

## Due Diligence Panel's Assessment and Scoring 18 April 2016

	Panel's assessment, score and recommendations for mitigating action
Interested party:	<p>J D Sports Fashion plc – outdoor division including Blacks outdoor and Millets</p> <p>Proposal considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To consider uniform testing, sponsorship through supply of uniform clothing items for all relevant staff and volunteers.</li> <li>2. A possible donation contribution linked to product sales in store by JD Sports Fashion PLC. This would be an extension of the previously agreed arrangement on 'tested ranger endorsed products'.</li> <li>3. To note the potential procurement arrangement to purchase clothing not covered in sponsorship at cost price (this will follow all proper procurements guidelines and procedure).</li> </ol> <p>NB: Through a previous DDP paper in November 2015 – there has already been legal and financial checks and 'draft Heads of Terms' for a separate arrangement around donations through stores at Millets and Blacks.</p>
<b>Assessment of proposal against 1-6 in process criteria</b>	
1. Contribution to achieving corporate plan section	<p>Panel agreed relationship would contribute to directional shifts.</p> <p>Score 10</p>
2. Fit with PDNPA brand values section	<p>Panel noted that the proposed Berghaus and Brasher brands are better quality designs.</p> <p>Score 10</p>
3. Motive of interested party section	<p>No issues identified. Motives confirmed as reasonable.</p> <p>Score 10</p>
4. Identity and financial check section	<p>No issues identified.</p> <p>Score 10</p>
5. Environmental credentials section	<p>No evidence of an environmental statement.</p> <p>Proposer had been requested to ask Company for environmental information on agreed products and to encourage Company to develop an environmental statement as they had not got one. Company working with Proposer and will put a statement in their annual report that they are working on producing an environmental statement.</p> <p>Score 6</p>
6. Conflict of interest/impact on Authority's reputation section	<p>No apparent conflict of interest.</p> <p>Proposer had been requested to ask Company if they have any plans for development within the National Park. This has been added to Heads of Terms.</p> <p>Score 8</p>
Conclusions on whether appropriate to develop a relationship with interested party	<p>Panel agreed it was appropriate to support the following proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Uniform testing of Berghaus and Brasher brands and sponsorship through supply of uniform clothing items for all relevant staff and volunteers.</li> <li>2. Donation contribution linked to product sales in store by JD Sports Fashion PLC. This would be an extension of the previously agreed arrangement on 'tested ranger</li> </ol>

	<p>endorsed products’.</p> <p>3. Noted that the potential procurement of clothing not covered by sponsorship at cost price will follow all Authority procurement guidelines and procedures.</p>
--	---

Scoring: Score out of 10

- 10 = no issues
- 1= prohibitive issues meaning cannot proceed whatever the value of other scores
- 5= satisfactory – some issues but not insurmountable
- 0= difficult to make judgement from information provided- more information needed