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Executive Summary

Major contemporary public health challenges include the fight against Malaria, the promotion of hygiene to eradicate several related major diseases and the reduction of harmful use of alcohol. Recognizing that these health challenges are too complex to be overcome by one group of actors alone, namely governments, this report aims to make the case for an all-of-society approach that involves private business’ involvement in advancing the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals in the realm of health. It does so by referring to the B Corp Brands on a Mission (BOAM) and its ambition to accelerate private investment in public health through a non-profit foundation in addition to its core business.

By answering the question of what the most feasible and sustained way is for BOAM to achieve impact on increasing private sector investment to drive progress on Malaria, hygiene and the reduction of harmful use of alcohol, this report presents insights into academic research on impact accelerating models and supports these with findings from interviews with leaders in the private sector impact space. The report identifies three in academic research grounded approaches to achieving impact through private sector businesses: impact through the core business and linked CSR efforts, business-led foundations and other philanthropic models, and membership or leadership within multi-stakeholder initiatives. Consistent with the literature, case studies that are due to their impact-related ambition, industry-focus, and institutional set-up similar to BOAM provide evidence for real-world implementation, alongside associated challenges and benefits.

The interviews reveal considerable differences in terms of strategic outlook on resourcing and embedding of non-profit units within the business when compared to BOAM’s vision for a foundation. Combined with findings from the literature, the report therefore recommends:

1) Instead of focusing on setting up a foundation at this stage, BOAM should focus its efforts on growing its core business alongside engaging in either the day-to-day activities of an existing multi-stakeholder initiative or setting up a novel initiative of this kind.

2) Associated with this recommendation is the endorsement of exploring opportunities for BOAM to set up a new, solely on public health promotion focused B Corp Collective as a novel multi-stakeholder platform.

3) Endorsement is given for BOAM to consider active engagement in the process of reviving the in response to COVID-19 set up National Business Compact for Coronavirus in Kenya.

4) Given commitment to creating more public health impact beyond the core business, a re-evaluation of potential for a localized, community-level BOAM foundation should be conducted after several years of business growth have passed.
Introduction

Few moments illustrate as well as the COVID-19 pandemic that humanity depends on public health. While health has been traditionally understood as a government concern, businesses are increasingly stepping up to accelerate progress on health goals. The B Corp and purpose consultancy *Brands on a Mission* (BOAM) set up with the aim of designing, implementing, and evaluating sustainable business models that improve health and well-being is one example of a firm committed to inspiring private resource dedication. BOAM is considering an independent foundation to drive accelerated business impact on health. Health challenges that BOAM wants to support progress on are Malaria, hygiene, and the reduction of harmful use of alcohol. Previous behavior change interventions and purpose campaigns had isolated impacts and did not inspire large-scale investment. Given BOAM’s ambition to maximize health impact while ensuring commercial viability, this report will address the question:

**What is the most feasible and sustained way for BOAM to achieve impact on increased private sector investment to drive progress on Malaria, hygiene and the reduction of harmful use of alcohol?**

Related to this focus are several questions: Why is accelerated progress on Malaria, hygiene, and reduction of harmful use of alcohol necessary? What is the role of governments and of business? What is BOAM’s current impact on private sector investment and what gaps exist relative to aspiration? Is a foundation feasible? Which alternatives exist? What can BOAM learn from others?

This is a pivotal moment for accelerating private sector impact on public value generation in the space. With COVID-19, the awareness of health being important for business has reached previously unimaginable dimensions. To build resilience, health investments will be crucial (Dash et al., 2020). It is evident that the private sector is dependent on a healthy workforce and client base (Myburgh et al., 2021). Given estimates of improved health accounting for one-third of GDP-per-capita growth across developed economies in the last 100 years (Dash et al., 2020), businesses should consider the pandemic a wake-up call for stepped up investments in health systems (WHO Council, 2021). It is also necessary to progress on SDG achievement, specifically on *Goal 3: Good Health and Well-Being*, which requires private sector involvement. By achieving sustainable development, the foundations of human life can be secured, people’s prosperity facilitated, and social justice improved.

This report will provide context on Malaria, hygiene, and harmful use of alcohol. It will highlight the role for governments and business. BOAM’s positioning will be elaborated, and the foundation idea will be introduced. Approaches for private sector impact activities will be identified and cases will provide the basis for options and recommendations.
I. The Challenge

Improving public health is a global ambition enshrined in the SDGs. Reaching Goal 3 of healthy lives and the affiliated targets 3.3 and 3.5 (see Figure 1) for which ending epidemics including Malaria and water-borne diseases, alongside better prevention of harmful use of alcohol are key components, would mean tremendous progress (UN, 2015). Despite advances in medicine, however, improving human health remains an ambition of massive scale that involves challenges associated with health care access, behavior change, financial resources, development, and cross-sector cooperation. As many health issues transcend sectoral boundaries and can only be solved through multisectoral approaches focused on combatting root causes, it will be crucial to overcome cooperation hinderances between the public and private sectors (WHO Europe, 2018). To drive accelerated progress on Malaria, hygiene and harmful use of alcohol while reducing inequalities and inequities, the private sector needs to support governments on public health despite challenges of such partnerships.

Figure 1: SDG 3 of Good Health and Well-Being and Associated Targets 3.3 & 3.5. Adapted from “Goal 3: Good Health and Well-Being: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages”, European Commission, n.d., Retrieved February 2, 2022 from https://knowsdgs.jrc.ec.europa.eu/sdg/3

1.1 Scale of Public Health Challenges: Malaria, Hygiene & Harmful Use of Alcohol

Malaria is a disease caused by parasites transmitted through mosquito bites. With 241 million cases and 627,000 deaths in 2020, it was sub-Saharan Africa driving most of the case load. Infants and children under 5 account for 80% of deaths in the region, and pregnant women, HIV/AIDS patients and mobile populations are at high risk (WHO, 2021). Vector control, preventive chemotherapies and vaccine uptake can reduce risk. Advances over the last decades including the certification of eleven countries as Malaria free (WHO, 2021) and 46 countries reporting less than 10,000 annual cases
(Honigsbaum, 2019) show that funding and political commitment can bring success (Gates Foundation, 2021a). Given Malaria’s toll on health alongside socio-economic burdens, it is crucial to achieve elimination. Business, which through involvement in natural resource extraction and industrial projects contributes to transmission, can be part of the solution. The private sector can create public value embodied by progress towards elimination through its logistics that allow for scale, financing, and community access (Jones et al., 2020).

Hygiene describes behaviors improving bodily cleanliness. Examples are handwashing or bathing. Insufficient access of 2 billion people to water and soap contributes to the spread of various diseases. Due to poor sanitation, there are 432,000 diarrheal deaths annually (WHO, 2019a) and 1,200 deaths of children under five daily, representing more deaths than AIDS, measles and tuberculosis combined. Inadequate hygiene is related to cholera, Hepatitis A, typhoid, and polio thus making benefits of improved hygiene to public health and economic growth an opportunity for furthering social justice, increasing human productivity, and creating prosperity (Gates Foundation, 2021b). The private sector is uniquely positioned to enable the provision of basic sanitation across its supply chains (WaterAid, 2018). This makes good business sense given that the lack of proper sanitation costs the world about USD$223 billion annually while the annual market value for more affordable sanitation is estimated to reach more than USD$6 billion (Gates Foundation, 2021b). Since investing in better hygiene can act as a strategic multiplier towards enabling more dignified lives, the public and private sector should partner for product innovation, broader access, strengthened distribution and economies of scale (WSP, 2018).

Harmful consumption of alcohol leads to 3 million deaths annually, many of these in the 20-39 age group. It is associated with more than 200 diseases and injuries including mental disorders, dependence, noncommunicable, violence and road accidents. Additional connections were established mental strains, the problem intensified (Scarpetta et al., 2021). The intersection of harmful alcohol consumption with socio-economic factors necessitates a whole of society approach (Anderson & Rehm, 2016), whereby the health sector, development, transportation, justice, social welfare, fiscal and trade policy, education, employment, civil society, and economic actors need to be engaged or addressed (WHO, 2010). The private sector and alcohol-producing companies can play an important role in reaching consumers more durably and effectively, thus creating conditions for reduced alcohol-induced harms for society. Examples of action are intensified smart drinking messaging, product innovation and social norms marketing (Sidibé, 2021).
## 1. The Challenge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malaria</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Harmful Alcohol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burden</strong></td>
<td>As of 2019: • Half of the world at risk • 220,000/300 cases &amp; 400,000 deaths • 67% of deaths among children under 5</td>
<td>• 2,000,000/4,000,000 without access to sanitation • 4,000,000/8,000,000 deaths (2019) • 1,200,000 deaths of children under 5 (2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Risks</strong></td>
<td>• Anemia • Anaemia • Malnutrition • HIV/AIDS • Mental illness • Corona</td>
<td>• Diarrhea &amp; Cholera • Dysentery • Diarrhea A • Typhoid • Tuberculosis • Exertion of crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solutions</strong></td>
<td>• Vector control (insecticide-treated bed nets &amp; indoor residual spraying) • Preventive chemotherapy • Malaria vaccines especially effective in children</td>
<td>• Low-cost sanitation technology • Improved water and soap access • Handwashing and bathing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2:** Overview of the Health Challenges of Malaria, Hygiene and Harmful Use of Alcohol. Adapted from "Fact Sheet: Malaria", "Fact Sheet: Sanitation", "Fact Sheet: Alcohol", WHO, 2021, Retrieved January 22, 2022 from [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/malaria](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/malaria), [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/sanitation](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/sanitation), [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/alcohol](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/alcohol).

