THE PURPOSEFUL COMPANY

Provocation Series Edited by Will Hutton

"Companies are potential organisational structures of genius that allow humanity to innovate and then produce to meet the great challenges of any era: in these terms profits are made by delivering a noble, moral business purpose, integral to the wider legitimacy of the enterprise. Of course in the hurly-burly of business and organisational life, nobility and integrity of purpose get qualified, but they are nonetheless at the heart of any just and sustainable economic and social order. In the second decade of the twenty-first century the idea of the company has lost its way."

How Good We Can Be:
Ending the Mercenary Society and Building a Great Country
– Will Hutton (2015)

Great companies are defined by a commitment to an over-riding purpose. That informs its values, strategy and processes. The proposition is that the stronger business purpose, the cleverer, more adaptable and sustainable the business model – and the genius of the company can be brought to life. With our network of innovative companies and thought leaders the Chair of the Big Innovation Centre – Will Hutton – is launching a discussion on how formulations and declarations of business purpose inform values and how they can be lived through investor relations, innovation processes, workplace relations, leadership, incentives, supply chain strategy, customer engagement and performance.

Based upon provocations from Will Hutton's forthcoming book *How Good We Can Be* we delineate a possible breakthrough link between company purpose and innovation. Do owners committed to the business purpose permit longer term thinking and lower the cost of capital, thus enabling more innovative risk taking and higher levels of investment? One continuing theme of our work will be to see whether this link holds in practice.

The Big Innovation Centre (BIC) will use its hub capacity for open innovation to facilitate learning between its partners, drawing out the key opportunities and challenges presented by adopting business purpose at the centre of an enterprise. We are convening a high level panel of our partner organisations (corporate, public and academic) to gather insights as to how BIC companies understand and use the concept of purpose. In a series of business forums we investigate the value of company purpose to our partners. For each topic area we look at innovative ways in which purpose is being integrated, and at how purpose is being used to enhance companies' innovation capability. Organisations committed to engage in the business forums include BT, Unilever, Barclays, Hermes Investment Management and the Bank of England.

The business forums take as a starting point a series of provocations derived from Will's book *How Good We Can Be*. Here are some extracts from the book grouped under five headings, followed by questions for discussion. They are not exhaustive: there are other potential dimensions for discussion and other task force members may be keen to develop those themes as well as comment and discuss the initial five. Contact details are provided at the end.

Business Forum 1

Repurposing the company is essential to good business

Provocation from How Good We Can Be – Chapter 5:

"Companies were originally invented in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as legal structures that enabled groups of investors to come together, committing to share risk around a shared goal and so make profit for themselves, while in the process delivering wider economic and social benefits. Incorporation – to create a company – was then understood to be associated with obligations: a company had to declare its purpose before earning a licence to trade. The East India Company, for example, England's earliest company, was given the monopoly of English trade in Asia but with the reciprocal obligation that it operate English ships and construct manned forts along the trade routes to protect other English trade. There existed a mutual deal between company and society. Other companies were incorporated in the same way.

The objective in this discussion series is how to put business purpose at the heart of every enterprise as a repurposing of the idea of the company back to this core origin. It is to make purpose the animating dynamic of a business and to create a societal obligation to match the privileges of incorporation. Directors should be held to account for the delivery of purpose; fiduciary obligations should be broadened to have this interpretation.

Andrew Haldane, chief economist of the Bank of England, and Richard Davies have measured the degree to which shareholders are so myopically preoccupied with short-term profits rather than purpose that they value profits made immediately much more than those made in, say, five or ten years' time, even allowing for the rational cost of waiting. They find that share price valuations are only explicable if the stream of profits in the future is judged to be worth in today's terms between 5 and 10 per cent lower than if they were rationally valued. This may not sound much, but cumulatively the impact is devastating.

For example, a project that would in reality pay back all its cash outlay within nine years would be judged by the stock market not to be worth bringing forward because cumulatively it undervalues each year's profits by 10 per cent. Over thirty-five years the valuation is one thousandth of an investment's real value. A later study shows that unquoted companies have four to five times more capital assets for every pound of turnover than companies whose shares are quoted on the stock market, a huge differential that can only be explained by the disastrous impact of stock market myopia on company investment decisions. Yet directors' pay has been linked ever more closely to share price performance, offering them the prospect of stunning remuneration but diverting director attention to this sole metric. As a result, R&D, investment and innovation are consistently undervalued. British companies are now hoarding some £800 billion in cash, cash they would rather use buying back their own shares than committing to investment. We have allowed a madhouse to develop. An important reason for the crisis in business investment and innovation is the way our companies are owned or, rather, *not* owned. Too few exhibit or demonstrate purpose.

