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Appendix I: Initiative Approval Process Flow Chart

Is the initiative in-line with the principles of the BDA guidelines for working with commercial companies?

Yes → Complete Background / Governance Questionnaire (Appendix II)

No → Decline

Who are the messages of the initiative aimed at?

BDA Members → Approval Given

Other HPs / the Public

Is there a BDA policy or a policy from a government or professional body to support or decline the initiative?

Yes

No → Refer to COO

Approval Given → Refer to COO

Rejected → Refer to Chair

What is the risk assessment score for the initiative? (Appendix III – VI)

Green → Approval Given

Amber → Approval Given

Referral to Chair

Red → Approval Given

Decline / Renegotiate

Is further due diligence required?

What is the scope / financial grade of the initiative? (Appendix VII)

1 → Partnerships Officer to authorise agreement

2 → Partnerships Manager to authorise agreement

3 → COO or CEO to authorise agreement

Is legal advice required?

What was the result of the EDI impact on the Plan on a Page?
Appendix II: Background / Governance Questionnaire

To be completed for each new proposal. For a partnership renewal, consider whether any of the below have changed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) How does this proposal tie in with the principles of the BDA Guidelines for Working with Commercial Organisations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Does this proposal tie in with the strategic plan and, if so, which part(s) of it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) What is the target audience for the initiative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Is there a request to endorse or support a specific brand or product? If so, specify.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) What is the core message of the proposal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) If appropriate, does the proposal have sufficiently verified research or scientific opinion to support it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Is there a history of working with this organisation and, if so, what were the previous experiences?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Has the organisation signed up to any relevant industry codes of conduct or are they part of any relevant corporate responsibility indexes eg, FTSE4Good, ATNI or BITC?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Is this a one-off proposal or a long term relationship building a strategy between the BDA and the approaching organisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(j) Are you aware of any unrelated activities from this organisation that could be potentially harmful by association?

(k) Does the approaching organisation have a corporate social responsibility report or policy?

(l) Has a dietitian been involved in the development of the proposal?

(m) Is there a dietitian involved with this organisation in general?

(n) What is the added value of the initiative to the BDA?

(o) Will the proposal require a significant amount of BDA time or resources to deliver?

(p) What controls will be in place that allow the BDA to ensure unsuitable messages are rejected?

(q) Is the proposal something that the members would, in general, support?

(r) How else can the relationship generate support for the BDA’s aims?

   e.g. data, insights

(s) Does this company manufacture breastmilk substitutes (according to the Unicef definition in our policy statement on The BDA's commercial relationships with companies who manufacture breastmilk substitutes) or supply ingredients to the breastmilk substitutes industry?

   - Do they comply with the International Code of Marketing Breastmilk Substitutes and do you have evidence of this?

(t) Does this organisation demonstrate good examples of employment practices? For example does it offer wellbeing support for staff, does it recognise Trade Unions for its staff? Do they have staff forums for people with protected characteristics?
Appendix III: Risk & Opportunity Estimation

**RISK ESTIMATION**
Risk Factor for each question 1 – 5 can be measured by A x B. Risk is the highest number in the A x B column for questions 1-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A = Impact</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Catastrophic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B = Likelihood</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A x B ≤ 4**
Green

**5 ≥ A x B ≤ 11**
Amber

**A x B ≥ 12**
Red

Please circle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A x B</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Rate the level of risk due to adverse publicity should the initiative fail

2. Rate the possibility of adverse legal action should the initiative fail

3. Rate the risk of being associated with the partner

4. Rate the likelihood of the partner being subject to adverse publicity

5. Rate the risk of a loss of control of the initiative by the BDA

**OPPORTUNITY ESTIMATION**
Opportunity can be estimated by the mode score across questions 6 – 10
(Mode: The number or range of numbers in a set that occurs most frequently)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C = Potential</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Rate the potential for the BDA to raise its profile

7. Rate the potential for the profile of dietitians being raised

8. Rate the increase in the potential for the public to be able to access safe and useful information

9. Rate the possibility of an increased awareness of the BDA brand

10. Rate how highly the membership is likely to approve the initiative*

Mode Score
* Member approval could be determined by previous examples of similar projects, data from the member attitudes survey conducted by PARN (May 2017) or via insights from BDA Board of Directors or office staff.