### 1.2 Importance of Government Involvement

While various stakeholders play a role, advancing public health has been historically understood as a **government responsibility**. Roman sanitary laws, the quarantine of disease-carrying ships during the age of Crusades (Richards, 2009) and the creation of the first national health insurance in the 1880s in Germany (Tulchinsky, 2018) illustrate this. National laws attribute governments at different levels a role in protecting and promoting health. The level of government with prime responsibility can differ, but laws tend to necessitate the creation of health-promoting agencies (Institute of Medicine, 2002). Across most high-income countries, 70%+ of economy-wide health spending comes from governments. This aligns with the connection of health development with social capital formation (WHO, 2006). Moreover, it is the UN’s Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) that manifests health and well-being as universal rights that need to be provided for.

In practice, government involvement to foster health is important to assess society health and launch interventions (Institute of Medicine, 2002). Institutions like health departments can contribute to strengthened health systems and development. Government leadership is necessary to ensure equity, solidarity, and fairness. These values would be threatened through free market forces given patient-provider information asymmetries, and adverse selection at the expense of the vulnerable. As health-related, yet not necessarily profitable public goods with positive externalities exist, such as e.g., mass immunization, governments are providing some of these (WHO, 2006). To sum up, governments should continue their leadership in health, but private participation should be encouraged.
1.3 Case for Business Leadership

It is in the business, moral and social interest of the private sector to invest in health. The sector is increasingly buying into this argument and a case for creating shared value exists. Within companies, investing in employee health can have bottom-line implications related to reduced absenteeism, productivity, health-care savings, and retention (Zellner & Bowdish, 2017). Externally, dedicating resources to health can help achieve commercial goals as poor health reduces global GDP by 15% annually (Remes et al., 2020). This creates a case for increased profits resulting from stepped-up investments. Accordingly, the pursuit of sustainable and inclusive business models could create economic opportunities worth USD$12 trillion annually by 2030, with USD$1.8 trillion arising from health (WBCSD, 2017). Private sector engagement can not only help end some of the largest diseases and epidemics, but it is socially necessary to achieve business aims including prosperity, development, and sustainable thriving (Dzau et al., 2017). Business’ moral responsibility to support health was enshrined in the SDGs. These were deemed achievable if all sectors help. Alongside the SDGs emerged a private sector consensus about the need of social equity for prosperity (Serafeim et al., 2020).

One can witness businesses recognizing the inclusion of health as an important component of strategy (Tennenberg & Mulvaney, 2020). Philanthropy, advocacy, employee volunteering, novel product and service development, and external partnerships with health initiatives illustrate this (Zellner & Bowdish, 2017). Moreover, one witnesses new social business approaches to meet the needs of people at the base of the pyramid (Reinhardt, 2015). This trend also applies to non-health focused industries (Nelson & Thomson, 2020). The case for creating shared value, i.e., the creation of economic alongside societal value through private sector responses to community needs, provides an important connection of company success with social progress. By investing in public health, businesses can expand the pool of economic and social value, thus increasing profit prospects (Porter & Kramer, 2011). By developing new products and services, improving productivity, or enabling cluster development, the private sector can profitably work towards global health while minimizing company and society risks to prosperity.

The private sector has in the past shown that it can accelerate progress on achieving public health goals. Encouraging greater business leadership in health represents an opportunity to fight Malaria, promote hygiene and reduce harmful alcohol consumption more efficiently. While no sector alone can stem the outlined health challenges, different industries can strengthen health systems. Through philanthropy, core business or behavior change campaigns, success on health could be achieved (WHO, 2012). These contributions created vaccines, drug therapies, increased life expectancies and lowered disease burdens (West et al., 2021). On Malaria, commitments of USD$170 million made by Exxon Mobil increased capacities, supported health education, improved access to preventive tools and eased
diagnosis (Exxon Mobil, 2021). On hygiene, Lifebuoy, lobbied for the inclusion of added handwashing facilities into the SDGs. It co-founded Global Handwashing Day, which with other initiatives helped improve the handwashing habits of more than 1 billion people (Sidibé, 2020). On alcohol, the largest beer company AB InBev committed USD$1 billion to smart drinking promotion. Associated are a social norms campaign, product diversification towards non- and low-alcoholic beverages, and clearer labeling (Sidibé, 2021).

2. Role of Brands on a Mission (BOAM)

The B Corp Brands on a Mission is as a private sector-focused purpose consultancy positioned in the business world to act as an accelerator for increased investment towards Malaria elimination, hygiene, and the reduction of harmful use of alcohol. Through its young team and innovative organizational structure, which allows for close connections with private sector clients and partnerships with public policymakers, BOAM can support public health and capitalize on commercial opportunities.

2.1 Overview of Brands on a Mission (BOAM)

BOAM is a Nairobi-based private company founded in 2019 by Public Health Doctor and handwashing expert Myriam Sidibé. In 2021, the company became a B Corp. Established with the purpose of helping brands and organizations accelerate their health and well-being impact while achieving growth, BOAM aims to bring this purpose to live through its mission (see Figure 3). Products include talks, workshops and advisory. Key activities are the definition of purpose strategies and their implementation. Overall, BOAM’s focus extends that of a traditional purpose consultancy as BOAM helps implement purpose.
2. Role of Brands on a Mission

BOAM focuses on driving private sector impact on Malaria, hygiene, and harmful alcohol consumption as this is considered to lend credibility to the young company’s mission. This could increase appeal among prospective public partners and private clients, which are deemed important to the company’s growth and impact trajectory. It is the momentum of the pandemic that BOAM wants to capitalize on by bringing attention to the urgent need for larger health investments. While currently tasked by two major clients to improve brand impact on Malaria and the reduction of harmful alcohol consumption, it is the aspiration to move these projects forward for building of the BOAM brand that plays a role in the attempt to drive increased investment. This research insofar represents a first step towards deciding whether to set up the envisioned not-for-profit. If a foundation is deemed feasible, increasing knowledge about the conditions for an enabling environment can be derived. If a foundation is not deemed feasible, this research can help reinforce the company’s unique positioning as more than just a purpose-consultancy on becoming an ever more effective steerer of progress on health.

BOAM’s competitive environment features a competitive landscape of sustainability agencies, training-focused consultancies, creative and PR agencies. They are usually not B Corps, which gives BOAM the edge of perceptions of deeper commitment to public health beyond profitability. While competitors, shared commitments to public health can be a force behind cross-firm health initiatives, which can move clients towards greater interest in purpose consulting services. Beyond that, prospective and existing clients influence BOAM. Existing clients should ideally commit to BOAM’s services for the longer-term. If BOAM is perceived as delivering on high impact, this can be achieved, and some clients might support further BOAM efforts beyond consulting. New clients are key to establishment of the BOAM brand by helping build credentials while necessary for increased impact and growth. Clients on the other hand benefit from consulting services through bottom line implications and reputational gains. More important for desired impact is another group of beneficiaries: vulnerable populations suffering from Malaria, hygiene-related illnesses, and consequences of harmful alcohol use. As citizens of countries in which governments tend to have authority over public health, these populations can benefit through improved life quality, health outcomes and decreased socio-economic stress. With governments as guardians of health, BOAM’s work will need support from the public sector which also extends to international health organizations.

2.2 Potential for Increased Public Health Impact

BOAM can unlock potential for driving accelerated private sector investment by motivating businesses to dedicate resources towards health. And it should for the company’s and society’s sake. Currently BOAM is missing out on some public value generation as Malaria remains a health threat despite being preventable. Similarly, poor sanitation continues to cause various illnesses resulting in
death at a scale not justifiable given the availability of preventive steps. Harmful use of alcohol is linked to evermore potentially deadly diseases and exacerbates social problems. Despite achieving progress with clients, market-wide shifts of capital towards health are yet to be witnessed. Success would mean that BOAM through its clients achieves measurable progress on Malaria with lower incidences in target markets, a reduction in death rates related to poor sanitation alongside an increase in the availability of sanitation products in underserved areas, and a substantial reduction in alcohol-related road accidents combined with an industry shift towards non-alcoholic alternatives. If at least some of these gains are credited to BOAM, private sector interest in working with the company will likely increase and materialize in a higher client number and increased capability for scale through larger clients. With currently one client for the Malaria and one for the alcohol focus areas, on-boarding additional clients for these issues alongside at least one for the hygiene focus would represent success.