Every aspect of business strategy is affected. It is now a common place, for example, that Britain's big four supermarket chains are suffering from the challenge of German discount retailers Aldi and Lidl. A typical basket of prices in British supermarkets is up to 20 per cent higher than their German competitors, a pricing policy imposed by the need to generate the financial returns required by footloose shareholders. Aldi and Lidl, privately owned and with a clear business purpose, can price more keenly. Nor is this anything new. In the 1950s and 1960s Japanese motorcycle manufacturers were able to price similarly keenly against British manufacturers for exactly the same reasons, eventually killing indigenous British capability. It is often remarked that openness to foreign ownership has transformed the British car industry. What is less remarked is that the foreign companies that have achieved this transformation – Tata and BMW – are themselves privately owned while the Japanese companies are similarly anchored in long-term ownership structures. They are purposeful car companies."

Questions for discussion

- *To what extent is there agreement about the centrality of purpose? Would a focus on purpose address the problems listed above – or are they overstated and/or have origins in other factors?*
- *What benefits does purpose have? Could it lower the cost of capital by reducing investor myopia? How could that be validated economically and statistically?*
- *How far can any company argue for purpose in a context where others do not?*
- *The current Section 172 of the 2006 Companies Act requires that directors "have regard to" the delivery of business purpose. Why is this not more followed in practice? Should the requirement be strengthened? Is voluntarism sufficient?*
- *Should fiduciary obligations be re-defined to encompass purpose?*
- *Is it possible to pursue other goals, such as sustainability, without purpose?*

Business Forum 2

Declarations of business purpose: How and why are they linked to values? Should corporate structures be better designed so that, literally, they are better fit for business purpose?

Provocation from How Good We Can Be – Chapter 5:

"The cornerstone of a new approach to ownership in the twenty-first century must be the recreation of purposeful companies with a more just relationship between themselves and the wider society, capable of fostering the trust relationships that are at the heart of high-innovation and high-performance workplaces. Companies should declare their business purpose on incorporation: they should incorporate to deliver particular goods and services that serve a societal or economic need and will need particular capabilities and skills. It is through delivery of their purpose that they should seek to make profits. Most great companies have this purpose at their heart already, even if informally. Unilever famously exists to make the best everyday things for everyday folk; Boeing to build planes that fly furthest safest; the owners of the Guardian Media Group, the Scott Trust, pledge to ensure that the *Guardian* is edited as it has been ‘heretofore’.

The notion could be further developed. Companies delivering goods and services of fundamental public or social importance – say in banking, insurance, the utilities, defence or the media – could incorporate by going beyond the declaration of business purpose. Instead they would receive a licence to operate by incorporating with a charter, setting out along the lines of, for example, the BBC’s charter the detailed terms under which they would do business. This would represent an overt bargain between the company and the wider community, recognising that whether in defence, media, financial services or the utilities the attitude of the government is of existential importance to the business model. The charter would set out the objects of the public benefit company, the terms of its governance and constitution of its board, the contract with public or private shareholders, how it would hold itself to account for the delivery of its public benefit services, its approach to executive remuneration, its policies on innovation and training, how it would recognise employees’ voice and the priorities it would have in allocating any surpluses. The charter would be subject to periodic review, say every ten or fifteen years. In return the public benefit company would enjoy tax advantages, reflecting its status along with guaranteed autonomy and independence. It would be a non-public body, free to borrow without that borrowing being categorised as public sector debt.

Mutualisation, from worker co-operatives to consumer-owned mutuals like building societies or even football clubs, must represent an irrevocable ownership choice. The capital built up over generations of stewardship is not there to be flipped into different forms of ownership. As a country and a society we want mutuals to be a permanent feature of our ownership landscape – another way of approaching the relationship of an organisation to its workers, members and customers. Every other European country requires that once assets are mutually owned they must stay mutually owned, being transferable only if a mutual is failing or its business model is changing to another mutual under a provision called ‘disinterested distribution’ – in other words the assets are not distributed for gain except to the mutual. If Britain had had a similar provision, the demutualisation of the 1990s would have been prohibited. Such a provision should now become part of British law. It would thus enable a new flowering of mutuals and membership organisations – from football clubs to agricultural co-operatives – that could reflect their purpose better.“