Where risks are estimated as being amber or red, a more detailed description is required which should include the information below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of risk</td>
<td>Is it strategic, operational, compliance, financial, reputational risk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimation of risk</td>
<td>Amber / Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk tolerance / appetite</td>
<td>How significant is this risk estimation? What is the overall opportunity estimation? Does the opportunity help offset the risk estimation? Is the risk acceptable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk treatments</td>
<td>How will the risk be managed? What levels of confidence are there in existing controls? Protocols for monitoring and review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for improvement</td>
<td>Can the risk be negated? Recommendations for limiting / reducing risk. Can the risk be delegated?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix IV: Impact Matrix (Risk Estimation)

The highest category of risk is the figure which should be used to determine Impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Member Complaints</th>
<th>Internal Publicity</th>
<th>External Publicity</th>
<th>Litigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Insignificant | Minimal impact | ▪ 1 member  
▪ 1 member of BDA staff | - - -                                       | - - -                                                                                                                                   | ▪ Very unlikely to cause litigation                                    |
| Minor       | < £2 K      | ▪ < 10 members                         | ▪ BDA Staff and Council aware             | ▪ One-off adverse publicity from an individual where BDA is given right of reply e.g. on twitter                                                                 | ▪ Litigation unlikely                                                   |
| Moderate    | > £2 K      | ▪ Members of a group / branch  
▪ BDA Team                           | ▪ Needs careful PR within membership  
▪ Chief Execs of other HP bodies aware | ▪ One piece of adverse publicity or comment in trade publications / open social media forums  
▪ Negatively discussed on a longer social media thread by opinion leaders | ▪ Possible but not certain                                               |
| Major       | > £50 K     | ▪ Significant proportion of membership > 100  
▪ Member resignation  
▪ Adverse publicity across other HP members / other bone-fide bodies  
▪ Negatively discussed on closed member forums, engaging 20+ member comments | ▪ Widespread adverse publicity across multiple channels  
▪ Coverage in a national newspaper article | ▪ High potential for complaint                                        |
| Catastrophic | > £500 K | Whole membership  
|             |         | Board of Directors  
|           |         | Executive  
|           |         | Adverse publicity across whole membership  
|           |         | National adverse publicity such as being the focus of a broadcast investigatory programme  
|           |         | Expected / certain |
## Appendix V: Likelihood Matrix (Risk Estimation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimation</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>- Cannot occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No external influences can exert control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Full capital availability / resource allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No possibility for policy or culture conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>- Has never occurred before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Under full BDA control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Full capital availability / resource allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Very low possibility for policy or culture conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>- Could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Could be difficult to control due to some external influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A history of occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requires some management culturally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>- Reasonable certainty that this will occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A strong history of occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- BDA retains very little / no control over external influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>- Absolute certainty that this will occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A strong history of occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- BDA retains no control over external influences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix VI: Potential Matrix (Opportunity Estimation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimation</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>- Remote potential for increased awareness / high impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Members unlikely to approve (see Note * in Appendix III for ways to determine this)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>- Reasonable prospects for increased awareness / high impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Members likely to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Favourable prospects for increased awareness / high impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Members very likely to approve (see Note * in Appendix III for ways to determine this)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix VII: Scope / Financial Grade Assessment

### Guidance for Administration

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Partnerships Officer to authorise agreement |  ▪ Value of £0 – £10,000  
  ▪ Literature review  
  ▪ Conference participation  
  ▪ Website Sponsorship  
  ▪ Key supporter corporate membership |
| 2 | Partnerships Manager to authorise agreement |  ▪ Value of £10,000 - £19,999  
  ▪ National campaign – charity, government or professional body  
  ▪ BDA publication Sponsorship  
  ▪ Initiatives requiring resource from other BDA Officers / Members (more than 0.2 WTE for a period of time)  
  ▪ Strategic partner corporate membership |
| 3 | COO or Chief Executive to authorise agreement |  ▪ Value of £20,000 +  
  ▪ National campaign – food manufacturer / retailer  
  ▪ Major alliance with other HPs / professional bodies  
  ▪ Initiatives requiring significant resource from other BDA Officers / Committees (more than 0.4 WTE for a period of time) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of acknowledgement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The British Dietetic Association Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This document details the agreed Sponsorship of the above event. The acceptance of Sponsorship by the Association is governed by the Association's Guidelines for working with commercial companies, a copy of which is attached. The client agrees to accept the conditions contained within the guidelines.

