

Queen Mary University of London Risk framework for High Risk Approval Collaborative Activities

Risk Identification

Activity type	Default risk category	Risk escalation triggers (see Risk Explanation and Mitigation table)	Approval Body	Authorised signatory for agreement
Funding Sponsorship agreements (Donations, Government agencies, A*Star)	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) University Reputation (Queen Mary) 2) Organisation or Individual reputation (External) 4) University (Standard) Due diligence checks 5) Location of activity in a known high risk country (as per FCO classification) 6) Scale of activity and sustainability (large for QM or individual school/faculty) 7) Financial risk 8) Legal (Tax, jurisdiction) 	Partnerships Board	Principal or VP Level
Flying Faculty	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) University Reputation (Queen Mary) 2) Organisation or Individual reputation (External) 4) University (Standard) Due diligence checks 5) Location of activity in a known high risk country (as per FCO classification) 6) Scale of activity and sustainability (large for QM or individual school/faculty – what will it mean for other Faculty programmes) 7) Financial risk 8) Legal (Tax, jurisdiction) <p><i>Other issues to note:</i> Need to grow the facilities and/or resources to deliver</p>	Partnerships Board	Principal or VP Level
Branch campus	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) University Reputation (Queen Mary) 2) Organisation or Individual reputation (External) 3) Academic Governance (for education collaborations) 4) University (Standard) Due diligence checks 5) Location of activity in a known high risk country (as per FCO classification) 6) Scale of activity and sustainability 	Partnerships Board	Principal or VP Level

Activity type	Default risk category	Risk escalation triggers (see Risk Explanation and Mitigation table)	Approval Body	Authorised signatory for agreement
		7) Financial risk 8) Legal (Tax, jurisdiction) <i>Other issues to note:</i> Need to grow the facilities and/or resources to deliver		
Double degree programme (UG or PGT only)	High	1) University Reputation (Queen Mary) 2) Organisation or Individual reputation (External) 3) Academic Governance (for education collaborations) 4) University (Standard) Due diligence checks 5) Location of activity in a known high risk country (as per FCO classification) 6) Scale of activity and sustainability 7) Financial risk 8) Legal (Tax, jurisdiction) 9) Sharing of research facilities and or significant University equipment/data	Partnerships Board [Programme approval by Taught Programmes Board]	Principal or VP Level
Joint degree programme (PhD only)	High	1) University Reputation (Queen Mary) 2) Organisation or Individual reputation (External) 3) Academic Governance (for education collaborations) 4) University (Standard) Due diligence checks 5) Location of activity in a known high risk country (as per FCO classification) 6) Scale of activity and sustainability 7) Financial risk 8) Legal (Tax, jurisdiction) 9) Sharing of research facilities and or significant University equipment/data	Partnerships Board [Programme approval by Research Degrees Board]	Principal or VP Level
Research Institutes (e.g. SEMS, BCI in China)	High	1) University Reputation (Queen Mary) 2) Organisation or Individual reputation (External) 4) University (Standard) Due diligence checks	Partnerships Board	Principal or VP Level

Activity type	Default risk category	Risk escalation triggers (see Risk Explanation and Mitigation table)	Approval Body	Authorised signatory for agreement
		5) Location of activity in a known high risk country (as per FCO classification) 6) Scale of activity and sustainability 7) Financial risk 8) Legal (Tax, jurisdiction) 9) Sharing of research facilities and or significant University equipment/data		
Major Research Collaborations requiring QM resources not externally grant funded To facilitate defined activities (e.g. data / sample sharing to scope out opportunities for further collaboration such as grant bids)	High	1) University Reputation (Queen Mary) 2) Organisation or Individual reputation (External) 4) University (Standard) Due diligence checks 5) Location of activity in a known high risk country (as per FCO classification) 6) Scale of activity and sustainability 7) Financial risk 8) Legal (Tax, jurisdiction) 9) Sharing of research facilities and or significant University equipment/data	Partnerships Board	Principal or VP Level

