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The world seems to be on fire in 2009. Increasing numbers of individuals are losing their jobs; governments allocate huge amounts of public money to private institutions solving urgent short-term business problems, at the same time increasing national debt to numbers beyond imagination for average human beings. When disasters like this take place, many people seem to have an urgent need to look for a scapegoat; who can be blamed most for the crisis?

The results of the Annual Reputation Study of the Reputation Study reveals a lot about what the general public right now considers to be the ‘good’, the ‘bad’ and the ‘ugly’ among the largest Dutch companies.

Reputations are assessments of stakeholder groups about what a company does well, what it does wrong and above all why they have these perceptions and what the consequences are of their evaluations. We started this study (originally using the label “RQ”, since five years RepTrak) eleven years ago. RepTrak results have been used in more than 30 countries revealing the opinions of hundreds of thousands individuals. This longitudinal approach has created an in-depth understanding to practitioners and academics of how reputations are created and maintained. Some lessons that have been learned:

• Reputations are ‘sticky’: robust reputations are not destroyed easily and seem to gain from the adagio ‘the winner takes it all’.
• Reputations may be strong in the country-of-origin, but that does not mean they are equally strong outside the home country.
• Reputations can be distinguished in multiple categories. World-class reputation scores are scores above 80 (not one firm in The Netherlands achieves this), weak reputation scores (hopeless in many situations) are RepTrak Pulse scores around 40. Scores above 70 (especially around 73-74) are approaching excellence.
• Reputations can be influenced. This requires three things: (1) excellence in performance on all drivers of reputation, (2) excellence in communication (especially being visible, consistent, transparent and authentic) and last but not least (3) the negative or positive nature of the context in which a company operates.
Corporate communication departments can especially impact number 2 (the NS is currently doing a great job in this respect) and 3. Of course number 1 is a predecessor before the corporate communication people can be successful regarding 2 and 3.

- Reputations are embedded in the context of their industry bandwidth. This implies that companies have to set a reputation goal in that context. If you are a telecom firm, reaching out for an 80+ result seems to be unrealistic. A food company on the contrary should take this goal as ambition.

We are very pleased to present to you the newest reputation results of the largest Dutch companies in 2009. Some results were a surprise to me, some were predictable. I am curious to hear your reactions during the Annual Event of the Reputation Institute in the Amstel Hotel on April 7, 2009.
The Reputation Institute created the RepTrak™ method, to provide companies with a standardized framework for enabling the identification of factors that drive reputations and to benchmark their corporate reputations internationally.

RepTrak™ is the world’s first standardized and integrated tool for tracking corporate reputations internationally across stakeholder groups. Companies can choose the data they want to see in their RepTrak™ and can juxtapose both perceptual surveys with analysis of media content. For instance, tracking polls conducted daily around the world provide companies with direct access to the perceptions of consumers, investors and employees. Real-time monitoring of selected groups makes it possible for companies to see if corporate branding activities are inducing the kinds of supportive behaviors they were intended for, if PR strategies are influencing public opinion, and if media coverage is hurting or helping the company’s reputation. All this, benchmarked against your key rivals.

The RepTrak™ Model is a tool that tracks 23 key performance indicators grouped around 7 reputation dimensions that research has proven to be effective in getting stakeholders to support the company in their supportive behavior regarding aspects like purchasing and investment decisions:
1. Products / Services
2. Innovation
3. Workplace
4. Governance
5. Citizenship
6. Leadership
7. Performance
The beating heart of the RepTrak™ Model is the Pulse, which takes the public pulse of a country by measuring how consumers evaluate companies on four attributes that the Reputation Institute has determined to comprise the overall reputation of a company: overall regard, good feeling, trust and admiration.

The strength of the RepTrak™ is that the dimensions used in this method are statistically independent of each other. This reduces the problems associated with multicollinearity in data analysis and strengthens conclusions about the relative impact that specific attributes and dimensions have on the company’s overall reputation.

Internationally standardized and comparable reputation scores

Market research shows that people are inclined to rate companies more or less favorably in different countries, or when they are asked questions directly or online. When asked in a personal interview, for example, it’s known that people tend to give a company higher ratings than when they are asked by phone, or when they are asked to answer questions about the company online. This is a well-established source of ‘systematic bias’. Another source of systematic bias comes from national culture – in some countries, people are universally more positive in their responses than in other countries.