An assessment of valued and disvalued effects is provided in Figure 4. Based on this assessment, the valued effects are judged to outweigh others thus implying feasibility of having BOAM pursue approaches to improve the enabling environment. While potential for conflicts of interest with public health objectives, and opportunity costs exists, it is the prospect of meaningful health progress and business growth that makes the case for attempting to drive private sector engagement a strong one.

**Assessment of Potential Valued and Disvalued Effects**

**Valued Effects**

**Institutional Level**
- Potential for growth of public health marketing target market
- Building of the BOAM brand
- Possibility for more and larger-scale investment in BOAM
- Greater recognition in public health circles
- Employee retention & engagement

**Societal Level**
- Potentially reduced under 5 death rate
- Progress on SDGs, especially Goal 3
- Long-term prospects for eradication of preventable diseases like Malaria and those associated with lack of hygiene
- Greater opportunities for achieving prosperity with community empowerment and economic growth prospects
- Reduced socio-economic burdens usually associated with diseases

**Disvalued Effects**

**Institutional Level**
- Opportunity cost of human & financial resource dedication
- Resource dedication associated with risk of unclear business payoffs
- Potential free-riding of competitors profiting from enabling environment

**Societal Level**
- Opportunity cost of private resource dedication for Malaria, hygiene & harmful use of alcohol
  - health & development challenge tradeoff
- Potential for conflicts of interest between firms’ commercial goals and public health delivery
- Diminished role for government and community-level agency

2.3 Potential for a Foundation

BOAM approached the author with the request to test whether an independent foundation dedicated to resource mobilization through the private sectors is feasible. BOAM would be solely responsible for setting up the foundation, which is thought to be separate from commercial interests while improving the supporting environment to increase momentum for BOAM’s value proposition. Legal definitions of foundations vary. The umbrella term foundation refers to a “pot of money or other assets invested to produce income, which is used to pursue the foundation’s mission, often by making grants to other organizations” (Leat, 2016, p.15). While usually created through a donation of a few thousands to billions of dollars, foundations are governed by a board of trustees and differ from other non-profits in not raising funds from the public. They tend to not operate their own programs and work through partners (Leat, 2016). As self-governing, private entities, foundations serve a public purpose to which they must dedicate resources (Anheier & Toepler, 1999). Like firms, value creating nonprofit entities need a clear strategy which should include the aim of superior performance. The strategy should also include a unique positioning aligned with unique activities (Porter & Kramer, 1999).

3 Methodology

To test feasibility of the foundation model and to provide options for alternative courses of action, this report will provide a literature review of approaches for generating more private sector investment towards public health progress. It will do so by introducing a variety of impact-accelerating models from the private sector, and by pointing to risks and opportunities associated with these. Building on this review, case studies of private organizations with affiliated foundations will be presented to provide best practice insights for a potential BOAM foundation. The case studies will be informed by interviews and inputs from individuals in the respective foundational leadership and focus on structural differences to the core business, business maturity at the time of set-up of the foundation, resourcing, benefits, and challenges of the dual structure. Based on which criteria cases were selected to be most applicable to BOAM’s situation is visualized in Figure 5. Information on the interview and outreach process can be found in Appendices 1 to 4. How options will be evaluated is highlighted in Figure 10.

While this mixed methods approach relying on qualitative analysis of expert interviews and options design based on real-world, literature discussed courses of action can provide the basis for targeted recommendations, limitations need to be noted. By nature of case studies, not all derived lessons are universally applicable due to different temporal, geographic, resources, leadership- and momentum-related circumstances. Given the small sample size and uncertainty about future impact of the studied foundations, some best practices might further prove to not be relevant a few years from now. As the
interviewing was virtual due to the continuing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, and since mostly foundation or business-internal stakeholders were included, insights are less holistic than analyses mitigating these impacts would be. As some stakeholders were only available for more informal online exchanges instead of interviews, some findings are less in-depth than others. Considering that options were mainly derived based on the literature surrounding real-world examples, these come with the caveat of emphasis on external analysis.

### 4 Findings

#### 4.1 Literature Review

**Possible Structures**

The literature and various industry examples point to three possible structures through which private sector companies can accelerate social progress on specific issues of focus. These include core business activities and related CSR efforts, foundations or other philanthropy-focused entities, and membership in multi-stakeholder initiatives and other forms of public-private partnerships. All three of these possible structures will be shed light on in terms of implications and real-world implementation. While impact through a foundation or other philanthropy-focused entities represents the by BOAM envisioned strategy for increased impact, the other two options will be considered as possible alternatives.
4. Findings

1) **Core Business and Focus on CSR Efforts linked to the Business**

As the notion of business’s development impact in the context of the Millennium Development Goals and increasing consumer demands for sustainability were becoming more mainstreamed in the 2000s, many companies adapted their core business to match demand side expectations. While the focus of these activities initially was on supply chains, it shifted to serving the needs of less well-off consumers at the bottom of the pyramid. Therefore, the development or adaptation of novel goods and services has taken center stage (Ashley, 2009). Along the lines of the concept of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2011), it is thought that by serving more consumers, lives can be positively shaped, and companies can simultaneously increase their profits. By creating more loyal customers that trust a firm’s commitment to social change exhibited through its core offerings, impact-focused adaptation and growth of associated core business activities can generate topline growth (Gast et al., 2020). Other examples of how core business activities can help address social issues such as climate change are instances where companies committed to reducing their value chain’s carbon footprint, which helps them serve the needs of local communities and the planet (Beal et al., 2017). It has been argued that without core business adaptation or growth of sustainability promoting offerings, companies are not doing enough and only fulfill minimum standards for continued profitability (Serafeim, 2020).

While this approach firmly relies on successful business conduct through delivery of unique products and services or the improvement of to the core business related activities across the value chain, it does not exclude conventional CSR approaches. Although CSR emerged as a voluntary business response to increasing public skepticism and was mostly practiced in a from business disconnected manner to increase reputational capital through charitable efforts (Porter & Kramer, 2006), it can be part of with core business adaptation combined impact acceleration. Since the creation of more inclusive business approaches often requires new research insights or implementation partners, “CSR budgets can help partners develop to the point where they can engage with the core business” (Ashley, 2009, p. 5). Beyond that, CSR efforts can at least in the short- to medium-term help reduce harm-producing aspects of a company’s business. CSR efforts can also be combined with cause-related marketing campaigns, whereby a company partners with a charitable organization on a broader cause and commits parts of its revenues to it. Through this effort, investment in a cause can be raised, awareness increased, and societal value created while supporting business motivations (Beise-Zee, 2013). This is not to understate the necessity to move beyond solely thinking about CSR as a sufficient vehicle for change. One should instead focus on social impact generation as an element of corporate strategy, and not as a strictly philanthropic endeavor.
Core business growth can take various forms. These are the optimization of the core business to improve service delivery for existing clients, the extension of established core business boundaries to serve novel client segments through adapted services, and a more fundamental reinvention of the core business to target entirely new clients with different needs through rescoped services (PwC, 2022). These three approaches are visualized in Figure 6. Further instrumental to core business growth for impact acceleration are increased brand awareness, increased distribution channels and price calibration (PwC, 2022).

Figure 6: Overview of Core Business Growth Approaches for increased Impact. Adapted from “To grow, companies need to optimize and protect their core business first”, PriceWaterhouse Coopers International, 2022. Retrieved January 12, 2022 from https://www.pwc.com/ca/en/services/deals/whats-the-deal-blog/companies-need-to-optimize.html

In alignment with this approach, many large companies have comprehensive anti-Malaria efforts through their core business and philanthropy. Pharmaceutical and generics companies alongside companies in biotechnology have for years dedicated resources to large-scale R&D efforts behind the possible development of vaccines, drugs, tests, and insecticides necessary for Malaria control. Many more have invested in Malaria-related prevention efforts at the workplace and even encouraged lower-tier suppliers to follow suit within Malaria-endemic countries (Nelson et al., 2012). Many of these efforts come with benefits such as contributions to national-level disease control advancement and increased project profitability through reduced absenteeism (Jones et al., 2020). Relatedly, on hygiene companies like PepsiCo are moving beyond their legally mandated responsibility to provide adequate sanitary facilities to its employees by investing in water stewardship across their operations. It is believed that by increasing investment in water solutions across the supply chain, companies can take
advantage of an $8 return per dollar invested quantifiable in costs averted and productivity gained (Schulte & Fenwick, 2014). On the reduction of harmful use of alcohol, even among the leading alcohol producers, one can witness increasing product segments covering the non-alcoholic or low-alcoholic beverage markets, thus clearly indicating product innovation for continued profitability in accordance with social impact considerations.

2) Business-led Foundations or other Philanthropy Efforts

Another approach aimed at increasing a company’s social impact is the creation of associated foundations or other philanthropic entities. As legally independent entities, business-founded foundations serve the public interest and are usually focused on one specific social objective. For the most part, corporate foundations have many financial resources at their disposal, which gives them relative freedom to sponsor programs that advance their social cause. The funding that foundations receive to conduct their activities comes from a separate endowment of an investment portfolio that is independent from the affiliated company’s stock. Like with funding, also human resourcing, degree of operational independence and oversight can vary from foundation to foundation. While some foundations have very few employees based in one location, others are staffed by a few hundred people. While some foundations are governed by an independent board of directors, others are designed to be governed by business-internal directors (Kramer et al., 2006).