Risk Explanation and Mitigations

Risk number	Risk name	Risk Description	Potential mitigating actions	Responsible for Due Diligence	Escalation to Partnerships Board
1)	University Reputation (Queen Mary)	<p>University is not of equivalent rank or not ranked in Times Higher or QS Reputations (including subject specific Reputations)</p> <p>Working with low-Reputation or non-Reputation universities may have reputational risks as well as standards and quality issues if the proposal relates to activities like exchanges, progression agreements or programmes leading to an award.</p>	<p><i>May be acceptable if:</i></p> <p>Faculty is satisfied that university is well-established or specialises in subject area of agreement</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>National Reputations for country indicate university is well-ranked</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>Working with the university is a strategic decision to support agreed internal objectives or to align with external policy drivers (e.g. governmental, regulatory)</p>	Proposer	<p>None of the mitigations are applicable but proposer would like to proceed.</p> <p>Partnerships Board asked for a wider view on whether the Institutional risks outweigh the benefits</p>
2)	Organisation or Individual reputation (External)	<p>Is the proposal compliant with the Partnerships Ethical Policy? http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/media/arcs/policyzone/Partnerships-Ethical-Policy.pdf</p> <p>Concerns relating to any of the following: funding sources, political influence, regulatory body registration or regulatory changes, press reports on aspects of organisation's business or researcher integrity (for research-related proposals) as well as concerns relating to tobacco companies, defence/ military, territories on FCO list [weblink]</p>	<p><i>May be acceptable if:</i></p> <p>Issues are historic</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>It is a multi-national company and proposed activity is with a separate section from where issue has arisen.</p> <p>Legal Due diligence should also include any connections to a company location in an embargoed country in which Queen</p>	<p>Proposer</p> <p>DDAE (for alumni donations)</p>	<p>Anything that does not comply with the Partnerships Ethical policy</p> <p>OPr where the proposer is unsure the mitigations are enough</p>

			<p>Mary cannot insure work to be carried out in.</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>Faculty is satisfied that benefits of partnership outweigh potential negative impacts. (Marketing & Communications should be informed of any partnerships which may draw negative attention so they can prepare to address queries.)</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>Research Ethics Committee has approved or set conditions for approval for issues under its remit (to define with Chair of REC – MC to contact)</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>Adherence to standard international policies ABC, Anti-Slavery (refer to JRMO checklist – weblink to access)</p>		
3)	Academic Governance (for education collaborations)	There are concerns that the academic programme does not meet QAA and Queen Mary quality and standards requirements. Proposal requires substantial variation to Queen Mary Academic Regulations.	<p><i>May be acceptable if:</i></p> <p>Checks with NARIC or the British Council (with support from Global Engagement Office) show that standards are equivalent to UK expectations</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>School/institute is prepared to provide extra support to students if required</p>	<p>TPB (taught programmes)</p> <p>RDPEB (research degree programmes)</p> <p>ARCS</p> <p>Faculty</p>	<p>There are still concerns about the education standards of the partner</p> <p>Faculty has concerns support available is insufficient</p>

			<p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>University is based in USA, China, Brazil (+ others) where Global Engagement Office has comprehensive information on the national education system and can confirm standards</p> <p>Amendment / waiving of Queen Mary entry requirements</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>TPB/RDPEB agree variations to standard programme requirements are acceptable</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>Quality of pastoral / academic support</p>		
4)	University (Standard) Due diligence checks	<p>Partner wishes to include legally-binding clauses to agreements/contracts that may be problematic for Queen Mary. Guidance and input should be sought from ARCS, QMI and JRMO depending on what the clauses are (student or academic regulations, IP, overseas partners on grant proposals).</p> <p>For other agreements, it is not possible to omit /remove references to the UK Bribery Act 2010, GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018 and Freedom of Information Act 2000. Changes to indemnity or liability clauses are also to be avoided without legal and</p>	<p><i>May be acceptable if:</i></p> <p>The alternative document covers the areas of the QM template and matches (but does not exceed) the commitments QM is prepared to undertake</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>Advice has been sought from ARCS, QMI, JRMO in regard to the template or altered text.</p>	ARCS QMI	<p>Faculty is concerned about the commitments required of Queen Mary</p> <p>Some but not all of the due diligence checks reveal a potential issue</p>

