

2016/17 Corporate Risk Register

APPENDIX 6

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: 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"> • Local nature partnership considering as a priority 	High likelihood High impact	RED 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"> • Programme Board monitoring progress • Funding strategy being developed • Internal project team established 	High likelihood High impact	RED 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"> • Hedging arrangement to be put in place if we can • Cap on sterling budget with appropriate output adjustments agreed 	Medium likelihood High impact	AMBER 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"> • Recruitment to establishment agreed and progressing • Edale site development in progress • Programme and project management processes in place 	Low likelihood High impact	AMBER 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"> • Immediate attention being given to answering questions from European office 	Low likelihood High impact	AMBER Closely monitor	JRS

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	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"> Free adviser brokerage of national schemes (a chargeable service may increase risk) Increase promotion of the service provided, working closely with other agencies such as NFU, CLA, NE, EA, FC 	High likelihood Medium impact	AMBER 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"> Approach to giving approved by the Authority Organisation design to provide appropriate capabilities planned 	High likelihood High impact	RED 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"> New leadership team in place Organisation design to provide appropriate capabilities planned 	Medium likelihood High impact	AMBER 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"> Design principles drafted and consultation started Part of investment discussions Timetable outlined 	Medium likelihood High impact	AMBER 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"> Refreshed managing change policy in place Additional resources identified for HR Resilience training a key part of learning and development programme Continuing implementation of internal communications plan 	Medium likelihood High impact	AMBER 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"> Community engagement through peak parish forum Development of management development policies with members and public consultation Member training 	Medium likelihood Medium impact	AMBER 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"> Timetable for discussions agreed SAG, Staff Committee/UNISON discussions in hand Staff roadshows to present to staff 	Low likelihood High impact	AMBER Closely monitor	SF

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

IMPACT	High	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>closely monitor</u></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;"><u>manage and monitor</u></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;"><u>significant focus and attention</u></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>
	Medium	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>accept but monitor</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>management effort worthwhile</u></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;"><u>manage and monitor</u></p> <p>6. Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of new (RDPE) implications</p>
	Low	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>accept risks</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>accept but review periodically</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>accept but monitor</u></p>
		Low	Medium	High
LIKELIHOOD				