Among benefits that corporate philanthropy and business-led foundations represent is that they can add a competitive edge to a company by increasing brand recognition while being connected to societal causes that necessitate investment for improvement. If efforts are directly focused on geographies where a business operates, foundations can directly increase the local quality of life, which can help build lasting relationships with government officials and community leaders. These relations can be useful for future business while simultaneously decreasing risk arising from environmental uncertainty. Through the investment that a foundation provides to a community, this community’s economic standing can improve, which can translate in business growth through an enlarged customer base. Importantly, foundational giving can support academia in research projects aimed at the identification of solutions to public challenges including those associated with health issues in question (Tonello, 2011). All these advantages are present in the context of foundations facilitation of collaboration between the company behind it and external stakeholders important to the continued conduct of business. With regards to cross-sector partnerships, foundations can be helpful for establishing coordination to drive societal change. Due to their positioning as entities between the private and public sector, foundations can help businesses establish closer relationships with NGOs, civil society and public actors to an extent that businesses alone struggle to replicate (Herlin & Pedersen, 2013).
While foundations can bring businesses benefits, they necessitate certain facilitating conditions. To successfully run a foundation, it is necessary for a business to divert resources, i.e. financial, organizational, and human, to the effort. This might have straining effects on the business especially if opportunity costs involved with the focus on a foundation do not materialize in terms of social impact and brand recognition. In addition, particularly when a specific social cause is perceived as becoming politicized, setting up a foundation to support that cause can alienate a subset of potential clients (Chron, 2021). In the past years this materialized with regards to issues such as racial justice in the USA. Beyond that, setting up a foundation beyond practicing CSR-related efforts can increase scrutiny that a private business faces for its social impact-related programming. By having a foundation and communicating associated efforts, a boomerang effect that creates public perceptions of a company doing good to hide potential negative business impacts can be created. This boomerang effect can lead to a company’s brand identity appearing disconnected from out-sourced social impact generation and the foundation being perceived as nothing more than a marketing ploy (Monfort & Villagra, 2016).

Examples of corporate foundations with impact on public health are the ExxonMobil Foundation and the Dangote Foundation. As an entity focused on supporting STEM education, female empowerment and malaria eradication, the ExxonMobil Foundation can look back at a more than 20-year impact on combating Malaria. Through partnerships with governments and nonprofits in regions were ExxonMobil conducts business, more than 15 million bed nets, 4 million test kits and 5.3 million treatments could be provided. With additional health system-wide investments, the foundation helped secure livelihoods and the health of employees and local communities in Malaria-endemic countries. Most notably, the ExxonMobil Foundation has through direct involvement in a partnership with the PATH Malaria Vaccine Initiative helped fund the development of the first-ever Malaria vaccine for children, which has the potential to save tens of thousands of lives annually (ExxonMobil Foundation, 2021). As a foundation based in sub-Saharan Africa with the mission of improving opportunities through investment in health, education and economic empowerment, the Dangote Foundation also helped advance progress on another health issue of focus: water and sanitation. As part of the foundation’s efforts to fight malnutrition, $100 million were committed to the promotion of healthy sanitation and disease prevention (Independent, 2018). This has the potential to strengthen community members and national health systems (Dangote Foundation, 2022).

3) Membership in or Leadership of Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives

Another commonly mentioned and practiced approach to increase company social impact and broader industry-wide change is membership in or leadership of multi-stakeholder initiatives dedicated to a specific social issue. These partnerships typically bring together resources of private sector
organizations with governments at various levels, and in some cases international organizations. Set up with the aim of accelerating innovation, advancing public goods including health and/or mobilizing resources to match specific needs, multistakeholder groups can be powerful vehicles to motivate a whole-system response to a social issue (Global Financing Facility, 2016). As voluntary partnerships, multistakeholder initiatives focus on increasing transparency and encouraging broad stakeholder participation in dealing with a social problem. While these initiatives have due to their voluntary set-up only limited impact on obliging countries to comply with their proposals, they can create peer pressure and motivate countries or national actors to support progress on a social issue. As research shows, the success of multistakeholder initiatives is dependent on various factors including degree of sustained political commitment, business sincerity, effective management, public support, and local ownership (Gruzd et al., 2018).

One advantage of multistakeholder initiatives is that they mobilize coordinated action (Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, 2020), which can prove helpful given that the health challenges of focus are of cross-cutting nature and can only be addressed if various social dimensions are considered. Given typical participation of governments in these structures, business is further better enabled to leverage its capabilities across society as governments have in the past been helpful partners for achieving buy-in, gaining trust, and achieving interventions at scale (Global Financing Facility, 2016). Furthermore, by the very nature of multistakeholder initiatives, more resources of various kinds are available. With many leading companies engaged in comprehensive anti-Malaria efforts through public-private partnerships, evidence shows that product donations, shared value business models and low cost or free provision of drugs helped achieve measurable progress in Malaria-endemic countries that would have otherwise not been as promising (Nelson et al., 2012). Similarly, on also on hygiene and the reduction of harmful use of alcohol has progress been achieved. Examples of such are The Global Handwashing Partnership or the International Alliance for Responsible Drinking.

Some of the challenges associated with multistakeholder coalitions concern stakeholder inclusivity, the emerging nature of a social issue of focus, the continued mobilization of political and financial support (The Stanley Foundation, 2016) and on a private business level the limited effect of supporting company branding. Although these initiatives aim to include all to a specific social issue relevant stakeholders, often de-facto stakeholders and direct community representatives, that have not organized their community in formalized groups are absent, which can limit buy-in and effectiveness of solutions. Due to the emerging nature of social issues of focus, it might further become necessary to include different actors with different capabilities at later stages, which if not addressed can lead to limited impact. If addressed, it can create organizational challenges, that might become hard to overcome given established coalition-internal dynamics to which novel stakeholders are outsiders.
Given limited company and public resources, alongside varying ideologies associated with political transitions and strategic re-orientation of private businesses, stakeholder coalitions face the risk of declining momentum, which could make them fall apart without achieving progress on a social issue. Lastly, it might not be wise for companies that while focused on maximizing social impact also aim for favorable public perception to dedicate limited resources to multi-stakeholder efforts for which credit is given to various actors. As companies only represent part of the effort, reputational payoffs and resulting business opportunities are more limited than with company-centric models like foundations.

Examples of relevant multi-stakeholder coalitions and related initiatives that valuable lessons can be derived from are Business Fights Poverty, the Corporate Alliance on Malaria for Africa, the National Business Compact for Coronavirus in Kenya, and the B Corp Collective We the Change. Business Fights Poverty is a B Corp organization that unites partners committed to building a more equitable future with improved livelihoods for those facing poverty. While not solely focused on public health, the organization represents an inspiring model for bringing large businesses together with civil society groups to drive social impact through convenings, circles, collaboration, collective insights, and communications (Business Fights Poverty, 2022). In a similar vein, the Corporate Alliance on Malaria for Africa brings together cross-industry companies with country-level partners to collectively support Malaria control in Sub-Saharan African and reduce the disease incidence. It does so by focusing on building country-level capacity for Malaria control and elimination, facilitating multi-company and multi-sector partnerships for scaled up initiatives, and by providing a forum for exchanging best practices (GBCHealth, 2013). The Business Compact for Coronavirus in Kenya, established as a cross-sector partnership under the leadership of BOAM’s CMO to meet the immediate needs of Kenyans at the beginning of the pandemic, represents another multi-stakeholder initiative that Brands on a Mission has already been involved in. While the coalition was initially set up to collaborate for an urgent COVID response, buy-in from large-scale companies could make it desirable to transform the entity into a long-term focused coalition for public health promotion in Kenya and beyond. Lastly, the B Corp Collective We the Change represents another variation of the multi-stakeholder coalition model that this research considers. B Corp Collectives are initiatives associated with the B Corp Organization to which membership is exclusively reserved for certified B Corp leaders. We the Change as an initiative of female B Corp leaders is committed to creating a more inclusive and regenerative global economy. With impact on all 17 SDGs including Goal 3, the initiative supports the promotion of social justice and gender equality. In bringing together leading B Corp CEOs, the organization represents a collective effort to spread purpose-dedication in the private sector and aims to increase the social impact of the B Corps that these women lead (We the Change, 2022). Currently no B Corp Collective that is solely dedicated to the advancement of public health exists.
To identify organizations that serve as sources of best practices, it is crucial that similarities in accordance with the criteria outlined in Figure 5 exist. An overview of how these are fulfilled can be viewed in Figure 7. As a starting point for identifying similar organizations that ideally share BOAM’s B Corp status and in addition to being equipped with a health-focused social mission have founded a foundation to further their missions, this research started with an inquiry with the B Corp certifying B Lab Global Movement. This revealed that while many certified companies have foundations, there seems to not be any other health-focused B Corp with a foundation to mobilize private sector investment in global health. Examples of B Corps or associated foundations donating to health-related causes or running related initiatives related are the with a travel company associated Intrepid Foundation, Danone, and the foundations of the pharmaceutical companies Chiesi and Expanscience. These examples do not fit the selection criteria due to industry and larger size. However, two certified B Corps with foundations with either directly associated or completely independent foundations could be identified: Clean the World with the independent Clean the World Foundation, and endeva with the not-for-profit endeva e.V. While the limited number of similar cases confirms the novelty of BOAM’s approach to setting up a foundation while being a B Corp, it necessitates some degree of flexibility on case selection criteria to provide a broader set of cases. One should note that while a degree of flexibility on case selection criteria can limit real-world applicability of best practices for BOAM’s situation, it increases the sample size and thus the likelihood of generalizability for successful practices found in several organizations. With these caveats in mind, the not-for-profit consultancies FSG with its Shared Value Initiative, and Dalberg with the associated Dalberg Trust were identified as cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B-Corp/Social Mission</th>
<th>Development-related mission</th>
<th>Business Focus</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Non-profit/Foundation Arm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clean the World</strong></td>
<td>B Corp focused on sanitation</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>Change through private sector; Focus on Africa</td>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endeva</strong></td>
<td>B Corp focused on inclusive innovation</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>Consulting; Change through private sector</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FSG</strong></td>
<td>Social advisory firm focused on social change</td>
<td>![X]</td>
<td>Consulting; Change through private sector</td>
<td>Much larger</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dalberg</strong></td>
<td>Strategic consultancy focused on building inclusive &amp; sustainable world</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>Consulting; Change through private sector; Focus on Africa</td>
<td>Much larger</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7: How Cases fulfill Criteria.*
4. Findings

