



Corporate Evaluation Panel Criteria for Scoring

1) Public Reputation Risk

Important Key Question: What is the money being used for?

- Is the partnership likely to attract unfavourable media comment?
- Is the partnership likely to engender opposition/protest from the general public or audiences aligned to the Museum (eg NHM Members)?
- Is the partnership likely to engender opposition/protest from special interest groups?
- Is the existence of - or potential comment on - the partnership likely to be viewed in negative terms by DCMS or other central or local government stakeholders?
- Is the existence of - or potential comment on - the partnership likely to be viewed in negative terms by non-governmental funders/potential funders of the Museum?
- Is the existence of - or potential comment on - the partnership likely to be injurious to the Museum's standing within the heritage and culture sector?
- Is the existence of - or potential comment on - the partnership likely to damage the Museum's reputation with the general public, or their willingness to visit the Museum?
- What is the likely impact for and response from other potential partners?

2) Scientific Reputation Risk and Mission Affinity

Our mission is

The Natural History Museum maintains and develops its collections and uses them to promote the discovery, understanding, responsible use and enjoyment of the natural world.

Our science mission is:

The Natural History Museum is an international leader in the scientific study of the natural world. Our science describes the present diversity of nature, promotes understanding of the critical importance of its past, and develops knowledge that supports anticipation and management of the impact of human activity on the environment.

Use of science.

- If science is a part of the organisation's activities, do they conform to specific standards for good practice in science?
- Do they use science as a part of their decision-making or product development, or in meeting regulatory requirements?
- Science that is of commercial interest would be expected to conform to legal and regulatory standards, but there may also be a moral dimension in terms of how knowledge is derived and from whom: the issue of patents of genes and species is of particular interest here. Confidentiality is a given in this context, but should not prevent consideration on some levels.
- Where science is undertaken in response to regulatory requirements – toxicology, or environmental impact assessments, for example, is that science openly conducted and the results placed appropriately in the public domain?
- A difficult issue is selective use of scientific evidence to secure a desired end – does the company routinely undertake such practices?

- What is the likely impact for and response from other potential partners?

Environmental responsibility and sustainable development

We should look for a responsible approach to the environment

- Clear statements of corporate ethics and responsibilities
- Conformity to national and international laws
- Adoption of best practice as demonstrated by industry associations or sector leaders
- External auditing of environmental performance
- Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity – minimising impacts, ensuring renewable uses
- Limiting environmental impacts – carbon emissions, pollutants, waste reduction, remediation, full costs.
- Health impacts
- Reporting and communication of policies, practice and performance
- Consistent standards across multinational operations
- Engagement with governments, NGOs and others on collaborative projects

Governance, Capacity building, equity and access

- An issue in the broader context of corporate ethical responsibility for multinationals is the degree to which local operations use local expertise, empower nationals in corporate structures, pay reasonable rates and so forth. All of these have political and other dimensions, but can be important in environmental responsibility and sustainability for various reasons. An organisation that failed to do this would constitute a risk in some respects.
- Compliance with laws and regulations
- Managing/transparency on conflict of interest
- Policy on corruption

Museum and cultural property standards

- Unlikely to be an issue for most potential collaborators, but there are issues in terms of cultural and natural heritage that might arise and should be considered.

3) Partner Value

| | | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| Guide Value | Low | up to £50,000 |
| | Medium | below 250,000 |
| | High | equal to or above £250,000 |

- At the start of any project commercial objectives and targets need to be set and agreed among the stakeholders, normally the Steering Group but also sometimes through the Head of Business and Commercial Strategy with the business head.
- Does the level of income match or exceed the target objectives?
- If No the likelihood of other offers needs to be ascertained. Is this the best offer?
- What are the costs associated with the income?
- How crucial to the success of the project is the income? Is it a stop/go situation?
- Is it in keeping with the benchmarking information currently available?
- Does this lower the commercial risk of the project to the Museum?
- Are their medium term Museum benefits?
- Is this a relationship that could lead to other opportunities?
- If so what?
- Are their in-kind benefits e.g. technology, access to new markets, expertise, equipment etc
- What is the likely impact for and response from other potential partners?

4) Brand Alignment

- How analogous is the company's brand values to ours?
- How aware are our audiences of this brand?
- How ethical environmentally is this brand perceived to be amongst our audiences?
- Overall is this brand seen as positive amongst our audiences?
- How damaging would this partnership be to our brand?
- Does this brand operate within the same markets as ours?
- What does the brand do to facilitate working in new markets with new audiences?
- What is the likely impact for and response from other potential partners?

Responsible Owner: Policy Advisor, Directorate (Corporate Evaluation Panel Chair)
DG Approved: 21 November 2006
Last Updated: 30 March 2007