In statistical terms, it means that the entire distribution of scores in a ‘positive’ country is artificially ‘shifted’ because of this propensity for people in that country to give higher ratings to all companies, good or bad. The distribution of scores in that country may also be more ‘spread out’ than in another because people have more information and are able to make more subtle differences between companies.

To overcome these sources of systematic bias, Reputation Institute’s policy is to adjust all RepTrak™ scores by standardizing them against the aggregate distribution of all scores obtained from the RI’s Annual Global RepTrak™ Pulse. Standardization has the effect of lowering scores in countries that tend to over-rate companies, and has the effect of raising scores for companies in countries that tend to rate companies more negatively. Due to this procedure, all RepTrak™ reputation scores are comparable across industries, countries, and over time.

Through further statistical analysis, Reputation Institute connects RepTrak™ Dimension scores with RepTrak™ Pulse scores, as well as with various supportive behaviors, in order to identify the drivers and implications of corporate reputation. The findings enable companies to understand and take advantage of the dynamics of reputation among the general public.
The Global Distribution of Reputations

The global mean is 64.2 and the largest concentration of companies have a RepTrak™ Pulse between 60.0 and 70.0. Based on the global distribution of scores, Reputation Institute proposes the following benchmarks for benchmarking standardized corporate reputation results internationally:

- Maintain (>70)
- Improve (60-70)
- Immediate action (<60)
Measuring The Reputations of the World’s Largest Companies

The RepTrak™ Pulse 2009 is the annual study of the reputations of the World’s Largest Companies. The study was developed by the Reputation Institute to provide executives with a high-level overview of their company’s reputation with consumers. Over 70,000 online interviews with consumers in 32 countries on six continents were conducted in January and February 2009. More than 190,000 ratings were used to create reliable measures of the ‘corporate reputation’ of more than 1,300 companies.

In 2009 the Global RepTrak™ Pulse study is conducted in 32 countries:

Europe:
- Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom

Asia:
- China, India, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand

North America:
- Canada, Mexico, United States

Latin America:
- Brazil, Chile

Africa:
- South Africa

Oceania:
- Australia

Companies Rated

The Global RepTrak™ 2009 measures the reputations of the largest corporations in each country based on their ‘total revenues’. Rated companies had to have significant consumer presence and be minimally familiar to the general public. All companies are measured in their home country only.

Survey Methodology

The Global RepTrak™ 2009 was conducted online in all countries. The RepTrak™ Pulse is calculated by sampling an average of 150 local respondents a month, who are familiar with the company.

Questionnaire

The Global RepTrak™ 2009 questionnaire is a 10 minute long online survey that invites respondents to describe their perceptions of companies. The Reputation Institute uses online surveys since they are more diverse than traditional samples in many domains (e.g. gender, geographic location and socioeconomic status).
Reputation Results of the Largest Companies in The Netherlands

Companies Rated
The Global RepTrak™ Pulse 2009 measures the reputations of the largest corporations in The Netherlands based on their ‘total revenues’. Furthermore, rated companies had to have significant consumer presence and be minimally familiar to the general public in The Netherlands. These conditions have as a consequence that a small number of corporations were not included in the list (e.g. Vitol and Gasterra); the general public in The Netherlands is not familiar enough with the companies to evaluate them in a valid way.

Profile of Respondents to Global RepTrak™ 2009 in The Netherlands
More than 12,000 respondents were interviewed during January and February of 2009 to come to the ranking of the Global RepTrak™ Pulse The Netherlands. Respondents had to be familiar with the company they were rating and were allowed to rate up to four companies. The interviews were conducted online. The demographic breakdown of the sample was intended to reflect the demographics of the general population with internet access. The results are balanced on age and gender.
Reputation Results of the Largest Companies in The Netherlands

The reputation of the Dutch largest companies has been measured for the eighth time. This year’s reputation leader in The Netherlands is Philips with a RepTrak™ Pulse of 77.9. Rabobank Groep takes the second place with a Pulse score of 77.3, followed by Friesland Campina (75.1).

Reputation scores above 70 are hard to achieve as we have seen over the years. This year, almost one third of the largest Dutch companies manage to accomplish this top achievement.

