

Appendix 2: Corporate Risk Register 2016/17, Q1 (Summary)

IMPACT	High	<p>4. Insufficient capacity to deliver Moorlife 2020</p> <p>5. Debt from final Moorlife claim not met</p> <p>NEW: 11. Impact of EU exit vote</p>	<p>1. No common understanding of aims for White Peak</p> <p>2. Not submitting bid for SW Peak</p> <p>8. Fail to develop integrated strategic commercial plan</p> <p>12. Fail to design organisation with skills and capability to deliver</p> <p>13. Not support staff through change</p>	<p>7. Fail to inspire people to give to a NPA</p>
	Medium	<p>9. Fail to increase ownership and understanding of our policies among stakeholders</p>	<p>14. NEW: Fail to deliver against performance and business plan</p>	<p>6. Reduced area of land in agri-environment schemes</p>
	Low	<p>3. Adverse exchange rate Moorlife 2020 funding</p> <p>10. Fail to gain support for and agree investment proposals (REMOVE)</p>		
		Low	Medium	High
LIKELIHOOD				

Appendix 2: Corporate Risk Register 2016/17, Q1 (Summary)

Corporate Risk Register: list of risks

1. Failure to create a common understanding of what we want to achieve in the White Peak
2. Failure to submit a quality, funded bid for the South West Peak project
3. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding
4. Insufficient capacity to deliver Moorlife 2020 programme
5. Outstanding debt from final Moorlife claim is not met
6. Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of new Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE) implications
7. Failure to inspire people to give to a National Park Authority
8. Failure to develop an integrated strategic commercial plan
9. Failure to engage in a way that increases ownership and understanding of our policies amongst communities and decision makers
10. Failure to gain support for and agree investment proposals in a timely way (REMOVE from register)
11. NEW: Failure to effectively manage the impact of changes resulting from the EU exit vote in terms of:
 - a. Euro funding for Moorlife 2020
 - b. UK government funding
 - c. Policy and legislation changes
 - d. Partnership funding position
12. Failure to design the organisation so it has the skills and capability to deliver
13. Failure to support staff going through a time of change
14. NEW: Failure to deliver against our Performance and Business Plan in a time of structural change.

Appendix 2: Corporate Risk Register 2016/17, Q1 (Summary)

Impact	High	AMBER (closely monitor)	AMBER (manage and monitor)	RED (significant focus and attention)
	Med	GREEN (accept but monitor)	AMBER (management effort worthwhile)	AMBER (manage and monitor)
	Low	GREEN (accept)	GREEN (accept/ review periodically)	GREEN (accept but monitor)
		Low	Med	High

Likelihood

Corp. Strat. Ref.	Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red)						Timeframe of mitigating actions	Lead officer	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly update
						Start	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4				
S1 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	Have Local nature partnership as a high priority	H x H RED	a) Senior level engagement with Natural England, NFU and the Environment Agency to consider potential for collaboration to secure the best outcome from agri-environment schemes in the White Peak.	Impact	High	High				End Mar '17	SF (Chief Executive)	Progress with partnership bid led by Derbyshire Wildlife Trust LNP setting out strategic intent for the White Peak.	Derbyshire Wildlife Trust, working through the LNP, are developing a grasslands project. Chief Executive has had discussions with the Chairs of NE and the EA regarding strategically working together in the White Peak.
					Likelihood	High	Medium							
					Rating	RED	AMBER							

Appendix 2: Corporate Risk Register 2016/17, Q1 (Summary)

Impact	High	AMBER (closely monitor)	AMBER (manage and monitor)	RED (significant focus and attention)
	Med	GREEN (accept but monitor)	AMBER (management effort worthwhile)	AMBER (manage and monitor)
	Low	GREEN (accept)	GREEN (accept/ review periodically)	GREEN (accept but monitor)
		Low	Med	High