Questions for debate:

- *What declarations of purpose work best as animating statements? Are there good examples? How important is it that declarations are business specific rather than general?*
- *Should profit follow purpose? What does that mean in practice?*
- *Purpose has to be enmeshed in values, process and strategy if it is to be effective. How is that done?*
- *How should governance reflect purpose?*
- *In practical terms purpose is a dimension of – and gives life to – the balanced scorecard approach. Is this correct? How would this work in practice?*
- *Is the current PLC too dominant an organisational form? Is the UK ready for public benefit companies and more mutuals that might reflect purposes that have a public, social or*

communal character? What role might employee stock ownership have in entrenching purpose?

Business Forum 3

Investor relations and business purpose: How does purpose drive stability in ownership and governance? What does it take to build long-term investor engagement?

Provocation from How Good We Can Be – Chapter 5:

"Purpose has to be understood and owned by shareholders, most of whom are now large institutions. Global asset managers for example own nearly half all UK shares, so any initiative or reform has to be work and be accepted by them. No UK firm can change the terms of engagement unilaterally, meaning that in practical terms currently firms have to work on investor relationships within the current balance of power between institutional shareholders and firms. A wider framework is needed that recasts the possibilities. However equally no firm or even the UK government can reform the global asset-management industry unilaterally, but it could reframe the terms on which British shares are owned. It could demand, for example, that all investors in British companies sign and comply with a tougher Stewardship Code, which returns to the ultimate savers by up to 2–3 per cent per annum. A win-win all round. It currently sets out milk-and-water obligations to monitor investee companies, exercise votes, steward companies and act with other investors if necessary. It is better than nothing, but essentially minimalist. The Code should be greatly stiffened. It should set a cap on the annual turnover of portfolios under asset managers' direction at 30 per cent (following the recommendation of the LSE's Paul Woolley); not pay performance fees; and insist on total transparency on strategies, costs, leverage and trading. One of the features of the asset-management industry is that not only does it not support enterprise, innovation and investment, it is organised as a system of wealth transfer from the ultimate savers to the stage army of intermediaries – some of it very opaque. For example, one recent report from the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) castigated the market-makers, intermediaries, banks and investment banks who take orders to buy and sell shares for not working hard enough to secure the best price for their customers, and, worse, charging both the buyer and seller a commission, so-called 'payments for order flow'. This was a blatant conflict of interest, but was nonetheless widespread and continued despite the FCA's advice it should stop. The benefit of such a toughened stewardship code is that it will both create more engaged investors and reduce such practices, so potentially increasing returns to the ultimate savers by up to 2–3 per cent per annum. A win-win all round.

Another area for examination is shareholder voting rights. It is perfectly possible for a share to attract more votes the longer it is held. A share held for five years could attract 50 per cent more votes, doubling once it is held for ten years. Alternatively shareholders can contract to hold shares for predetermined periods, thus attracting greater voting rights immediately. If shares are lent, voting rights will be forgone Capital gains tax paid on selling shares will reduce on a sliding scale that reflects the period over which shares are held. Those investors – hedge funds and day traders – who are primarily short-term traders and do not want to accept stewardship responsibilities or sign the

Stewardship Code should be able to buy non-voting shares. Equally any owner who does not want to disclose their identity will lose voting rights automatically. Stock Exchange listing rules should be relaxed to allow such non-voting shares to be readily traded. These will receive dividends and can be lent to others, but they will attract no votes; gains will attract capital gains tax whatever the character of the holder – pension funds as much as hedge funds.

This will strike many in London as a bridge too far. But when Google floated, its founders Sergey Brin and Larry Page issued two classes of shares, with Class A shares having ten times more votes attached than Class B – so Brin and Page ended up with 37.6 per cent of the votes for 3.7 per cent of the shares. As they said in the letter accompanying the initial public offering, 'we have set up a corporate structure that will make it much harder for outside parties to take over or influence Google. This structure will also make it easier for our management team to follow the long term, innovative approach.'[11] Ten years on from the flotation, who can say they were wrong? LinkedIn offered its original long-term shareholders ten times the votes when it floated in 2011, and the Glazers floated Manchester United in New York rather than London because American rules allowed the family shares to have ten times as many votes. Owners in mainland Europe – from the Wallenbergs in Sweden, who have holdings in most of Sweden's top companies, to the Piech family, part-owners of Porsche – use similar devices. Where there is business success and innovation, look for non-British corporate structures.

