

<b>MBA Second Year (2019-2020)</b>	<b>Assignment Solution - Corporate Governance &amp; Ethics</b>
<b>Even Semester (Fourth Semester)</b>	<b>MBA124</b>
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Dr. Rajesh Singh</b>

**Question Number-1.) Discuss issues related to pay and perks of an employee?**

**Answer-**

All businesses contend with issues common to provision of employee benefits. Small businesses meet the challenges with fewer resources than large companies. Employers offer most benefits voluntarily, with an eye to recruitment and retention of employees. Companies can choose from an increasingly long list of employee benefits, such as medical insurance, life insurance and retirement plans, in addition to financial benefits such as bonuses, stock options and profit sharing. However, small businesses often are challenged to provide employees with benefit packages like those offered by larger companies. All businesses, regardless of size and resources, are charged with managing employee benefit programs responsibly and legally.

Employee benefits are a normal part of doing business, but for a small business the cost can have a greater impact on profit, cash flow and decisions about investment, expansion and hiring. A small business's expenses could include hiring staff to manage its benefits program or paying outside benefit plan managers. Managing the benefit plan adds to legal and financial accounting services. Providing leave benefits can adversely affect a small business, requiring the company to hire temporary employee and pay the salary of an employee who is on vacation or maternity leave. Businesses can lower employee benefits costs by offering fewer benefits and passing along more of the cost to employees. Cost-saving measures typically include excluding working spouses and hourly workers from insurance coverage or requiring employees to be on the job for at least three months before they are eligible for benefits. Small businesses can often save on the cost of employee benefits by joining to form a larger purchaser of benefits.

Small-business employees often pay higher portions of the cost of employee benefits plans that offer fewer choices, less flexibility and frequent changes in providers and policies that occur when small businesses shop and negotiate for lower prices. Delayed eligibility means newer employees may not have basic health care benefits. The impact on employee income, reflected in high payroll deductions, can influence decisions to remain with the employer. The added expense of employee benefits makes voluntary participation in employee benefit programs difficult. Workers who cannot afford the cost may choose plans that do not meet their needs or opt out of the benefit plans.

Under the income tax provisions, “salary” comprises of 3 components:

1. Salary/wages/pension/gratuity,
2. Perquisites and
3. Profits in lieu of salary.

Of the above, the term perquisite, owing to its complicated valuation is one of the most talked about topics related to salary head.

Perquisites, familiarly known as perks, is nothing but casual emolument or benefit which an employee enjoys on account of his/her job or position.

Perks are in addition to remuneration received by individual periodically for services rendered. Perks can be either of the following:

**Monetary perks:** Perks which are given in the nature of cash payment are considered to be monetary perks. Amount is either reimbursed by the employer for expenses already incurred by employee or directly paid by employer on behalf of employee. For eg: Obligation of employee such as education expenses, Medical bill, Gas bill, servant salary, electricity bill, vacation expense etc of employee are either reimbursed by employer or paid to respective service provider directly by employer

**Non-monetary perks:** Benefits given in kind are considered to be non-monetary perks. Following are examples of non-monetary perks:

- a. Rent free accommodation or accommodation at concessional rent provided by employer

b. Employee stock options/Restricted stock units

c. Contribution to approved superannuation fund

The income tax laws have provided for rules on valuation of various kind of perquisites. Further, as Form 16 is only the consolidated statement of salary/benefit given to employee by employer, income tax provision has provided for a requirement of issue of separate statement providing details of various perquisites given to an employee. This statement needs to be furnished in Form No 12BA.

Employee perks are non-wage offerings given to employees that extend beyond salaries and benefits (like health insurance, dental, vision, etc.).

They're often called 'fringe benefits' too.

Perks are ways to support the employees beyond the standard salary and benefits and include purchasable, programmatic, and environmental perks.

**Purchasable perks** include catered lunches, books, fitness stipends, pet insurance and student loan forgiveness.

**Programmatic perks** are policy-driven advantages to working at a company such as remote work opportunities, being pet-friendly, or offering Summer Fridays.

**Environmental perks** are the ways in which you set up your office including meditation rooms, slides, and the overall space.

Perks are **not** health care, dental, or vision package.

Perks are **not** essential company hygiene factors like mission, vision, values, fair pay, or a strong/ethical team.

Perks are **not** equivalent to company culture, but rather a component of it.

And while it's really great if you work close to where you live, it wouldn't be considered an employee perk.

**Question Number-2.) Describe Environmental issues like Pollution control and animal protection?**

**Answer-**

There are many **environmental issues in India**. Air pollution, water pollution, garbage domestically prohibited goods and pollution of the natural environment are all challenges for India. Nature is also causing some drastic effects on India. The situation was worse between 1947 through 2005. According to data collection and environment assessment studies of World Bank experts, between 2005 through 2020, India has made some of the fastest progress in addressing its environmental issues and improving its environmental quality in the world. Still, India has a long way to go to reach environmental quality similar to those enjoyed in developed economies. Pollution remains a major challenge and opportunity for India.