The industry effect on reputation is clear: the general public tends to have an appreciation for customer-facing sectors like Consumer Products, Beverages, Computers and Electricals & Electronics, resulting in a favorable operating environment for companies in these sectors.
Another thing worth noting is that Dutch companies fare very well in comparison to the ‘average’ players within their global industry. Last year only 10 Dutch companies underperformed compared to their industry, this year that number has been brought down to a mere 5. The best Dutch performer in comparison to its industry is the Rabobank, which reputation (77.3) is almost 16 points higher than the average in the global banking industry (61.6). A striking contrast to Fortis, which has a score that is 16 points below that industry mean. Wolters Kluwer and CZ perform very well, by scoring about 10 points higher than their industry means (Information & Media and Insurance).

“Voor ons is het opnieuw winnen van de Reputation Award een belangrijke mijlpaal, juist in deze tijd van economische recessie. De methode van het Reputation Institute maakt reputatie meetbaar en vergelijkbaar.

Dat wij de Reputation Award voor de derde keer in de laatste vier jaar hebben gewonnen zie ik vooral als een duidelijk signaal dat de transformatie van Philips, die erop is gericht een toonaangevend merk op het gebied van health and well-being te worden, herkend en gewaardeerd wordt. Dit is voor ons zeer motiverend en daarmee een bron voor verder succes.”

Gerard Kleisterlee
President en CEO Koninklijke Philips Electronics NV
Shifts in the Reputation Ranking

Philips is in the winning spirit: Philips was also number one in 2008 and 2006. Striking is the newcomer in the top 3 – Rabobank, which climbs from the 6th to the 2nd position. Remarkable is the continuous improvement of the reputation of the Nederlandse Spoorwegen; they increased their score to 60.5 this year. The efforts of the Nederlandse Spoorwegen in reputation management are clearly paying off.

“Het is verheugend te constateren dat NS op de kaart staat. De afgelopen jaren zijn wij erin geslaagd keer op keer een sprong vooruit te maken in de dienstverlening naar onze klanten. Inmiddels geeft 75% van onze klanten NS een rapportcijfer 7 of hoger. Met plezier zien wij dat steeds meer mensen voor NS kiezen en laat onze reputatie de afgelopen vier jaar een stijgende lijn zien; in 2008 hebben wij de grootste reputatiestijging tot nu toe gerealiseerd. Vanuit mijn achtergrond weet ik hoe belangrijk communicatie is en het belang van consistente sturing op beeldvorming. Dat vraagt om een scherpe blik, creativiteit en lange adem. Het vertrouwen van onze klanten geeft aan dat we op de goede weg zijn en dat is een groot compliment voor alle NS communicatie professionals die een bijdrage hebben geleverd aan de verbetering van onze reputatie.”

Bert Meerstadt, president-directeur NS
Reputation gains:
The Nederlandse Spoorwegen achieves the greatest gains in reputation. Rabobank follows with an increase of 3.4 points. Other notable increases in reputation are attained by Reed Elsevier (+3.2), Nuon (+2.9) and Shell (+2.8).

Reputation losses:
Fortis suffers the greatest decline in reputation: a drop of 19.6, caused by their financial problems attributable to the financial crisis. Also ING experiences the effects of the credit crunch; their reputation decreases with 7.0 points. Air France-KLM sees its reputation diminish with 3.8 points.

Top 5 Reputation Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reputation Improvement</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nederlandse Spoorwegen</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabobank Groep</td>
<td>+3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Elsevier</td>
<td>+3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuon</td>
<td>+2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 5 Reputation Declines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reputation Decline</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortis</td>
<td>-19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING Groep</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air France-KLM*</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegon</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Last year we measured only KLM.

“Als CEO van TNT voel ik me de Chief Reputation Officer van onze onderneming. Wij nemen dat heel serieus en ondernemen concrete acties om onze reputatie te managen. Een van mijn bonus targets is dan ook dat TNT in de top vijf eindigt van de RepTrak in Nederland.”