Not-for-profit mutuals could be created whose sole purpose is to aggregate the proxy votes of those investing institutions who are essentially passive investors and who do not want or do not have the resources to become committed, contracted long-term shareholders. Shareholders will be compelled to exercise their vote, either directly or through the new proxy mutuals. These mutuals, expanded versions of how Hermes (owned by the BT pension fund) acts as an active, responsible investor on behalf of many funds under its management alongside the core BT fund, will thus take their place in a new ecology of shareholders. There will be contracted shareholders with a long-term engagement who may have more votes; there will be shareholders exercising voting privileges through proxy mutuals; and there will be non-voting shares that are essentially casino chips. This trinity – business purpose, trusteeship and a range of committed shareholders – will be the foundation for the creation of purposeful companies, freed to behave like long-term trusts rather than dance to the tune of peripatetic day traders."

Questions for debate

- *Is a toughened stewardship code possible? Would it work? What are the obstacles? Could it be introduced without government prompting?*
- *Are differential voting rights still a bridge too far? Is opinion moving in this direction?*
- *Could companies create more committed shareholders without such changes?*
- *Are the incentives in the asset management industry correct?*
- *Is the idea of not-for-profit mutuals voting proxy shares likely to gain any traction? Is the Hermes model scaleable?*
- *Are there examples of companies proactively creating a committed shareholder base? What is best practice in communicating purpose to shareholders? What kind of shareholder listens best?*
- *Are shareholders persuadable that purpose brings long term returns?*

Business Forum 4

Translating purpose into performance: How can companies use purpose to inspire and empower their people to achieve excellence?

Provocation from How Good We Can Be – Chapter 6:

“Britain must aim to be the smartest economy it can be – it is the only route to prosperity in the decades ahead. The smart economy and the smart society are two sides of the same coin. They are the cornerstone of the good economy. This smart future cannot be constructed without enfranchised citizens, intelligent, risk-taking consumers and equally intelligent, reflexive, creative employees. They are the investors, workers and consumers in the better-owned, better-financed and more innovative enterprises that we need to create as the core of a great economy. I borrow the notion of mass flourishing from Nobel Prize-winning economist Professor Edmund Phelps. Flourishing, he writes, is ‘the heart of prospering – engagement, meeting challenges, self-expression and personal growth’. He continues that ‘a person’s flourishing comes from the experience of the new: new situations, new problems, new insights and new ideas to develop and share. Similarly, prosperity on a national scale – mass flourishing – comes from broad involvement of people in the processes of innovation; the conception, development and spread of new methods and products – indigenous innovation down to the grass roots.’ Amen to that.

Put in my terms, the smart economy, resting on innovation, is coterminous with a society that ceaselessly and restlessly sponsors mass flourishing: they are indispensable and interdependent concepts. This was the heart of the Enlightenment – makers, inventors and philosophers all interconnected, daring to think, to understand and to challenge old boundaries, infecting each other with the enthusiasm for the new while being part of a great social awakening that affected everyone. This spirit imbued every branch of British economic and social life in the late eighteenth century; it was this as much as cheap labour, water mills and Europe’s first single national market that triggered the Industrial Revolution. Every age is different, but what is not different are the interdependencies between the economic and social that animate and lift the human spirit.

This is a world of sentient adults trying to live their lives as well as they can, doing what they need to do as individuals while at the same time recognising their obligations to support, help and associate with others. Please don’t raise your eyes to the ceiling as you read the next line, but the object is to live virtuously in the very broadest sense. The purposed company enables its workforce to work and live well, marshalling all their talents.

Workplace voice is an indispensable part of this bargain. Unions are the societal institutions above any other that can take responsibility for two giant social needs – lowering inequality and re-enfranchising workers in order to create mass flourishing. Of course they must cleave to their traditional role as defenders of the underdog and champions of workplace justice. But they should also talk incessantly of their willingness to be partners in enterprise, to experiment with new forms of workplace organisation, to be involved urgently in the exploration of public sector reform and of how they want to be champions of mass flourishing. They need both to be pioneers in the reinvention of the public sector that is newly responsive to citizen preferences and to take part in the reinvention of British capitalism around the inclusive forms of ownership proposed here, while also being active instigators of a genuine Big Society.