4.2.1 Background on Cases

1) Clean the World and Clean the World Foundation

*Clean the World* is a U.S.-based social enterprise founded in 2009. It has been active in 127 countries with the mission to save millions of lives through the distribution of soap and hygiene products. These products are sourced from more than 8,000 hotels globally and distributed to families in countries with high mortality rates due to respiratory infection and diarrheal diseases. As such diseases are leading causes of death in children under 5, the enterprise contributes to reduced child mortality. More than 63 million bars of soap have been distributed (*Clean the World*, 2018). In 2015, *Clean the World* and the *Global Soap Project* created the *Clean the World Foundation*, which in addition to the soap distribution of the social enterprise focuses on related issues such as water and sanitation access alongside feminine hygiene. As an independent nonprofit organization, that while not directly affiliated with *Clean the World* has a close relationship with the B Corp, the foundation has reached more than 12 million people. Its programs focus on local ownership, community engagement, education, and monitoring and evaluation of efforts. The goal behind the foundations’ efforts is to create sustainable local capabilities that eventually grow independent of aid (*Clean the World Foundation*, 2022).

2) endeva UG and endeva e.V.

*endeva* is a 2007 founded B Corp and mission-led organization consisting of a for-profit unit, *endeva UG*, and a nonprofit foundation-like entity, *endeva e.V*. Founded with the mission of creating economic systems serving people and planet, *endeva* acts as a management consultancy by helping clients build inclusive systems innovations across sectors (*endeva*, 2022a). Key activities of the for-profit arm include the provision of research for the creation of technology-driven business models of the future, strategy and business model development services, and the facilitation of multi-stakeholder collaboration. With more than 150 projects across sectors, the organization established itself as a partner for companies, social enterprises, development organizations, non-profits including foundations, and academia (*endeva*, 2022b). *endeva e.V.* furthers the organization’s mission through studies on sustainable development, events on opportunities and challenges of such, and project development on to development relevant issues including health and the supply of essential goods (*endeva*, 2022c).

3) FSG and the Shared Value Initiative

*FSG* is a nonprofit social advisory firm based in the U.S. and focused on the mission of reimagining social change. Through advisory services to entities across different sectors, research activities, and initiatives and programs, *FSG* helps organizations combat societal challenges. Through its services, *FSG* aims to do its part in creating a more equitable and sustainable future (*FSG*, 2022). Although not a foundation
but integrated into the overall nonprofit structure of the organization, the affiliated *Shared Value Initiative* is studied for this research as it brings together global leaders to address societal challenges through business solutions, which aligns with BOAM’s focus on accelerating private sector investment in health. With various purpose-led companies as partners, among them leading health-focused businesses, the initiative contributes to increasing business buy-in into the need for companies to create shared value through products and markets, the value chain and/or local cluster development for a more equitable, healthy, and sustainable economy (Shared Value Initiative, 2022). Given the established and well-recognized nature of FSG and its initiative, this case is considered in the context of learnings for a possible BOAM-led foundation and as a potential non-profit project that BOAM could join to achieve its goal of accelerated private sector investment in public health.

4) *Dalberg and Dalberg Trust*

*Dalberg* is a 2001 established strategic consultancy that in addition to providing various business offerings ranging from advisory to implementation, media and research is committed to building a more inclusive, sustainable world with equal opportunities for everyone (Dalberg, 2022a). The group is rooted in the *Dalberg Trust*, which through its governing Board of Trustees ensures that the mission of sustainable and inclusive growth through innovative solutions to societal problems is being honed across activities. The trust receives a percentage of the total value created to fund governance and innovation investment. It does so by supporting businesses through cost or risk sharing when innovative approaches are tested, adding new business arms to the *Dalberg Group*, and by supporting external innovators with financial, strategic, operational and support resources (Dalberg, 2022b). As with the *Shared Value Initiative*, the trust is not equal to a foundation but is considered as a related not-for-profit model with important learnings that could inform BOAM’s decision about a foundation.

4.2.2 Interview and Outreach Analysis

To derive best practices from the cases, a total of six individuals associated with the selected organizations were either interviewed or otherwise engaged. Three interviews were conducted with *Clean the World* affiliates that included the CEO and an assistant to the B Corp leadership, alongside an individual in the leadership team of the *Clean the World Foundation*. For *endeva*, it was the General Manager of Foundational Activities that this research engaged with. To discuss learnings from FSG’s *Shared Value Initiative* the former Executive Director the initiative was interviewed. And lastly, to discuss what BOAM can learn from *Dalberg*, a former Global Managing Partner was interviewed. An overview of interviewees is presented in Appendix 1. All engagements and interviews addressed structural differences that existed between the for-profit and non-profit units, resourcing of the non-
profit, business maturity at the time of founding of the non-profit, and perceived benefits and challenges of organizational structures. A summary of insights is provided below.

1) **Structural Differences**

**Clean the World:** The for-profit arm of the organization was initially set up with the goal of becoming a funding generating vehicle for foundation activities. It was thought that by focusing on profitable value generation, the foundation as the partial benefactor would be better positioned to conduct large scale impact work. Both the for-profit and the foundation continue to serve the same mission and the creation of this dual structure should be understood as an answer to funding difficulties and an effort to improve public perception of delivering mission work aside from pursuing profitability motivations. Between both entities exists an operating agreement through which it is clarified that the B Corp directly interacts with clients to profitably source soap, while the foundation enters the process and takes ownership of the soap once it is recycled. Subsequently tasked with distributing soap across global WASH programs and humanitarian relief operations, the foundation is considered responsible for distribution and building the external impact narrative. Structurally differing activities that the foundation takes care of are engaging in new donor acquisition and providing input for the establishment of public-private partnerships in the sanitation space. Overall, the relationship between the B Corp and the foundation can be described as one at an arm’s length, whereby the administration of both units is separate but the on-the-ground workplace dynamics are integrated.

**endeva:** The dual structure of the B Corp and e.V. mainly serves practical interests in making work with private and public sector clients less legally complicated. That means that depending on what kind of partner endeva is engaging with, the responsible unit within endeva will vary. The B Corp focuses its work on private partners, whereas the e.V. is responsible for projects with public partners. The mission of the B Corp and the foundation remains the same and the way both entities serve it in practice does not fundamentally differ from one another. Due to the differing nature of partners, the topical and geographic focus of projects differs. This means that the not-for-profit projects that the foundation is coordinating mostly center on Africa, whereas the for-profit projects of the B Corp tend to focus on the European context. That does not imply that the latter does not deliver social impact that helps serve endeva’s mission, since endeva as a whole remains a mission-driven organization that mainly creates impact through its B Corp within which the largest share of projects is housed.

**FSG:** The main difference between FSG as a whole and the initiative is that the first provides targeted, proprietary consulting services to clients with business challenges, whereas the initiative aims to build a community of practice surrounding shared value creation. Insofar, the initiative’s positioning within FSG’s structure resembles that of a business unit that from time to time works across organizational
structures and cooperates with other units on delivering impact. However, in practice the nature of impact achieved by the Shared Value Initiative as opposed to other business arms of FSG often differs. While other units are focused on project-based work that is professionalized and resource-generating while helping private or public clients, the initiative dedicates its main attention to increasing knowledge about the shared value concept amongst companies. Through involvement in stakeholder engagement, research, which tends to highlight best practice examples of shared value creation through private actors, and the building of affiliate networks of other consulting firms, the initiative helps spread the word about the importance of business’ involvement in creating public value across industries and geographies. Therefore, one can consider the Shared Value Initiative much more programmatic in nature than FSG. While promoting impact through the private sector idea as a public good, the initiative is also open to showcasing external actors’ work, which is deemed useful to supporting the building of a community of practice. Considering FSG’s overall client focus, one can therefore argue that the initiative helps improve the enabling environment by driving ever more players to actors like FSG, which can support them in creating public value.