Likelihood

Corp. Strat. Ref.	Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red)						Timeframe of mitigating actions	Lead officer	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly update
						Start	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4				
S1 The Place and the Park on a Landscape scale	2. Failure to submit a quality, funded bid for South West Peak project	Programme Board monitoring progress	H x H RED	a. Funding strategy being developed. b. Internal project team established.	Impact	High	High				a. End June 2016 b. End May 2016	JRS (Director of Conservation and Planning)	RMT	On track for submission on 22 nd July
					Likelihood	High	Medium							
					Rating	RED	AMBER							

Appendix 2: Corporate Risk Register 2016/17, Q1 (Summary)

Impact	High	AMBER (closely monitor)	AMBER (manage and monitor)	RED (significant focus and attention)
	Med	GREEN (accept but monitor)	AMBER (management effort worthwhile)	AMBER (manage and monitor)
	Low	GREEN (accept)	GREEN (accept/ review periodically)	GREEN (accept but monitor)
		Low	Med	High
Likelihood				

Corp. Strat. Ref.	Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red)						Timeframe of mitigating actions	Lead officer	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly update
					Start	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4					
S1 The Place and the Park on a Landscape scale	3. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding	None	H x H RED	a. Hedging arrangement to be put in place if we can. b. Cap on sterling budget with appropriate output adjustments agreed.	Impact	High	Low				a. Continuous assessment	PN (Chief Finance Officer)	Chief Finance Officer Budget monitoring Group ARP	Request for detailed budget made to budget manager. Full sterling cap confirmed to budget manager as necessary. Received 30% up-front funding. Hedging arrangement under consideration.
					Likelihood	Medium	Low				b. End Q2 detailed budget breakdown			
					Rating	AMBER	GREEN							

Appendix 2: Corporate Risk Register 2016/17, Q1 (Summary)

Impact	High	AMBER (closely monitor)	AMBER (manage and monitor)	RED (significant focus and attention)
	Med	GREEN (accept but monitor)	AMBER (management effort worthwhile)	AMBER (manage and monitor)
	Low	GREEN (accept)	GREEN (accept/ review periodically)	GREEN (accept but monitor)
		Low	Med	High

Likelihood

Corp. Strat. Ref.	Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red)					Timeframe of mitigating actions	Lead officer	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly update	
						Start	Q1	Q2	Q3					Q4
S2 Connecting people to the place	7. Failure to inspire people to give to a National Park Authority	Approach to giving approved by the Authority.	H x H RED	a. Organisation design to provide appropriate capabilities underway	Impact	High	High				a. Dec '16	SM (Director of Commercial Development and Outreach)	RMT	Key roles and resource implications have been identified and initial analysis of skills gap of current team undertaken.
					Likelihood	High	High							
					Rating	RED	RED							

Appendix 2: Corporate Risk Register 2016/17, Q1 (Summary)

Impact	High	AMBER (closely monitor)	AMBER (manage and monitor)	RED (significant focus and attention)
	Med	GREEN (accept but monitor)	AMBER (management effort worthwhile)	AMBER (manage and monitor)
	Low	GREEN (accept)	GREEN (accept/ review periodically)	GREEN (accept but monitor)
		Low	Med	High

Likelihood

Corp. Strat. Ref.	Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red)						Timeframe of mitigating actions	Lead officer	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly update
						Start	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4				
C2 Our services	9. Failure to engage in a way that increases ownership and understanding of our policies amongst communities and decision makers	a. Community engagement through Peak Parish Forum. b. Development of development management policies with Members and public consultation.	M x M AMBER: management effort worthwhile	6 x training sessions with parish councils on enforcement and general planning	Impact	Medium	Medium				a. End Mar '17	JRS (Director of Conservation and Planning)	Satisfaction survey among parish councils	2 sessions have been held – attended by 26 parishes.
					Likelihood	Medium	Low							
					Rating	AMBER	GREEN							

Appendix 2: Corporate Risk Register 2016/17, Q1 (Summary)