Peter Bakker, CEO TNT
Corporate Leaders on Reputation Dimensions in 2009

A reputation is built on seven pillars from which a company can create a strategic platform for communicating with its stakeholders. Reputation Institute measured not only perceptions of companies on the four Pulse attributes – the beating heart of the model – but also asked respondents to rate the companies on the seven key dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products &amp; Services</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Workplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Friesland Campina</td>
<td>1 Philips</td>
<td>1 Rabobank Groep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Philips</td>
<td>2 Unilever</td>
<td>2 Air France - KLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Heineken</td>
<td>3 Ahold</td>
<td>3 AkzoNobel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Unilever</td>
<td>4 AkzoNobel</td>
<td>4 Friesland Campina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Rabobank Groep</td>
<td>5 DSM</td>
<td>5 Philips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Rabobank Groep</td>
<td>1 Rabobank Groep</td>
<td>1 Rabobank Groep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Air France - KLM</td>
<td>2 Friesland Campina</td>
<td>2 Heineken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Volker Wessels Stevin</td>
<td>3 Philips</td>
<td>3 Air France - KLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Wolters Kluwer</td>
<td>4 CZ</td>
<td>4 Philips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DSM</td>
<td>5 Wolters Kluwer</td>
<td>5 DSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Rabobank Groep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Heineken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ahold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Unilever</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reputational leader in 2009, Philips, is present in the top 5 of five of the seven reputation dimensions. This demonstrates that the company’s reputation sits on a solid multidimensional foundation.

Yet, the number two in the reputation ranking, Rabobank Groep should not be underestimated. Rabobank Groep is present in the top 5 of six of the seven reputation dimensions. Rabobank Groep receives the highest ratings on the dimensions Workplace, Governance, Citizenship, Leadership and Performance. The financial crisis has had an extremely positive effect on the reputation of the Rabobank Groep.

Friesland Campina, Heineken, Unilever, DSM and Air France-KLM are in the top 5 of three of the seven reputation dimensions. Noteworthy is that Friesland Campina is the leader of the Products & Services dimension.

"Unilever is een bedrijf in beweging. Enkele jaren geleden lanceerden we onze nieuwe Vitaliteitsmissie, die nu breed gedragen wordt en van invloed is geweest op de portfolio en producten die we op de markt brengen. Nu is het tijd om ook de buitenwereld meer over onze Vitaliteitsmissie en het bedrijf achter de consumentenmerken te vertellen. 

In dat kader lanceerden we vorig jaar tijdens de Olympische Spelen een eerste campagne waarin ons Unilever-merk – en wat wij als bedrijf doen – centraal stond.

Ook in de toekomst zullen we meer gaan doen om de zichtbaarheid van Unilever te vergroten en uit te leggen waar onze onderneming voor staat."

Kees van der Waaij, National Manager Unilever Nederland Holdings BV
Global Industry Reputations

Industry results provide an indication of the context within which companies operate. Some companies operate in industries with a positive halo, others operate in an industry with a negative halo.

**Top-Rated Industries:**
Five industries show an average score above 70: Consumer Products, Beverage, Computer, Electrical & Electronics and Food Manufacturing. The firms in these industries have built strong reputation platforms.

**Industries with Weak Reputations:**
Financially diversified, Insurance and Tobacco companies have a weak reputation platform, showing an average industry score below 60.

The Transport & Logistics, Food Manufacturing and Telecommunications industry reputations have improved enormously in comparison to last year’s results. Transport & Logistics took the largest leap; the industry climbed from the 21st position last year to the 10th position this year with a RepTrak™ Pulse of 67.2.

Food Manufacturing climbs 9 places to the 5th position with a RepTrak™ Pulse of 70.0. The Tobacco industry shows the greatest decline (-7.7 points)\(^1\).

\(^1\) The improvement and decline of Food Manufacturing and Tobacco may be driven by the former classification as one industry (Food & Tobacco).
An ounce of prevention is a worth a pound of cure in many instances

By Dr. Majorie Dijkstra

Executives know the importance of their companies’ reputations. Firms with strong positive reputations attract better people. They are perceived as providing more value, which often allows them to charge a premium. Their customers are more loyal and buy broader ranges of products and services. Because the market believes that such companies will deliver sustained earnings and future growth, they have higher market value and lower costs of capital. In an economy where 70% to 80% of market value comes from hard-to-assess intangible assets such as brand equity, intellectual capital, and goodwill, organizations are especially vulnerable to anything that damages their reputations. Damage to reputation is an enterprise-wide event that can lead to lowered stakeholder support, decline in financial performance, and a loss of goodwill with local communities as well as its ‘license to operate’ in key markets.