Dalberg: The Dalberg Trust serves the mission of protecting the Dalberg brand while also taking a portion of annual profits from the for-profit operations to re-invest in innovations that are in alignment with the company’s mission of achieving progress in the global development landscape. It insofar represents a structure that ensures the long-term value alignment of Dalberg’s work with the mission that the company was established with. Fundamentally different from the other cases, the trust takes a much more checks-and-balances focused role than some of the other more formalized non-profit structures outlined above do. At the same time however, the trust creates a specific forum for innovation that the company is not yet as invested in. Insofar, the trust helps create organization-internal conversations about the direction of the company and underlines its long-term focus on mission-driven work. As a place for heads of different business units to come together, the Dalberg Trust helps support existing impact creation and sets the company up for future consistency on such.

2) Resources

Clean the World: The source of capital the Clean the World Foundation started with was private funds of the founder. This did not represent a sustainable funding source for activities at scale, which is why players in the hospitality industry were recruited to support the foundation’s activities through grants. Given that there also were small profit margins associated with initial partnerships with, several smaller scale resourcing structures were in place. Given the complexity of sanitation challenges and the global focus of the entity, attempts to receive funding from large and important players such as the Gates Foundation were soon launched, but these failed to deliver the hoped-for success. This must be
understood in the context of the outgoing 2008 worldwide economic crisis that limited economy-wide resource availability. With the establishment of the dual B Corp and foundation structure, this problem was largely solved by moving to a subscription-based hotel program model. With this model, partner hotels buy a recycling program from Clean the World which provides them with access to collection and delivery infrastructure through which soap is sent to Clean the World, diverted from landfills, enhanced, and in accordance with SDG-related objectives distributed through a global WASH program. To this day, a large share of profits created through this program is channeled into the foundation, which at least in part finances its activities. Additional funding sources originate within county, state and federal government in the U.S. In the context of COVID, Clean the World Foundation received support from the Center for Disease Control. Looking ahead, the foundation is exploring further funding opportunities arising from partnerships with government-related international development agencies.

Endeva: Resourcing of the B Corp and foundation at endeva is pragmatically understood. Given that the largest share of projects rests within the for-profit unit, it is also the largest resources that are mobilized and generated there. As the for-profit unit is subject to less regulatory and reputational pressures when it comes to money generated, it is the scale and ease with which capital can be transferred to the e.V. that represents the rationale for why proceeds from for-profit projects mostly fund project activities associated with public partners. Resources are organized in one big pool through which administrative, human resources-associated, operational, and logistical costs are covered.

FSG: The Shared Value Initiative is funding itself through membership fees collected from participating partners, which through payment of annual membership fees can access the initiative’s programming. Beyond membership fees, the initiative funds itself through ticket sales for an annual large-scale summit that supports the objective of bringing together various stakeholders to build a community of practice. Another source of funding has been the Rockefeller Foundation, which alongside an initial group of ten companies has committed funding to the initiative before its formal launch. Through a grant-based model, the Rockefeller Foundation thereby supports many activities associated with the initiative. What is important to consider is that the launch of the initiative only began once the initial group of ten companies had committed monetary support. The relatively large number of companies to commit resources was deemed important as FSG considered that longer-term support beyond a three-year time frame would be hard to secure given a limited number of partners.

Dalberg: The trust is set up in such a manner that it enables the company’s mission driven work without owning financial stakes or other resources in the process. Without any financial resources specifically dedicated to trust-related activities aside from the portion of profits the trust re-invests in innovation, there is also no from the structure arising need for future resourcing. Given that the entity is mainly
understood as an impact safeguarding institution within a for-profit company, questions about whether the trust can effectively live up to that responsibility considering profitability and scale pressures might arise in the future.

3) Maturity

Clean the World: Interestingly, Clean the World started out as a foundation instead of as a for-profit business, which stands in contrast to BOAM’s situation. Considering that Clean the World was originally founded in 2009 in the aftermath of the economic crisis, which was a time in which there was great skepticism about achieving profits related to a broadly social impact focused mission, the primary existence of a stand-alone foundation must be understood in this context. Moreover, the B Corp movement while already in existence, did not yet receive as much publicity and buy-in as it later did. With this background, Clean the World initially focused on a traditional donor-based funding model but quickly faced complications in attracting external capital from large-scale players in the space such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Without an established long-standing track record, no official government agency support, and the presence of many with large players directly associated programs existing in competition, it became clear that a foundation by itself would not be sustainable. Therefore, and as B Corp certification became a more mainstreamed concept, Clean the World’s founder saw an opening in returning to his own private sector for-profit roots and thus committed to setting up a for-profit unit. Understood as a direct value delivery model to existing hotel partners and supported by favorable TV coverage surrounding foundation work in the context of the H1N1 virus and the aftermath of the Haitian earthquake in 2010, a tipping point to move to a revenue-generating business model to drive scale and create a sustained funding stream for foundation activities was reached.

Endeva: Given the pragmatic considerations underlying endeva’s organizational structure, the e.V. in addition to the for-profit business was founded early in initial business development stages. As the number of public partners increased, and particularly once ties to the German development agency GIZ became closer, the desire to create a not-for-profit unit associated with the for-profit organization became greater. The rationale proved to be a valid consideration as many German, EU-associated and partners with ties to other geographical regions ended up entering formalized partnerships with endeva following the creation of endeva e.V. Today, even partnerships with multilaterally focused UN agencies exist that might not have been possible had the foundation not been founded.

FSG: FSG’s Shared Value Initiative was not founded when the entity first launched but represented a response to client demands for programming around shared value after the idea had initially been published in leading journals. It was clear early on that no initiative for whose operations funding would not at least be secured for a couple years from the onset would be created, this represented favorable
conditions for fundraising. Favorable coverage in leading publications including the *Harvard Business Review* and the involvement of re-known influencers and academic professionals like Mark Kramer and Michael Porter eased the process of arriving at the idea of creating shared value programming.

**Dalberg:** A couple years after the founding of Dalberg’s for-profit business, the trust was set up. This largely represented a response to company growth in terms of impact and projects. It served the goal of not losing sight of the social impact generation mission that sits at the heart of the company and did so in times of increasing commercial pressures associated with growth stages. At the same time, the creation of the trust helped the company’s founders to step out of an operating role and created a more formalized process through which the mission orientation could be placed on a more solid, long-term focused footing.

4) **Benefits & Challenges**

**Clean the World:** From the dual structure of being a B Corp and having an associated foundation arise benefits. First, it is noteworthy that this structure enables *Clean the World* to receive support and funding from private and public sources, which would otherwise not be accessible at the same time. Moreover, the entity has taken advantage of its ability to attract diverse talent that is committed to delivering impact and sees *Clean the World*’s approach to creating such while being able to fund it sustainably as authentic. Beyond that it is also employee interactions between both entities that creates a lot of organizational and individual learning due to the diverse backgrounds in the private and public sector. In terms of challenges, differing metrics of success, with the foundation being more focused on lives impacted as opposed to the B Corp paying greater attention to business development, some tensions about prioritization of activities are created. This means that there is implicit pressure that the foundation is facing to bring in more partners that can drive soap sales for the B Corp. Beyond that, the formal separation can come across as artificial and in practice, the line often becomes blurry, which can complicate assignment of responsibility. An associated external perception issue also arises, which means that due to the similar names of the foundation and the business, some confusion about the difference between the entities exists. Given persistent, albeit gradually reducing skepticism, in society about for-profit organizations advancing a public good like health, this creates some reputational concerns.

**Endeva:** The narrative surrounding endeva’s dual structure of a B Corp and a non-profit e.V. tends to be focused on the from the division arising benefits. Throughout the existence of the organizational division of tasks have more and more clients and partners engaged with *endeva*. Business and profitability growth have picked up since, although it remains hard to isolate the drivers of this impact. As multiple factors in the enabling environment such as limited competition, increasing demand for B
Corp social impact consulting in the German market, and growing public agency buy-in into external consulting engagement for development-related policy issues made it easier for endeva to build external relationships, it is impossible to fully explain the strengthening of the endeva brand with the creation of the foundation alone. In terms of challenges, it was mainly the issue of perception, which refers to lack of clarity amongst external stakeholders on the meaning of the dual structure to business interests and impact capability that endeva is thought to be able to achieve, that was communicated.