		<p>financial advice and consultation with the QMUL insurance brokers for any special permissions required. Changes to Intellectual Property clauses should be checked against Queen Mary's IP Policy and discussed with ARCS and QMI.</p> <p>IP ownership – collaborations must ensure Queen Mary's rights are protected. Critical if the IP was exploitable and may require advice from the IP Committee and/or lawyers.</p>	<p><i>May be acceptable if:</i></p> <p>IP change is advantageous to Queen Mary</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>IP Committee has reviewed and approved</p>	<p>IP Committee</p> <p>Doctoral School</p>	<p>Concerns Queen Mary's IP is not protected</p>
5)	<p>Location of activity in a known high risk country (as per FCO classification)</p>	<p>For international partners, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) advice should always be checked. FCO advisories against travel to countries or specific areas should be heeded.</p> <p>Regardless of FCO advice, consideration must be given to the cultural, social and political environments of the country e.g. laws about sexuality which may impact on students and staff.</p> <p>Check the proposed partner country is not an embargo country [insert link to list / how check this?]</p>	<p>Should always be flagged as high risk to Partnerships Board</p>	<p>Proposer</p>	<p>PB should be able to take a view for decision by SET</p>
6)	<p>Scale of activity and sustainability</p>	<p>Volume of students/other income sources and longer-term sustainability should be considered, full business case needs to be prepared</p>	<p><i>May be acceptable if:</i></p> <p>The Faculty is satisfied that there is existing capacity to budget shortfalls and use as a loss leader for 5+ years</p>	<p>Faculty</p> <p>GEO</p>	<p>For substantial programmes business case should be shared</p>

			<p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>The faculty is satisfied that these numbers have been accounted for in financial, staff, space and resource planning.</p> <p>Business case outlining initial student numbers, projections and milestones required including financial analysis / feasibility is sound</p>		with Partnerships Board
7)	Financial risk	<p>Large value partnership identified involving multi sector/multi-national, multiple countries</p> <p>Partner's financial legal capacity and financial ratio of fees to funding as against commitment to the partnership (e.g. solvency risk/liquidity/cashflow/overfunded against fee balance) to be considered versus role (and potential financial contribution)</p> <p>Financial analysis conducted of track record of partner or partnership (seeking renewal) identified a significant financial loss</p> <p>High risk deliverables or payment/ funding terms are via a lump sum payment or payment by results), Currency risk in payment terms for that territory or exchange controls and currency affecting payments to/from proposed partner country</p>	<p><i>May be acceptable if:</i></p> <p>Business case and financial plan and partner financial data provided given sufficient detail proportionate to the partners' contribution financially and unforeseen costs/funding gap mitigated</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>Confirmation of commitment of financial contribution (cash/in kind) to the partnership secured</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>Justification provided re partner and or partnership that is seeking to renew regarding prior poor financial performance</p> <p><i>And / Or</i></p> <p>Currency conversion has been factored into financial costing and contributions,</p>	Financial Due Diligence conducted by Faculty Business Partners and reviewed by central Finance team	<p>Faculty still has concerns after due diligence</p> <p>Faculty still has concerns of imbalance of financial commitment to proposed partnership activities and deliverables</p> <p>Central Finance have concerns</p>

			<p>legal / financial due diligence checks done satisfactorily</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>Financial due diligence should include financial legal capacity of partners (document re solvency of the proposed partner institution; A copy of the management accounts or equivalent records of the proposed partner institution since the end of the last accounting period; Details of all mortgages, charges or other security documentation affecting the proposed partner and copies of any documentation that may affect the proposed partnership; tax status of partner territory; exchange control or currency rules affecting payments of currency into/out of partner country; grants/subsidies taken out by partner in relation to partnership, any state/public funding applicable to that that partner, tenders/quotes submitted by partner relevant to the partnership, liabilities of partner relevant to partnership) etc.</p>		
8)	Legal (Tax, jurisdiction)	Governing Law / jurisdiction is not in line with UK law	If partner is willing to vary contract to meet UK law standards	<p>Faculty Business Partners</p> <p>ARCS</p>	If Finance are still concerned there are negative legal risks
9)	Sharing of research facilities and or	Academic partners should be sharing the costs of maintaining facilities through contributions via grants.		Faculty Business Partners	When high risk issues exist

	<p>significant University equipment/data</p>	<p>Commercial partners should be paying commercial rates for access to equipment and facilities.</p> <p>Data should be shared in compliance with GDPR and any terms on which the data was collected.</p> <p>All of the other risks (location, reputation, etc.) need to be considered when considering partnering over research facilities and equipment</p>		<p>Faculty</p> <p>JRMO</p>	
--	--	--	--	----------------------------	--