Most companies, however, do an inadequate job of managing their reputations in general and the risks to their reputations in particular. They tend to focus their energies on handling the threats to their reputations that have already surfaced. This is not risk management; it is crisis management – a reactive approach whose purpose is to limit the damage. Reputation risk management is about anticipating threats that may damage the company’s reputation capital.

A recent survey on global risk management, conducted by AON indicated that of the top 10 corporate risks managers see today, ‘damage to reputation’ has the highest threat to value. Although ‘damage to reputation’ tops the list of risks identified by senior managers, fewer than 50% of them claim to have a strategic plan in place for managing reputation risk. Most CEOs admit that their companies lack coordination with respect to who owns reputation risk, and responsibilities are fragmented among a wide range of business managers.

So, what drives reputation risk and how can managers do a better job of assessing existing and potential threats to their companies’ reputations and deciding whether to accept a given risk or to take actions to avoid or mitigate it?
What is Reputation Risk and What is Driving It?

A gap between a company’s behavior and stakeholders’ expectations creates reputation risk. Reputation risks can manifest in two ways: first, as an “issue,” here meaning some shortcoming in stakeholders’ eyes of a company’s actions (e.g., human rights, obesity, CO2 emission). Second, it may manifest as an incident — a specific event typically — that violates a regulation, law, policy, or accepted norm (e.g., ethical violation, faulty product).

A company’s vulnerability to reputation risk is driven by several dynamics beyond and within the organization. Externally, these factors include legal changes and shifting societal values; internally, factors range from organizational culture to actions taken by individuals to a company’s strategy. A shift in any of these variables can cause a change in the two components that create the potential for reputation risks: stakeholder expectations and company behavior.

There are different sources of risks, but the most appropriate focus of communicators should be on those reputation risks that stem from when a company fails (or is perceived as failing) to behave in the way stakeholders expect: above and beyond what is legally required. The failure to meet expectations, when acute enough, can negatively impact reputation, alienating stakeholders and causing them to withdraw their support. After all, managing and building stakeholder perceptions are the responsibility of the communicators.

How to Manage Reputation Risks?

It is crucial that companies implement a Reputation Risk Management Process to objectively and systematically assess potential gaps between stakeholder perceptions and company behaviors. Vital to the success of the process is that a senior executive below the CEO is responsible and that a cross-functional team manages the reputation risks. The figure below depicts the steps in Reputation Risk Management Process.
I. Identify reputational risks by assessing the gap between stakeholders’ perceptions and beliefs and the actual performance of the company. Are you able to meet the expectations of the stakeholders? The outcome of the first step is a list of potential reputational events that should be systematically monitored.

To know how the most important stakeholders perceive the company and to identify the gap, all available information from existing studies in place at Communications, Marketing, HR, Media, Investor Relations should be collected and integrated. Any information gaps could be closed by collecting information using media analysis, reputation research, interviews with front-line employees, discussions with management and BOD, stakeholder and industry research, industry and expert panels.

To assess the company’s real character is difficult. Companies have a natural tendency to overestimate their organizations’ and their own capabilities. Moreover, there is a general belief that the reputation is good, if it is not bad; but companies might not realize that they have no reputation at all. Ways to assess the company’s real character can be done by an external assessment of the company’s identity, behaviors and capabilities.

II. Prioritize reputation risk and stakeholders

The main question is which potential risks pose the largest threats to the company’s reputation and should be mitigated. At present, determining priority is mostly based on the potential impact of the risk on the business and the probability that the risk occurs. These two factors are difficult to objectively assess for many companies.

Reputation Institute has developed a method to prioritize risks in a more objective manner by multiplying the internal assessment of determining how likely issues are to occur and the impact of risks on each reputation driver by the following two assessments from stakeholder research:

- Likelihood of negative media coverage: How likely is a particular event to create negative media coverage? Research shows that reporters and analysts are more likely to pick up on certain types of events than others. If the media writes a lot about a specific issue the risk for reputation loss is higher than if the story only gets limited media coverage. By understanding what the media is focusing on, the media visibility of specific risks can be identified and prioritized.

- Reputation driver weights: The weight of the reputation drivers tell how much influence each reputation attribute and dimension has on the company’s overall reputation. Knowing the relative weights enables prioritizing events that have the highest likelihood of influencing the company’s reputation, and so to threaten the value of its reputation capital.
III. Identify effective means for mitigating risks and execute risk strategy

In general, there are four response strategies to handle reputation risks, i.e.,

i. **Avoidance**, i.e., taking actions so that the risk event no longer impacts the company’s reputation. Risk avoidance is the most effective and preferred way of managing risk. This can be done through closing the reputation-reality gaps by either a) managing-lowering or raising- expectations or b) improving the company’s capabilities, behaviors and performance.