**FSG:** One of the highlighted benefits arising from the dual structure of having the FSG-related consulting services being present alongside the Shared Value Initiative’s consulting work relates to how the initiative helped mainstream the idea of profitable social impact generation through the private sector. By considerably expanding the reach of FSG, the Shared Value Initiative thereby helped the organization build new partnerships with organizations and leaders not previously aware or bought into the viability of creating shared value. This helped FSG build its brand as the enabling environment including the amount of prospective clients interested grew. A perceived challenge relates to the from the massive expansion of reach arising perceived shallow impact on many external stakeholders. Beyond that, leaders at the initiative struggle to quantify their impact on changemaking and convincing businesses globally to fully embrace the shared value generation principles. Another challenge relates to client perception of the distinction between FSG’s consulting work and the initiative’s field-building. This distinction is in many cases regarded as an artificial one, and even created a degree of confusion about partners and clients.

**Dalberg:** The most obvious benefit of the trust is that it helps the company to stay focused on its mission, which is in the interest of the founders that set up Dalberg with the commitment to advance progress on building a more inclusive and sustainable world. The trust also better enables the company to build its impact narrative for the outside world and adds a level of authenticity to the mission that regular business operations cannot. With regards to challenges, it is opportunity costs associated with setting up the trust’s infrastructure, committing some employee and leadership time to it, and diverting a share of company profits to re-investment through the trust that play a role. Within any organization exist competing priorities, but the trust’s specific responsibility for using a share of company profits for not directly business development related projects represents the strongest tension.

### 4.3 Options Analysis

To evaluate what course of action is advisable for BOAM to increase private sector investment into public health, from the research arising options will be evaluated based on three dimensions with three associated criteria each. These dimensions and criteria are visualized in Figure 8. On the **structural dimension**, **strategic alignment** refers to how well an option is aligned with BOAM’s business model
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and organizational structure. Political feasibility speaks to impact on BOAM’s credibility in the public and private sector by evaluating whether an option helps BOAM establish itself as a public health actor while also preventing large-scale risks associated with externally perceived conflicts of interest. Operational feasibility considers how well an option fits to BOAM given implementation logistics, non-financial resource availability, associated challenges, and potential monitoring capability.

On the financial dimension, resource availability looks at whether the likely scale of costs associated with an option could be stemmed with BOAM’s current financial resources. The resource generation prospects criterion considers whether the for an option necessary financial resources could reasonably be generated through external sources, especially if BOAM’s own resources are insufficient. Opportunity cost assesses whether the resources spent on an option are justifiable given that they could have also been spent to support profit motivations of BOAM more directly.

On the outcome dimension, projected effectiveness provides an option-specific assessment of whether an associated course of action would help BOAM achieve its objectives of mobilizing more private sector resources, achieving their mission of reaching 100 million people through sustainable health interventions, generating business, distinguishing the organization from competitors, improving the enabling environment, and on progressing on Malaria, hygiene, and harmful alcohol use. Sustainability of impact considers whether an option is likely to create long-term impact on BOAM’s health goals and company reputation. Lastly, avoidance of conflicts of interests assesses whether an option reduces the risk of having public perceptions arise that regard BOAM’s engagement in non-profit activities as controversial given its profit motivations embodied in the core business.

**Dimensions and Criteria for Options Evaluation**

---

**Figure 8:** Dimensions and Criteria for Options Evaluation. Adapted from "A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis", 2012, Eugene Bardach, New York: Chatham House Publishers.
Arising from the research are five distinct options. These range from solely focusing on expanding impact through the core business, setting up different kinds of foundations, establishing or joining a multi-stakeholder coalition, to combining a focus on core business growth with engagement in multi-stakeholder platforms. An overview of options is provided in Figure 9.

A comparative evaluation of these options is displayed in Figure 10. Given that the evaluation scale ranges from “extremely low” to “extremely high”, it is Options 1 and 5 that stand out as most consistently ranked “extremely high”. While these options perform equally well on strategic alignment, operational feasibility, resource generation prospects and sustainability of impact, it is important to note that Option 1 is merely a business-as-usual approach that is being scaled up. Option 5 by contrast is much more aligned with the initial goal of exploring the non-profit space that my client approached me with and thus fits better to BOAM’s vision. The by BOAM envisioned foundation embodied by Option 2 falls short on several dimensions, but particularly so on resource availability, resource generation prospects and avoidance of conflicts of interests. This is particularly important as the findings of this research suggest that avoiding conflicts of interests and ensuring sustainable resourcing are of paramount importance for both business survival and value-added to larger social challenges. Although Option 3 of setting up a joint foundation with a partner performs a little better on these dimensions, opportunity cost remains high which provides a difficult tradeoff given limited resources. Option 4 provides a more feasible alternative to setting up a foundation with limited resources while not giving up on the initial vision of moving into the non-profit space, but it performs less well than Option 1 and 5. A more detailed presentation and evaluation of options follows.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Alignment</th>
<th>Option 1: Core Business Growth</th>
<th>Option 2: BOAM Foundation</th>
<th>Option 3: Joint Foundation</th>
<th>Option 4: Multi-Stakeholder Coalition</th>
<th>Option 5: Business Growth + Multi-Stakeholder Coalition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Feasibility</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Feasibility</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
<td>Low/Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate/High</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>Low/Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Generation Prospects</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>Low/Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Cost</td>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Effectiveness</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of Impact</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low/Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate/High</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: Extremely Low – Low - Moderate - High - Extremely High


4.3.1 Option 1: Core Business Growth

Recognizing BOAM’s relative youth and the importance of establishing the brand name, this option involves full company commitment to growing the core business above everything else. Instead of diverting some of the limited resources BOAM has to build a foundation or other non-profit entity, all profits from client work are to be reinvested into acquiring more, larger-scale clients. The option serves BOAM’s core objective of accelerating private sector impact on public health by relying on large clients to scale up their involvement on crucial health issues such as Malaria, hygiene, and the reduction of harmful use of alcohol. That way BOAM can increase private sector buy-in, which will improve its operating environment in the long-term. Concrete associated steps include leveraging pre-existing business contacts and turning them into longer-term client relationships, engaging regularly with conglomerate leadership to move the needle towards formalized consulting agreements, and extending pre-existing client relationships both temporally and strategically.
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4.3.2 Option 2: A BOAM Foundation

Building on BOAM’s proclaimed commitment to setting up a foundation focused on generating private sector investment in public health, this option focuses on utilizing some of BOAM’s resources for the initial set-up and running of operations of such a foundation. Without establishing direct for-profit client relationships with partners that decide to give resources to the foundation, this course of action involves human and financial resource commitment by BOAM to ensure resourcing, define foundational activities, identify impact opportunities, and continuously assess progress of private sector investment’s contribution to solving the above-outlined health issues. While the nuts and bolts of practical implementation would still have to be determined, this option makes the case for a foundation being a feasible option given structural and financial constraints BOAM is facing.
4.3.3 **Option 3: A Joint Foundation**

This option involves the setting up of a foundation in addition to BOAM’s core business but is distinctly different in that the envisioned foundation would not just be administered and run by BOAM but instead co-led with another organization(s). Considering limited financial and human resources, in addition to considerable opportunity cost associated with the set-up of a foundation, setting up a joint foundation reduces individual company-level risk without sacrificing BOAM’s vision of a non-profit entity. Further research will have to be done to find a partner with a similar commitment to the mission of accelerating private sector investment in public health. Depending on the partner, BOAM could also decide to focus more attention on just one of the above outlined health challenges, which could help maximize impact on e.g., Malaria specifically if desired by the entities.
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4.3.4 Option 4: A Multi-Stakeholder Coalition

Different from BOAM’s founding vision of setting up a non-profit entity that takes the form of a foundation, this option advocates for either joining or setting up a multi-stakeholder coalition consisting of private, public, and civil society partners. By joining a coalition, BOAM could capitalize on the well-established nature of the entity and thereby advance public recognition as well as its investment generation objectives while having to sacrifice much more limited resources of their own for these purposes. By setting up a novel coalition, BOAM would still have to invest considerable financial and human resources but could spread risk across partners in a way a foundation wouldn’t be able to. Some pre-existing coalitions to join could be The Global Handwashing Partnership, the International Alliance for Responsible Drinking or the B Corp Collective We the Change. Given that BOAM was involved in the Business Compact for Coronavirus in Kenya, it would also be reasonable to consider scaling the entity to focus on longer-term health goals associated with Malaria, hygiene, and the reduction of harmful use of alcohol by involving new partners and ensuring re-commitment of existing ones. Beyond that, an entirely new multi-stakeholder coalition could be set up in association with the B Corp organization and could unite B Corp leaders behind public health focused issues.
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4.3.5 **Option 5: Core Business Growth and Multi-Stakeholder Coalition**

As a combination of options 1 and 4, this option emphasizes the dual need for growth of BOAM’s client base and outside engagement in a non-profit multi-stakeholder coalition arrangement. Recognizing the nascent stage the business finds itself in, and given the need to build the brand to become profitable in the long-term, core business growth is considered a necessary pre-condition for long-term advocacy efforts for increasing private sector investment in health. At the same time, this option considers it reasonable to spend a limited amount of resources on not-for-profit efforts that enhance the enabling environment and even regards such efforts possible multipliers that can translate into business growth. A particular multi-stakeholder coalition to join could be the B Corp Collective *We the Change*. Alongside it is considered feasible to explore how to set up a novel, solely public health focused B Corp Collective, which while limiting BOAM’s resource spend could increase visibility of its efforts beyond what joining an existing collective would imply.
5. **Recommendations**