Impact	High	AMBER (closely monitor)	AMBER (manage and monitor)	RED (significant focus and attention)
	Med	GREEN (accept but monitor)	AMBER (management effort worthwhile)	AMBER (manage and monitor)
	Low	GREEN (accept)	GREEN (accept/ review periodically)	GREEN (accept but monitor)
		Low	Med	High

Likelihood

Corp. Strat. Ref.	Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red)					Timeframe of mitigating actions	Lead officer	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly update	
					Start	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4					
C3 Our organisation	10. Failure to gain support for and agree investment proposals in a timely way.	Timetable for discussions agreed	M x H AMBER: manage and monitor	a. SAG, Staff Committee and UNISON discussions in hand. b. Staff roadshows to present to staff. c. Authority meeting planned for 19 th May.	Impact	High	Low				a. End April '16 b. End April 2016 c. 19 th May 2016	SF (Chief Executive)	SLT Authority	Authority paper approved. Phasing detail delegated to SLT REMOVE FROM REGISTER
					Likelihood	Low	Low							
					Rating	AMBER	GREEN							

Appendix 2: Corporate Risk Register 2016/17, Q1 (Summary)

Impact	High	AMBER (closely monitor)	AMBER (manage and monitor)	RED (significant focus and attention)
	Med	GREEN (accept but monitor)	AMBER (management effort worthwhile)	AMBER (manage and monitor)
	Low	GREEN (accept)	GREEN (accept/ review periodically)	GREEN (accept but monitor)
		Low	Med	High

Likelihood

Corp. Strat. Ref.	Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red)					Timeframe of mitigating actions	Lead officer	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly update	
					Start	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4					
C3 Our organisation	11. Failure to effectively manage the impact of changes resulting from the EU exit vote in terms of: a. Euro funding for Moorlife 2020 b. UK government funding c. Policy and legislation changes d. partnership funding position.	a. Contract signed Oct '15 Upfront 30% payment. b. 4 year grant settlement letter from Defra	L x H AMBER: closely monitor	a. i. NP England discussions with Defra. ii. Monitoring commitments beyond 2 years. b. NP England are coordinating input into government to minimise risks to policy and funding and maximise opportunities for NPs c. Monitor implications as more information becomes available. d. Identify with staff what the issues may be.	Impact	NEW RISK AT Q1	High				a.i. ongoing a. ii. Ongoing b. End Sept '16	SF (Chief Executive)	a. Through MFF operations plan and budget setting for 2017. b. NPE board meetings	Added risk to risk register. Specialist groups across NPs are collecting their views and those of service heads on the potential impact.
					Likelihood		Low							
					Rating		AMBER							

Appendix 2: Corporate Risk Register 2016/17, Q1 (Summary)

Impact	High	AMBER (closely monitor)	AMBER (manage and monitor)	RED (significant focus and attention)
	Med	GREEN (accept but monitor)	AMBER (management effort worthwhile)	AMBER (manage and monitor)
	Low	GREEN (accept)	GREEN (accept/ review periodically)	GREEN (accept but monitor)
		Low	Med	High

Corp. Strat. Ref.	Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red)					Timeframe of mitigating actions	Lead officer	How monitor/indicator	Quarterly update	
					Impact	Start	Q1	Q2	Q3					Q4
C4 Our people	14. Failure to deliver against our Performance and Business Plan in a time of structural change	Tier 2 management in place. 1/4ly performance monitoring. Timetable for delivery of structural change/ max opp. For input/ feedback	Likelihood: Medium Impact: High	Review service level risks to highlight where performance may be affected. Add question in 1/4ly monitoring to understand areas requiring focus or support. Review of new PIs at end of Q2. Continue staff engagement and support them.	Impact	NEW RISK AT Q1	Medium				End Mar '17	SF (Chief Executive)	1/4ly performance monitoring process	NEW RISK
			Likelihood	Medium										
			Rating	MEDIUM										