Environmental issues are one of the primary causes of disease, health issues and long term livelihood impact for India.

The environmental consequences of rapid industrialization have resulted in countless incidents of land, air and water resources sites being contaminated with toxic materials and other pollutants, threatening humans and ecosystems with serious health risks. More extensive and intensive use of materials and energy has created cumulative pressures on the quality of local, regional and global ecosystems.

Before there was a concerted effort to restrict the impact of pollution, environmental management extended little beyond laissez-faire tolerance, tempered by disposal of wastes to avoid disruptive local nuisance conceived of in a short-term perspective. The need for remediation was recognized, by exception, in instances where damage was determined to be unacceptable. As the pace of industrial activity intensified and the understanding of cumulative effects grew, a pollution control paradigm became the dominant approach to environmental management.

Pollution prevention approaches can be applied to all potential and actual pollution-generating activities, including those found in the energy, agriculture, federal, consumer and industrial sectors. Prevention practices are essential for preserving wetlands, groundwater sources and other critical

ecosystems - areas in which we especially want to stop pollution before it begins.

Human health and environmental protection are sometimes at odds, political leaders, government officials, and citizens need a way to mediate and resolve conflicts between these values. Unfortunately, few approaches to applied bioethics have the conceptual tools to accomplish this task. An approach to ethical decision-making that gives policy-makers some tools for balancing promotion of human health and protection of the environment. Some of the deficiencies with theories and health care ethics and environmental ethics.

**Pollution** is the introduction of contaminants into the natural environment that cause adverse change. Pollution can take the form of chemical substances or energy, such as noise, heat or light. Pollutants, the components of pollution, can be either foreign substances/energies or naturally occurring contaminants. Pollution is often classed as point source or nonpoint source pollution. In 2015, pollution killed 9 million people in the world.

Environmental Pollution Control in air, water and waste pollution management, Social, technological and environmental change is forcing an urgent global reassessment of the way we live, how we consume the planet's resources, and how we best respond to changes driven by, for example, the climate, globalization, conflict and demographic change. You will explore the scientific basis of pollution and practical approaches to its control. You will also have the opportunity to get idea about the legal, business framework, and the many environments affected by pollution.

Preserve the physical, chemical and biological integrity of the ecosystem, with maximum protection of public health and the environment.

**Air Quality.** Promote measures to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary sources.

**Energy.** Support environmentally sound policies that reduce energy growth rates, emphasize energy conservation and encourage the use of renewable resources.

**Land Use.** Promote policies that manage land as a finite resource and that incorporate principles of stewardship.

**Water Resources.** Support measures to reduce pollution in order to protect surface water, groundwater and drinking water.

Ethical theories, concepts and principles have traditionally focused on human life, human rights, and justice within human societies, much of the debate in environmental ethics has addressed questions about the value of non-human life and larger entities, such as species and ecosystems. Because there is little dispute that we have moral obligations to human beings, the chief concern of environmental ethicists has been to justify and explain the basis for our moral obligations to the environment. Some of the central issues of environmental ethics include stewardship of the environment, protection of species and ecosystem, obligations to future generations, sustainable development and population control, genetic engineering of crops and animals, globalization, and environmental justice.

The most radical theory of environmental ethics, known as the deep ecology movement, rejects the notion of human-centered morality entirely and argues that ethics needs to be completely reformulated, from an ecological perspective. Human beings should not dominate the biosphere but should live in harmony with other species. For this to happen, human beings need to minimize their environmental impacts, including slowing down industrial activity and reducing population size. Basic facts about modern society must be changed so that non-human life may flourish.

Can any of these theories of environmental ethics help policy-makers to settle conflicts between human health and environmental protection? While they all have some important and interesting things to say about the environment, they have little to say about human health per se. The theories paint the conflict between humanity in very broad brushstrokes, i.e. human interests vs. animals, other species, the ecosystem, etc. If health were the only human interest, then this way of presenting the problem might be useful, but health is by no means the only human interest. Other interests include: wealth, education, recreation, freedom, and transportation, to name a few. The human interest in question makes a considerable difference to the policy debate, because different interests have different environmental implications. For example, suppose a country is aggressively pursuing deforestation to convert forest into cropland, and that the crops will be converted into food and biofuels. It is conceivable that the goal of protecting human health favors a policy against aggressive deforestation, because deforestation will have

consequences, such as pollution, that negatively impact human health, while the goal of economic development favors aggressive deforestation, because deforestation will produce new jobs. Thus, a debate about deforestation may not be as simple as human interests vs. the forest and its species. To make sense of the debate, we must specify the human interests in question and balance them against environmental concerns. None of the approaches to environmental ethics examined in this, contain the conceptual tools to do this well, because they engage the debate at a very general level without articulating human health as a distinct interest.

Every animal deserves a life worth living including tigers and sloths abused in the tourism industry. It's now more critical than ever that governments, businesses and people come together to end the use of wild animals as entertainment, food, medicine and exotic pets.