Trade unions should be central to such an effort. Unions need to be more like guilds, guarantors of skills and fair wages, than confrontational representatives of a shrinking working class. So, for example, unions are properly concerned about zero-hour contracts and workplace insecurity. They should campaign for change. But they should create employment arms of their own – employee mutuals – run by the union on good work principles, hiring out to other employers (who in turn pay the mutual for labour services) on flexible terms appropriately skilled workers paid by the mutual but whose ultimate employer is the union. Unions should pioneer profit sharing and employee share ownership schemes. Unions should be the avenue to better pension advice, coaches in the creation of programmes of lifelong learning in general and skills development in particular. The union should provide skilled pension fund trustees to represent workforces, skilled remuneration directors to sit on company remuneration committees to determine executive pay packages, and potentially skilled non-executive directors as trustees for corporate purpose. In all these examples, managements will find that union contributions legitimise and generate more trust – from executive pay to the development of training programmes.

Unions themselves want to convince managements that to sit down with union representatives and negotiate firm-wide wage deals or consult over a major change – a takeover, a redundancy or hiring programme, a relocation, co-ordination on a multi-billion-pound infrastructure project – will seem less a ceding of managerial sovereignty, and more a way of achieving a high-trust outcome. There may be conflict and tension, but a commitment to 'good faith' bargaining – entailing transparency on both sides and an understanding that deals, once struck, will be adhered to – will reinforce relationships of trust. This is a means of offering workers a voice and influence within a bounded framework of reciprocal partnership.

If all this seems a pipedream, consider the Social Covenant signed in July 2014 by EDF Energy and four unions – GMB, Prospect, UCATT and Unite – to create a common framework for 'just pay, industrial relations, recruitment, health and welfare, skills development and workforce communications' for the up to £24 billion nuclear construction site at Hinkley Point C, in what will be the largest infrastructure project in Europe today. Kevin Coyne of Unite welcomed its 'astonishing ambition', while Vincent de Rivaz, EDF Energy's CEO, said how he had wanted 'a different kind of culture from the established national agreements and some of the entrenched positions that were underpinning them' and praised the 'collective creation' of a new partnership approach replacing collective bargaining as confrontation. He called it 'Project Solidarity'. BT, for its part, has struck a three-year pay deal running from 2014 with its two chief unions – CWU and Prospect – to give both sides financial certainty over three years of ongoing economic difficulty: on top BT has invested many millions in developing the leadership skills of over 100 frontline and union middle managers, not only to help them contribute to developing a common purpose and culture within BT but to drive similar vital change into their own unions. In short, constructive union management dialogue can be done."

Questions for debate:

- *How does a company translate commitment to purpose into workplace engagement strategies?*
- *Is purpose a means to recasting employee relationships? To recasting unions?*
- *How important has purpose been in securing union engagement? Are there more examples than BT and EDF Energy?*
- *How much are companies ready to accept workplace justice as a concomitant of purpose?*

- *What is the role of skills and skill formation?*

Business Forum 5

Translating purpose into an innovation strategy: How should purpose relate to companies' innovation strategies?

Provocation from How Good We Can Be – Chapter 5:

"The economy is in the middle of a revolution. The stock of intangible assets that in one way or another embody knowledge – from computer programs to intellectual property rights, training programmes to the value of brands – surpassed the stock of tangible assets (bricks, mortar and machines) some fifteen years ago, around the turn of the century. In 2011 (the latest year for which figures are available) the UK market sector invested £126.8 billion in intangible assets, 44 per cent more than the £88 billion invested in tangible assets. The fastest-selling luxury car in the US, for example, is now the battery-powered, tablet-operated Tesla that is transforming consumers' notions of what a car should be. Yes, it is a recombination of existing ideas to produce an innovative first. But it is also even more of a knowledge good than the cars it is replacing: it is more 'intangible' than 'tangible'.

Britain should aim to be the world's leading smart society exploiting this new world, an aim underwritten by its status as the world's leading open innovation hub, a magnet for scientific endeavour worldwide and a creator of public knowledge. It already has the capability, with sufficient new investment, to be the global health hub in fields ranging from antibiotics to new gene technologies and regenerative medicine. It could also be the master co-innovator in big data, and the world centre for the co-creation of new materials. It should aim to be a leader in the green, sustainable and energy revolutions and to be at the forefront of global aviation and space technology. All this is within our grasp.

