICH FUNCTION – COMPLIANCE OR LEGAL – SHOULD LEAD THIS REVIEW? IF COMPLIANCE WERE TO LEAD IT, COULD THE REVIEW BE LEGALLY PRIVILEGED?

Here’s what U.S. compliance colleagues said:

A. Legal, and it’s privileged
B. Compliance, and it’s privileged
C. Compliance, and it’s not privileged

103 Responses
The team hires outside counsel, Vivian R., to handle the investigation.

Alessandra and Gary disagree on what to do about the threat to contact the various government authorities, and whether to make a voluntary disclosure.

Alessandra, incredibly worried about all of this, wants to make an immediate disclosure to the various government authorities, one and all, citing the credit GOOD Pharma Co. will get for being forthright and cooperative.

Gary does not think GOOD Pharma will get any credit by disclosing at this stage and instead risks engaging the government unnecessarily before GOOD Pharma has investigated the allegations. He has no idea why Alessandra, as the CCO, should even be offering her opinion on a strictly ‘legal’ matter.

Vivian R., who is being paid out of Gary G’s budget, tends to agree with him.

Sir Henry isn’t sure what to do, and is not happy that his two direct reports haven’t gotten aligned. But he tends to agree with his General Counsel, and doesn’t think that companies really receive a benefit for making disclosures.
ARE SIR HENRY, VIVIAN, AND GARY RIGHT THAT THE COMPANY SHOULDN’T CONTACT THE AUTHORITIES AT THIS TIME BECAUSE THERE WOULD BE NO BENEFIT?

A. Yes
B. No
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ARE SIR HENRY, VIVIAN, AND GARY RIGHT THAT THE COMPANY SHOULDN’T CONTACT THE AUTHORITIES AT THIS TIME BECAUSE THERE WOULD BE NO BENEFIT?

Here’s what U.S. compliance colleagues said:

A. Yes
B. No

102 Responses
Sir Henry chimes in that, in addition to thinking about informing the government, Pharma Co. needs to consider what to say to its Board of Directors and Audit Committee, neither of which have really been asking a lot of questions about compliance since the expiration of the CIA.

He also asks Alessandra and Gary what, as a publically traded company, they need to be thinking about in terms of making any sort of public disclosures.

And what about the outside auditors, who are always seemingly giving them a hard time about stuff as unimportant as routine t&e matters?

Things seem to be happening quickly – is there anyone they are missing?

**QUESTION:** Which of these stakeholders needs to be briefed at this point?
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THE INVESTIGATION

- The investigation team discusses the scope of the investigation and raises a lot of questions. They finally know that they need to get started on this.
- What GOOD Pharma Co. offices should the team investigate: Paris, as mentioned in François’ email, or any other markets? Or GOOD Pharma Co. globally? Do they do this by product? By business line? By geography?
- From whom should the team collect documents, and what search terms should they use? Should they just focus on the server? Actual laptops?
- What about preserving all of this information?
- What do they tell their employees about what to do and what not to do?
- And who should do all of this? Gary’s team? Outside counsel?

**QUESTION:** What rules of thumb should the investigation team use as they determine the scope of the investigation?
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The investigation team runs into trouble as they begin witness interviews.

1. One witness wants his own lawyer present during the interview.
2. One wants to record the interview.
3. One refuses to cooperate at all.
4. With there being much to do, GOOD Pharma hired two law firms in order to try to get done as much as possible within the threatened 120 days.
5. Unfortunately, though, the two firms have been conducting their witness interviews differently. One is providing “Upjohn” warnings, and noting the government investigations. The other is taking a more ‘cautious’ approach.

**QUESTION:** How should the investigation team handle these issues?
Your poll will show here

1. Install the app from pollev.com/app
2. Make sure you are in Slide Show mode

Still not working? Get help at pollev.com/app/help
or
Open poll in your web browser
The investigation team finally finishes the investigation and has prepared a summary report. It’s long, and full of detailed, adverse findings.

The draft report, prepared by outside counsel, also names individuals within the company, some of whom were involved in serious anticorruption violations.

Alessandra wants to send the report to the government, in the spirit of cooperation and full disclosure, and argues that the company can selectively waive privilege with the government and still protect it vis-à-vis others.

It is no surprise that Gary wants to keep the report internal in order to maintain legal privilege around the matter. This is a legal matter after all.

He suggests sharing some underlying documents instead of a formal report.

**QUESTION:** In what manner should the investigation be reported internally? What are the positives /negatives of providing the report to the government?
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WOULD YOU MAKE A DISCLOSURE OF THIS MATTER TO THE GOVERNMENT?

A. Yes
B. No
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WOULD YOU MAKE A DISCLOSURE OF THIS MATTER TO THE GOVERNMENT?

Here’s what U.S. compliance colleagues said:

A. Yes
B. No

99 Responses

89%
11%
THE INDIVIDUALS AND THE YATES MEMO

- Sir Henry reads the draft report and has serious concerns
- Two mid-level managers, whom he knew well as he rose through the ranks, are directly implicated in the likely anticorruption violations
- Outside counsel has advised, in light of the U.S. government’s Yates memo (a government directive regarding cooperation by companies against individual wrongdoers), that the Company must produce all evidence against them
- In addition, the report mentions two members of Sir Henry’s leadership team who are good friends and longtime colleagues
- The evidence against them is more mixed, but outside counsel again advises that in order for the Company to gain cooperation credit, the Company must also produce all evidence against them
WHAT SHOULD SIR HENRY, ALESSANDRA AND GARY DO? WOULD YOU TURN OVER ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AGAINST YOUR COLLEAGUES?

A. Yes
B. No
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WHAT SHOULD SIR HENRY, ALESSANDRA AND GARY DO? WOULD YOU TURN OVER ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AGAINST YOUR COLLEAGUES?

Here’s what U.S. compliance colleagues said:

A. Yes 81%
B. No 19%

103 Responses
THE RAID IN ROMANIA

- The team, hampered by indecision, has done relatively little for weeks
- About one month after François had sent the email reporting the misconduct, the Romanian Anti-Corruption Prosecutorial Unit conducts a nationwide raid on homes, offices, hospitals, and pharmacies related to GOOD Pharma Co.’s Romanian affiliate, as well as 11 other companies, including the bigger multinationals.
- Federal agents seized documents and computers, looking for evidence of bribery
- GOOD Pharma Co. already knew about potential misconduct in France from François’ email, but now there are concerns about this Eastern European market
- Sir Henry, Gary, and Alessandra all agree about one thing – they totally understand how the bigger multinationals might have gotten into trouble, as they often seem to do, but they don’t believe their smaller, more compliant company did anything wrong.

QUESTION: How should news of the raid change the investigation plan, if at all?
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IT’S IN THE NEWS

- News spreads of François’ whistleblower complaint and the raid in Romania
- The public is outraged at the alleged corporate greed and secrecy, and industry insiders are nervous that their companies might be next
- One week after the raid in Romania, the GOOD Pharma public relations department issues the following statement:

  “GOOD Pharma Co is a compliant company that stands by its products and its people. We have always played by the rules, and we always will. We have not done anything wrong. We will look into this situation, and disclose the results accordingly.”

QUESTION: How should GOOD Pharma have handled the media?
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COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS
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