1) The recommended option for BOAM that is deemed most sound based on structural, financial, and outcomes-focused evaluation is **Option 5**: accelerating private sector investment in public health through core business growth alongside getting involved in a **multi-stakeholder coalition**. Given the relative youth of the BOAM brand and considering both limited resources and continued necessity to establish oneself in the industry, on-boarding corporate clients with large-scale impact potential can be considered the least risk-associated, profit-generating and sustainable way forward. Recognizing BOAM’s desire to leverage its newly acquired B Corp status and considering the firm’s ambitious agenda to challenge traditional notions of social impact through business, it is desirable, to join the B-Corp exclusive multi-stakeholder collective **We the Change**, which can increase BOAM’s visibility within the purposeful business community and among prospective corporate clients.
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2) Associated with the recommended option is the endorsement of exploring opportunities for BOAM to play a leadership role in setting up a new B Corp Collective focused on public health, as a novel multi-stakeholder platform. As there is a considerable amount of certified B Corps that are active in the public health space and given the established nature of with the B Corp organization associated collectives, moving ahead with this recommendation would enable BOAM to increase its connections, be more actively engaged in raising awareness about the need for private sector investment and use less resources that other forms of multi-stakeholder forums would necessitate. By instrumentalizing the B Corp Organization’s established nature, BOAM would have to dedicate much less time towards establishing the platform, while taking advantage of the many advantages that multi-stakeholder groups come with.

3) Another associated endorsement is given for BOAM to consider active engagement in reviving the in response to COVID-19 set up National Business Compact for Coronavirus in Kenya. As an already established coalition consisting of various governments, international organizations, and both large- and smaller-scale businesses, the Compact represents a key opportunity for BOAM to gain visibility within Africa, and possibly at later stages more globally. It can also help reinforce the business growth goal by aligning large corporations’ strategic priorities inside the Compact with BOAM’s aim of increased private sector investment in public health through resulting establishment of client-consulting relationships. If the initial focus of the Compact is expanded to include longer-term health issues including but not limited to Malaria elimination, BOAM could take advantage of relationships with large-scale corporations that could translate into direct business transactions. Over time, and as impact of the Compact increases, it is likely that more large-scale players become involved, which could support BOAM’s business growth.

4) Given BOAM’s commitment to creating more public health impact beyond the core business, a re-evaluation of potential for a localized, community-level BOAM foundation should be conducted after several years of business growth. Although at the current stage of BOAM’s market positioning it is not considered prudent to invest a large share of resources in the set-up, advertising, and day-to-day operations of a foundation, this does not mean that it could not help BOAM achieve its objectives in the future. Should a re-assessment be considered, one should focus on how to best apply social marketing at a local community-level to mitigate adverse public health impacts in a geographically limited area. Only if this is done can one consider opportunities for scale-up. Further considerations to gain knowledge on include a scan of legal environments for a potential foundation, breadth of health issues of focus and mitigation of conflicts of interest.
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### Appendix 1. Overview of Interviewees and Other Research Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role of Interviewee at the Organization</th>
<th>Based in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Lab</td>
<td>Business Sustainability Analyst</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean the World</td>
<td>CEO of B Corp&lt;br&gt;Assistant to the Company Leadership&lt;br&gt;Member of the Foundational Leadership Team</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalberg</td>
<td>Former Global Managing Partner</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endeva</td>
<td>General Manager of Foundation Operations</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Value Initiative</td>
<td>Former Executive Director of Initiative</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 2. Ethical and Informed Consent (for non-Europe-based Interviewees)

My name is Svenja Meike Kirsch from Harvard University, and I am asking you to take part in my research study for my Policy Analysis Exercise (PAE). The PAE is an academic product that is the capstone to the Master in Public Policy Curriculum, which is a degree program at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. For my PAE, I am advising a real-world client and develop recommendations to address a policy or management problem the client is facing. My client is the certified B Corp and purpose consultancy *Brands on a Mission* (BOAM), which is focused on designing, implementing, and evaluating sustainable business models that improve health and well-being through behavior change at scale. I am advising my client on how to increase social impact in the public health sphere, focused on Malaria, hygiene, and the reduction of harmful use of alcohol.
I would like to interview you to learn more about your foundation. I am particularly interested in structural differences between the foundation and the core business, the foundation’s resource structure, the business’ maturity at the time of set-up of the foundation, and perceived advantages and challenges of the dual structure. The interview will last about 45 minutes.

You can skip questions that you do not want to answer or stop the interview at any time.

I will keep the data I collect confidential and will not share your personal information with anyone outside the research team if you so request. Solely the name of the organization you are employed with will be named. Please note that your work at your respective organization will be highlighted as a positive example that provides lessons to learn from and whose experience can guide progress on achieving key global health goals.

Participating in this research is voluntary. Please inform me if you do not want to participate.

Should you have further questions, please contact Svenja Meike Kirsch at svenja_kirsch@hks.harvard.edu or +1 (617) 412 6621. Should you have concerns about this research, you can reach the faculty advisors Jane Nelson and John Haigh at jane_nelson@hks.harvard.edu and john_haigh@hks.harvard.edu. You may also contact paeresearch@hks.harvard.edu, which is monitored by a faculty committee knowledgeable about research ethics.

Appendix 3. Ethical and Informed Consent (for Europe-based Interviewees)
This consent provides information for participants in the European Economic Area (EEA) and United Kingdom (UK) to understand how their data will be collected and protected for the purpose of this project. Data privacy laws in the United States may not offer the same protection as the laws in your own country.

If you would prefer to remain fully anonymous, we can avoid collecting any identifying information.
Would you like to remain anonymous? Yes__ No __

You can also elect not to be recorded during this interview, and I will solely take written notes. Otherwise, I will record your responses for reference during the project. Once I’ve finalized my report, I’ll delete any recordings.
You can video record ___
You can audio record ___
As you are located in the EEA, you are protected by the General Data Protection Regulation, or GDPR. Some of the information I will collect, if you choose to consent, is considered Personal Data under GDPR. This means I am required to appropriately safeguard your data, as I described earlier, use it only for the purposes of this project, and not share it outside of Harvard unless it has been fully anonymized.

I want to highlight that General Data Protection Regulation affords specific rights to EEA and UK citizens, such as the right to withdraw, review or delete your responses at any time, the right to transparent communication and information, and the right to submit a complaint. If you have any questions about your rights related to this project, Harvard’s GDPR Disclosures website https://gdpr.harvard.edu/eeaprivacydisclosures includes additional information, or please email myself and EEAdatasubjectrequest@harvard.edu with any concerns.

Please know that your data will be anonymized, meaning all identifiers are destroyed by June 2022.

Your signature below represents that you have freely given your consent for the use of your Personal Data for the purposes described by myself, Svenja Meike Kirsch, for the “Driving Accelerated Private Sector Impact on Public Health” project.

**Appendix 4. Interview Guide**

1) **Structural Differences between Core Business and Entity**
   - Which differences exist between the mission and its implementation through the foundation as opposed to through the business?
   - How would you describe the organizational and practical relationship between the foundation and the business?
     - Organizationally, which interactions between the foundation and business exist?
     - How are internal foundation structures different from those in the business?
     - Which activities does the foundation engage in that the business doesn’t?
     - If there are activities that both the foundation and the business engage in together to advance the mission, what activities are those?
   - How does the foundation’s scope of tasks enable it to serve the mission differently?
   - Does the foundation serve the mission better or worse than the business? Why?

2) **Resourcing & Minimum Capital**
   - What was the initial capital that the foundation began its operations with?
   - How are foundational activities financed?
   - To what extent is the foundation financed by the business?
   - If the resourcing structure changed over time, how did it change?
Looking back at the impact achieved through the foundation, how much minimum capital do you think would be necessary to set up a similar foundation?

- Which factors need to be considered?

3) **Maturity of Business prior to Set-up**
   - Where did the idea of a foundation in addition to the business come from?
     - What was the intention behind setting up the foundation?
     - In what way if relevant was the foundation thought to support the core business?
   - How long did the business exist when the foundation was created?
     - Was the business profitable?
     - How much impact did the business have at that point?

4) **Strategic and Operational Benefits & Challenges**

   **Benefits**
   - What advantages has the foundation model brought in terms of progress with regards to the mission?
     - Which of those advances would not have been possible without the foundation?
   - How has the foundation improved the business’ standing and competitive position?

   **Challenges**
   - Which elements of the dual foundation-business structure have been challenging to communicate or exercise?
   - How can one overcome these challenges?

5) **Conflicts of Interest**

   - In what context have potential conflicts of interest arisen considering that the foundation was set up by a for-profit business to address a public problem?
   - How have past conflicts of interest been mitigated or how are they to be mitigated?
   - From your experience, how can conflicts of interests be planned for or even avoided?