However the intangible revolution produces so much scientific and technological complexity that it is easy to make expensive mistakes and go down blind alleys; any actor, business, government or university research laboratory has continually to test what it is doing and proposing by being in a permanent, iterative, open relationship with similar institutions. The new model certainly entails purposeful state behaviour, but this needs to be carried out in close collaboration with universities and businesses as 'co-creators' of innovative action. It is less that the state should lead from the front, its own officials coming up with top-down plans, processes and proposals as in the various iterations of innovation policy since the Second World War (first science, then technology, then knowledge transfer policy[24]); it is more to reconceive the state as the equal partner of business, finance and universities in a dense network of interactions, sharing, co-creating and co-funding. If business is to be an effective partner in these relationships – with other businesses and with government – it needs to be purposed to innovate.

This is the core proposition of the Big Innovation Centre. Innovation has always been about trial and error; in the twenty-first century trial and error has to take place across an evolving ecosystem of co-created innovative institutions, and then, crucially, the skills of the people within them must be empowered, incentivised and developed.

The ambition to be a global innovation hub cannot come from government alone; it has to be shared by all those involved in making it happen – and then owned as a shared mission. One obvious implication is that spending on R&D must increase: currently it stands at 1.7 per cent of GDP, below the EU average of 2.06 per cent, of which around 60 per cent is carried out by the business sector. In 1980 Britain was one of the most R&D-intensive countries in the world: now it has slipped to be one of the least. Any recovery must see a reversal of this trend, which for all the reasons identified in this and earlier chapters has seen business R&D fall away faster than government R&D spending. Some point to the collapse of the great business research laboratories, notably at GEC and ICI, who before their demise as ownerless corporations driven by shareholder value were two of the great centres of UK industrial R&D. The paucity of the business response to a British invention such as graphene underlines the hollowing out of the country's indigenous industrial and R&D base, along with the capability to capitalise upon invention, over the last thirty years. Britain has taken out just over fifty patents on graphene use; the US 1700 and China 2200.

Business and government alike must raise their game, but the relationship must be transparent and based on mutually shared goals. Above all, if the government were to double its R&D spend to £16 billion in an effort to trigger an overall increase in R&D spending to 3 per cent of GDP – the precondition for any transition to a smart society – by making further frontier investments, say, in the eight great technologies identified by former innovation minister David Willetts, then it will need purposed, innovative companies as its partners. This should not be a stream of one-way grants and tax reliefs. It has to be a continuing, jointly created effort in the name of a great national goal. The purposeful company is the indispensable precondition to achieve this end."

Questions for debate:

- *Do you recognise the intangible revolution? Is the best strategic response some form of open innovation?*
- *Is it easier to be an open innovator as a purposeful company? How does purpose help formulate innovation strategies?*
- *Business R&D spending has fallen. Would placing purpose more at the heart of business help it recover? Is R&D spending a useful proxy for innovativeness and invention? Are there other measures?*
- *How important is it that government spending on R&D increase? Would business more overtly organised around purpose help the case – not least in ensuring better financial paybacks for the taxpayer investment?*
- *Do purposeful companies find building relationships with universities easier?*

Other Business Forums: Do you want to write a provocation and lead one?

Potential topics for discussion could include:

Delivering purpose through the value chain: How does purpose translate into supply chain strategies? What role do digital platforms, Big Data and networks have to play?

Purpose and customer responsiveness: How can purpose help to place customer responsiveness at the heart of companies?

Translating public purpose into business purpose: How can the public and private sectors support one another's purposes? Is there a case for repurposing the public sector along similar lines?

Sustainability: is it possible to deliver a sustainability agenda without a wider commitment to purpose? Should declarations of purpose include dimensions of sustainability?

How to take part?

- **As a Big Innovation Centre Partner**: You can sign up to participate in the Business Forums or put yourself forward as a thought leader proposing to co-lead a discussion.
- **Invite yourself or your organisation:** The Business Forums are for Big Innovation Centre partners or invited thought leaders. If you want your organisation to sign up to participate in the series contact us to become a partner of the Big Innovation Centre.
- **As a Business Purpose Champion or commercial sponsor:** We are offering the opportunity to organisations (mostly of interest to larger ones) to position themselves as Business Purpose Champions and sponsor one of the events signalling their particular interest, or add another one. This is an excellent promotional opportunity for any organisation with a commitment to creating societal value.
- **Submit your own provocation:** If you want to participate in The Purposeful Company discussion you can submit your own provocation piece. Contact us for more details.

Contact Hub Director, Helen Lawrence at h.lawrence@biginnovtioncentre.com