The basic principle of equality does not require equal or identical treatment; it requires equal *consideration*. This is an important distinction when talking about animal rights. People often ask if animals should have rights.

All animals have the ability to suffer in the same way and to the same degree that humans do. They feel pain, pleasure, fear, frustration, loneliness, and motherly love. Whenever we consider doing something that would interfere with their needs, we are morally obligated to take them into account.

Animal rights believe that animals have an inherent worth—a value completely separate from their usefulness to humans. We believe that every creature with a will to live has a right to live free from pain and suffering. Animal rights is not just a philosophy—it is a social movement that challenges society's traditional view that all nonhuman animals exist solely for human use. Each one values his or her life and fights the knife.

### **Question Number-3.) Explain value and protection of eco system?**

#### **Answer-**

Ecosystem services are the many and varied benefits to humans gifted by the natural environment and from healthy ecosystems. Such ecosystems include, for example, agro ecosystems, forest ecosystems, grassland ecosystems and aquatic ecosystems. These ecosystems, functioning in healthy relationship, offer such things like natural pollination of crops, clean air, extreme weather

mitigation, human mental and physical well-being. Collectively, these benefits are becoming known as 'ecosystem services', and are often integral to the provisioning of clean drinking water, the decomposition of wastes, and resilience and productivity of food ecosystems.

Heritage values can arise from either biological heritage or cultural heritage. Every ecosystem provides a link to the past and forms a record of evolution. Cultural heritage can come from the requirements of cultures to use the ecosystem.

Biodiversity can refer to ecosystem diversity, species diversity or genetic diversity. However, these all relate to the variety of life present on Earth. Biodiversity must be protected.

Ecosystems are dynamic in nature. They shift and change and will continue to do so regardless of what human activities take place around them. A good example of this is the erosion and deposition functions that take place on coasts and dunes.

Intrinsic values are those things that have no tangible benefit. Intrinsic values also include the inherent right of an ecosystem to exist. Although ecosystems are without voice, they deserve protection and respect.

Ecosystem valuation is an economic process which assigns a value (either monetary, biophysical, or other) to an ecosystem and/or its ecosystem services. By quantifying, for example, the human welfare benefits of a forest to reduce flooding and erosion while sequestering carbon, providing habitat for endangered species, and absorbing harmful chemicals, such monetization ideally provides a tool for policy-makers and conservationists to evaluate management impacts and compare a cost-benefit analysis of potential policies. However, such valuations are estimates, and involve the inherent quantitative uncertainty and philosophical debate of evaluating a range non-market costs and benefits.

Ecosystem valuation attempts to capture the range of benefits and costs contained within a complicated natural web with a range of economic methodologies.

Ecological systems provide four general categories of services: provisioning (e.g. fish to eat, timber to sell), regulatory, supporting, and cultural (e.g. ecosystems supporting indigenous gathering techniques, or supplies for



traditional clothing).for a mangrove-specific example of this complex subject.

These types of potential ecological values, economists utilize a variety of methods to calculate those market values and measure non-market values. Standard environmental economic methods are used to place a monetary value on ecosystem services where there are no market prices. These include "stated preference" methods and "revealed preference" methods. Stated preference methods, such as the contingent valuation method ask people for their willingness to pay for a certain ecosystem (service). Applying such preference based approaches has been criticized as a means of deriving the value of ecosystems and biodiversity and for avoiding deliberation, justification and judgment in making choices. The monetary value society attaches to ecosystem services depends on the income distribution.

Ecosystem services are a popular theme in conservation policy today. By preserving or restoring natural areas, the argument goes; important services such as clean water, flood control, and crop pollination will be provided to society. If properly accounted for, these services may even be worth enough to justify the protection of the forests, wetlands, and other ecosystems that provide them.

There is a dearth of reliable information on the value of ecosystem services. Moreover, basic economic principles suggest that many ecosystem services might be of limited value, and that the ecosystem services framework is unlikely to motivate large-scale conservation.

A clearer focus on the basic economics of ecosystem services can help clarify their values and help us understand how to devise defensible estimates of those values. Many ecosystem services are comprised of some natural asset—the ecosystem, or some of its components—that contributes to the production of something. We can then derive the value of the asset providing the service by multiplying the value of the thing being produced by the additional amount of the ecological asset. Moreover, for many types of ecosystem services, the more of the service the ecosystem supplies, the less of the service remains to be performed.

- In some cases, ecosystem services may be of considerable value. This would be the case if the “value of the product” is high, the “capacity” of the marginal unit to provide that product is high, and,

crucially, if the ecological assets providing the service are scarce. If there are few ecological assets providing a service, then great potential to provide that ecosystem service remains? For example, if there is little or no riparian buffer to filter pollutants from a stream, then the marginal value of an additional meter of riparian buffer may be quite high.

- By the same token, ecosystem services must *not* be of much value if the assets already providing them are abundant. And if the “capacity” of each unit to provide services is high, there may be little left for the marginal unit to do. For example, if pollinators are abundant, and each individual pollinator visits thousands of flowers, then the marginal value of additional pollination services may be low.