Managing expectations is eminent the responsibility of communications. Communication should develop position statements and a coherent set of reputing initiatives around which to ‘express’ the company to the stakeholders group, thereby setting the right expectations. For improving the company’s performance, the risk team should work with the different departments within the organisation to identify if it is doable to align behaviours, performance and capabilities of the company with stakeholder perceptions on short term.

Policy directives are useful to outline the needed modifications to change company behaviour and assign responsibility to the right departments and functions.

ii. **Mitigation**, i.e., reducing the likelihood and/or impact of the risk. 100% mitigation would be equivalent to risk avoidance. An example of reducing the likelihood is to avoid going into a line of business associated with risk. Procedures about how to effectively handle a particular threat may lessen the impact of the risk. This strategy is often chosen as second best if avoidance is not realizable or too costly.

iii. **Transfer**, i.e., transferring the risk to a third party more capable of accommodating the risk. Risk can be transferred in two ways. The first is through insurance. The second is through outsourcing aspects of the business as finance and complaint handling to a third party.

iv. **Acceptance**, i.e., accepting the consequences and likelihood of a particular risk and planning for ways in which to deal with the risk if it occurs. A common approach is to have a contingency plan ready for responding to the event and to reduce the overall impact to an acceptable level. Acceptance is often chosen if the cost of eliminating the risk completely is too high and the effect of risk is expected to be acceptable.

Solutions to handle risks should be prioritized based on the controllability of the risk, the impact it has on the business across stakeholder groups and the cost of implementing the solution.
IV. Monitoring changing beliefs and expectations

It is crucial that the company keeps an outside-in perspective, stays in touch with its stakeholders and closely monitors their beliefs and expectations. One should realize that expectations change and affect reputation even if they seem unreasonable at that time.

In summary, the Reputation Risk Management Process will provide companies with:

- An early-warning system by identifying which issues may impact the firm’s reputation and require immediate action and what emerging issues should be monitored.
- Insight in the magnitude of risk: Does the issue only affect one business unit or the whole company, does it involve one stakeholder group or multiple stakeholder groups?
- Direction on response strategies: Should the risk be avoided, transferred, mitigated or accepted? Should the risk mitigation be based on direct engagement with stakeholders or on media engagement?

Ultimately, risk management is about both anticipating strategic issues and leveraging opportunities to engage with the company’s key stakeholders around topics and initiatives that are most relevant to them. Effective risk management is about aligning perception and reality. A weak reputation that is not deserved is an opportunity to exploit. A great reputation that is not grounded in reality is a catastrophe waiting to happen.

For more information about reputation risk management and Reputation Institute’s tool RepTrak™ Risk, please contact Dr. Majorie Dijkstra; mdijkstra@reputationinstitute.com; +31 10 408 2767.

**Sources**

- Reputation Risk Management: Anticipating Downside Losses while Exploiting Upside Gains by Charles J. Fombrun, Kasper Ulf Nielsen, Nicolas Georges Trad, Reputation Institute
- Managing Reputation Risk, Corporate Executive Board 2008
- Reputation: Risk of Risks, The Economist Intelligence Unit 2005
Reputation Institute The Netherlands is located in Rotterdam. Reputation Institute The Netherlands brings together a diverse group of academics and corporate practitioners from institutions around the country. Reputation Institute The Netherlands cooperates with the Corporate Communication Centre, which is a joint initiative of the Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University and the business community. The Corporate Communication Centre conducts academic and applied research, consults to blue-chip companies, and educates the next generation of communication leaders.
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Reputation Institute Products

RepTrak™ – a tool which measures reputation across stakeholders, countries and industries. The RepTrak™ model tracks 23 key performance indicators (attributes) grouped around 7 core dimensions.

Media RepTrak™ – assesses the impact of media coverage on a company’s reputation; whether and how media coverage is contributing to building up or breaking down reputation.

RepTrak™ Risk – a tool that helps organizations evaluate intangible risks in real time. A tool to prioritize and mitigate risks as well as a standardized approach to risk reporting.

