

## Proposed 2016/17 Corporate Risk Register – Appendix 1

The following 2016/17 Corporate Risk Register has been developed through an assessment of the risks to achieving year one of our 2016-2019 corporate strategy. This assessment has also included an assessment of:

- 2015/16 corporate risks remaining at amber at the 2015/16 year end
- Any risks to be escalated from service risk registers
- The external environment that we operate in

In developing our risk register we have used a 9 grid tool based on likelihood and impact of the risk which not only gives a Green, Amber, Red classification but helps us prioritise action to mitigate that risk depending on where the risk sits on the grid. This is shown at Table 2. The risk register is a 'live' tool that is changed if new risks arise or risks are managed down over the year.

**Table 1: Proposed 2016/17 corporate risks and position at start of year**

| Corporate strategy ref                              | Risk Description   | Existing controls/mitigating action  | Risk rating at start of year     | Green, Amber or Red/ action            | Lead officer |
|---|--|--|----------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Shift 1 the place and the park on a landscape scale | 1. Failure to create a common understanding of what we want to achieve in the White Peak | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local nature partnership considering as a priority</li> </ul>   | High likelihood<br>High impact   | RED<br>Significant focus and attention | SF           |
| Shift 1 the place and the park on a landscape scale | 2. Failure to submit a quality, funded bid for South West Peak project                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme Board monitoring progress</li> <li>• Funding strategy being developed</li> <li>• Internal project team established</li> </ul>                                     | High likelihood<br>High impact   | RED<br>Significant focus and attention | JRS          |
| Shift 1 the place and the park on a landscape scale | 3. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hedging arrangement to be put in place if we can</li> <li>• Cap on sterling budget with appropriate output adjustments agreed</li> </ul>                                    | Medium likelihood<br>High impact | AMBER<br>Manage and monitor            | PN           |
| Shift 1 the place and the park on a landscape scale | 4. Insufficient capacity to deliver Moorlife 2020 programme                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment to establishment agreed and progressing</li> <li>• Edale site development in progress</li> <li>• Programme and project management processes in place</li> </ul> | Low likelihood<br>High impact    | AMBER<br>Closely monitor               | JRS          |
| Shift 1 the place and the park on a landscape scale | 5. Outstanding debt from final Moorlife claim is not met                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Immediate attention being given to answering questions from European office</li> </ul>  | Low likelihood<br>High impact    | AMBER<br>Closely monitor               | JRS          |

| <b>Corporate strategy ref</b>                       | <b>Risk Description</b>   | <b>Existing controls/mitigating action</b>   | <b>Risk rating at start of year</b> | <b>Green, Amber or Red/ action</b>     | <b>Lead officer</b> |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Shift 1 the place and the park on a landscape scale | 6. Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of new Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE) implications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Free adviser brokerage of national schemes (a chargeable service may increase risk)</li> <li>Increase promotion of the service provided, working closely with other agencies such as NFU, CLA, NE, EA, FC</li> </ul>                                  | High likelihood<br>Medium impact    | AMBER<br>Manage and monitor            | JRS                 |
| Shift 2 connecting people to the place              | 7. Failure to inspire people to give to a National Park Authority   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to giving approved by the Authority</li> <li>Organisation design to provide appropriate capabilities planned</li> </ul>  | High likelihood<br>High impact      | RED<br>Significant focus and attention | SM                  |
| Shift 4 Grow our income and supporters              | 8. Failure to develop an integrated strategic commercial plan   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New leadership team in place</li> <li>Organisation design to provide appropriate capabilities planned</li> </ul>  | Medium likelihood<br>High impact    | AMBER<br>Manage and monitor            | SM                  |
| Cornerstone 1 our people                            | 9. Failure to design the organisation so it has the skills and capability to deliver  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design principles drafted and consultation started</li> <li>Part of investment discussions</li> <li>Timetable outlined</li> </ul>   | Medium likelihood<br>High impact    | AMBER<br>Manage and monitor            | RMM                 |
| Cornerstone 1 our people                            | 10. Failure to support staff going through a time of change   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refreshed managing change policy in place</li> <li>Additional resources identified for HR</li> <li>Resilience training a key part of learning and development programme</li> <li>Continuing implementation of internal communications plan</li> </ul> | Medium likelihood<br>High impact    | AMBER<br>Manage and monitor            | RMM                 |
| Cornerstone 2 our services                          | 11. Failure to engage in a way that increases ownership and understanding of our policies amongst communities and decision makers             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community engagement through peak parish forum</li> <li>Development of management development policies with members and public consultation</li> <li>Member training</li> </ul>   | Medium likelihood<br>Medium impact  | AMBER<br>Management effort worthwhile  | JRS                 |
| Cornerstone 3 our organisation                      | 12. Failure to gain support for and agree investment proposals in a timely way  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timetable for discussions agreed</li> <li>SAG, Staff Committee/UNISON discussions in hand</li> <li>Staff roadshows to present to staff</li> </ul>   | Low likelihood<br>High impact       | AMBER<br>Closely monitor               | SF                  |

**Table 2: 2016/17 Corporate Risk Register – risk starting point following existing mitigating action**

|                   |               |   |  |   |
|-------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| <b>IMPACT</b>     | <b>High</b>   | <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>closely monitor</u></b></p> <p>4. Insufficient capacity to deliver Moorlife 2020 programme</p> <p>5. Outstanding debt from final Moorlife claim is not met</p> <p>12. Failure to gain support for and agree investment proposals in a timely way</p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>manage and monitor</u></b></p> <p>8. Failure to develop an integrated strategic commercial plan</p> <p>9. Failure to design the organisation so it has the skills and capability to deliver</p> <p>10. Failure to support staff going through a time of change</p> <p>3. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding</p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>significant focus and attention</u></b></p> <p>1. Failure to create a common understanding of what we want to achieve in the White Peak</p> <p>2. Failure to submit a quality, funded bid for South West Peak project</p> <p>7. Failure to inspire people to give to a National Park Authority</p> |
|                   | <b>Medium</b> | <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>accept but monitor</u></b></p>   | <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>management effort worthwhile</u></b></p> <p>11. Failure to engage in a way that increases ownership and understanding of our policies amongst communities and decision makers</p>   | <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>manage and monitor</u></b></p> <p>6. Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of new (RDPE) implications</p>  |
|                   | <b>Low</b>    | <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>accept risks</u></b></p>   | <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>accept but review periodically</u></b></p>  | <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>accept but monitor</u></b></p>   |
|                   |               | <b>Low</b>  | <b>Medium</b>  | <b>High</b>   |
| <b>LIKELIHOOD</b> |               |   |  |   |