Signed (on behalf of the BDA)

Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

Position

Signed (on behalf of the Client)

Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

Position

Company / Organisation

Date
Appendix IX: Specimen Letter agreeing terms of commercial initiative/project

Name of contact
Name of company
Address
Address

RE: (NAME OF PROJECT/CAMPAIGN/EVENT etc)

Dear <Contact>

Thank you for approaching the British Dietetic Association / agreeing to partner with the British Dietetic Association.

This letter sets out the detailed terms for the agreed project between the British Dietetic Association and <Name of company/organisation>. The acceptance of initiative by the BDA is governed by our Guidelines for working with commercial organisations, a copy of which is attached. <Name of company/organisation> agrees to accept these guidelines.

The letter should also include the following points as appropriate:

- Parties to the agreement
  - The British Dietetic Association
    - (or Branch/Group/Department)
  - The partnership organisation

- Context of the project
  - The campaign
    - The consumer advice leaflet
    - The information pack etc

- Involvement of the BDA
  - Statement of support
    - Working group/advisory panel

- Involvement of partnership organisation
  - Production of leaflets/posters

- Financing of project
  - Amount agreed/discussed

- What costs must be borne by the partnership organisation

- Payment terms

- Agreed terms for printed materials
  - Editorial control and/or:
    - Use/position of BDA logo
    - Review, approval and correction process
    - Consultation over reprints

- Agreed timescales of project
  - Expected timelines/agreed milestones
• Renegotiation / review dates for project - Standard review time is 12 months
• (if applicable)

• Means of acknowledgement - By the BDA

• Termination - Caveat allowing termination of the contract in cases where the alliance can be said to be harmful to one parties reputation.

• Legal Issues - Copyright
• Confidentiality
• Governing law of the agreement
• Partnering organisation’s obligations to ensure claims comply with UK, EU and International Law

Additional template agreements for specific activities such as online events or projects are available to Groups and Branches on the Volunteer Hub

Appendix X: Definitions

Due diligence
Comprehensive appraisal of a business proposal undertaken to evaluate potential and avoid unidentified risks.

Risk
Strategic Risk relates to the long-term objectives of the organisation, which can be affected by areas such as capital availability, political risks, legal and regulatory changes, reputation and changes in the physical environment.

Operational Risk concerns the day-to-day issues that the organisation is confronted with as it strives to deliver its strategic objectives.

Financial risk concerns the effective management and control of the finances of the organisation and the effects of external factors such as availability of credit and market exposures.

Knowledge management risk is about the control of the knowledge resources and the communication of messages. External factors might include the unauthorized use or abuse of intellectual property. Internal factors might be a loss of key staff.

Compliance risk concerns issues such as consumer protection, employment practices and regulatory issues.

Reputational risk concerns loss resulting from damages to a firm’s reputation.
Appendix XVI: Model for commissioning work from a BDA Member for delivery of commercial initiatives

See internal office guidance for quality assurance documents

- Approach received from organisation
- Discuss outline of project and timescales
- (In confidence) Circulate details to dietitians with required expertise
- Interested members respond to BDA with expression of interest
- Detailed brief developed and finalised with client
- Brief sent to interested members
- Select consultant and sign agreement
- Carry out work and communication with client
- Delivery to the BDA
- Internal peer review
  - Brief fulfilled
  - Brief not fulfilled
  - Refine / Rework
  - Delivery to the Client and payment to Consultant

Think: need staged delivery?

Quality assurance:
- Use briefing document

Quality assurance:
- See Criteria for reviewing external documents for support