EcQ® – The Employee Alignment Monitor – a tool for measuring employee alignment and analyzing the relative effectiveness of internal communications to ensure that everyone in the organization does their part to realize the strategy.

WorkRep™ – a tool for analyzing the relative impact of different aspects of the corporation on its attractiveness as a workplace.

CountryRepSM – a tool that measures the emotional appeal that people feel about a country.
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13th International Conference
May 28th - 30th 2009, Amsterdam

"Ensuring Business Continuity through Impactful Reputation Management"

Corporate Reputation, Brand, Identity and Competitiveness
The financial crisis has severely damaged reputations of companies and individuals. Monetary fortunes have been lost, increasing numbers of people have been laid off. Key questions to be answered at this conference are: What can be done to mitigate reputation damage? What lessons can be learned from academic research? What are the visions of representatives of leading global firms on how to maintain a sound reputation?

This year’s conference will present best practices and leading academic research on topics such as:

- How do we restore trust between top management and external and internal stakeholders?
- Is sustainability sustainable in times of crises?
- How do we handle internal conflicts from a reputation management point of view?
- What is the role of country reputation in creating competitive advantage?

- What are the newest developments in identity research and how does this help managers in the area of reputation?
- What are the newest developments in reputation risk assessment?

We have put together an exciting 3-day program with the help of our sponsors AkzoNobel, Eneco, Philips, Shell, KPN, ING and Océ. The conference starts Thursday May 28, 2009 and concludes on Saturday May 30, 2009. The Conference Program will begin Thursday evening with two plenary sessions followed by an opening dinner. A full program of plenary sessions and breakout workshops will follow on Friday and Saturday. And the conference will end on Saturday night with a marvelous boat tour through Amsterdam's beautiful canals.
Plenary Session Thursday 18.30-19.15 hours
  Contributions of Reputation Management in a Financial Crisis
  Forum Discussion:
  Alberto Andreu Pinillos - Telefónica; Herbert Heitmann - SAP, Jeroen Overgoor - Eneco;
  Cees van Riel - Rotterdam School of Management

Plenary Session Thursday 19.15-20.00 hours
  How Reputation Management Matters in Current Times:
  a Business View by Philips
  Rudy Provoost, Chief Executive Officer - Philips Lighting

Plenary Session Friday 9.00-10.00 hours
  Reputation Management at Shell and AkzoNobel
  Bjorn Edlund, Vice President, Communications - Royal Dutch Shell;
  John McLaren, Director, Corporate Communications - AkzoNobel

Plenary Session Friday 14.00-15.00 hours
  The Impact of Culture on Reputation Management
  Dr. Geert Hofstede - University Maastricht

Plenary Session Saturday 9.00-10.00 hours
  Multiple Professional Identities in Hospitals
  Dr. Janet Dukerich, University at Texas

  Managing Intractable Identity-Reputation Conflicts
  Dr. C. Marlena Fiol - University of Colorado at Denver

Plenary Session Saturday 17.00-18.00 hours
  Reputation Lessons Learned by US Firms
  Bill Margaritis, Senior Vice President worldwide Communications and Investor Relations - FedEx
  Dr. Charles Fombrun, Chairman - Reputation Institute
Parallel Sessions

- Like it or not, we’re in this Together: Identifying and Managing Reputation at the Industry Level
- Express Yourself: a Strong Identity with Sense-Giving
- Reputation and Competitiveness:
- New Insights to Ensuring Sales growth
- Aligning your Employees during Difficult Times
- Reputational Intermediaries - Where were the Gatekeepers during the Credit Crisis?
- Get a Grip: Media Impact on Corporate Reputation
- “The Business Case for CSR” Revisited
- Challenges in Managing Stakeholder Expectations
- Distinctiveness versus Legitimacy: Which Way to go in Reputation Management?
- The Effects of Country Reputations: From Measurement to Management
- How Companies can Align Strategy, Culture and Identity through Corporate Branding
- Latest Developments in Communication Sciences about Reputation Management
- Social Responsibility under Pressure, using your CSR Efforts to (Re)Position Yourself
- Breaking Boundaries with Visualization, your Corporate Identity beyond Language
- Is Your Reputation at Risk?
We look forward to welcoming you in Amsterdam!

Please visit our website: www.ReputationInstitute.com for more information and to register.