


# Appendix 2 – Q3 Corporate Risk Register 2016/17

<b>IMPACT</b>	<b>High</b>	13. Impact of EU exit vote  	1. No common understanding of aims for White Peak  8. Fail to develop integrated strategic commercial plan  NEW 15. Insufficient capacity to deliver SWP project & secure additional match funding NEW	7. Fail to inspire people to give to a NPA
	<b>Medium</b>	9. Fail to design organisation with skills and capability to deliver  11. Fail to increase ownership and understanding of our policies among stakeholders  3. Adverse exchange rate Moorlife 2020 funding  4. Insufficient capacity to deliver Moorlife 2020  10. Not support staff through change	14. Fail to deliver against performance and business plan	6. Reduced area of land in agri-environment schemes
	<b>Low</b>			
		<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>LIKELIHOOD</b>				

## Appendix 2

### Q3 Corporate Risk Register 2016/17

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

#### Corporate Risk Register: list of risks

1. Failure to create a common understanding of what we want to achieve in the White Peak
3. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding
4. Insufficient capacity to deliver Moorlife 2020 programme
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 design the organisation so it has the skills and capability to deliver
10. Failure to support staff going through a time of change
11. Failure to engage in a way that increases ownership and understanding of our policies amongst communities and decision makers
13. 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
14. Failure to deliver against our Performance and Business Plan in a time of structural change
15. NEW Insufficient capacity to deliver SWP project & secure additional match funding NEW

# Appendix 2

## Q3 Corporate Risk Register 2016/17

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

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	4. Insufficient capacity to deliver Moorlife 2020 programme	Programme and project management processes in place.	M x H  AMBER: Manage and monitor	a. Recruitment to establishment agreed and progressing.  b. Edale site development in progress.	Impact	High	High	High	Medium		a. Dec '16  b. Mar '17	JRS (Director of Conservation and Planning)  SLT	Through Director of Conservation and Planning  SLT	All posts are filled or appointed to.  Site development is progressing to plan.
					Likelihood	Low	Low	Low	Low					
					Rating	AMBER	AMBER	AMBER	GREEN					

# Appendix 2

## Q3 Corporate Risk Register 2016/17

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

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	High	High		a. Dec '16	SM (Director of Commercial Development and Outreach)	RMT	2 Heads of Service in place and 1 to be recruited to shortly. Three team managers to be recruited to. Therefore, the risk still remains the same.
					Likelihood	High	High	High	High					
					Rating	RED	RED	RED	RED					

# Appendix 2

## Q3 Corporate Risk Register 2016/17

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

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				
C1 Our people	9. Failure to design the organisation so it has the skills and capability to deliver		M x H  AMBER: manage and monitor	a. Design principles drafted for consultation.  b. Part of investment discussions.  c. Timetable outlined.	<b>Impact</b>	High	High	High	Medium		a. End July 2016	RMM (Director of Corporate Strategy and Development)	SLT Staff Committee/ UNISON/ MT discussion	a. Implementation of the new structure is substantially completed with residual vacancies being advertised in the new year for appointments to be made in quarter 4
					<b>Likelihood</b>	Medium	Medium	Low	LOW		b. End October 2016			
					<b>Rating</b>	AMBER	AMBER	AMBER	GREEN		c. End July 2016			

# Appendix 2

## Q3 Corporate Risk Register 2016/17

Impact	High	<b>AMBER</b> (closely monitor)	<b>AMBER</b> (manage and monitor)	<b>RED</b> (significant focus and attention)
	Med	<b>GREEN</b> (accept but monitor)	<b>AMBER</b> (management effort worthwhile)	<b>AMBER</b> (manage and monitor)
	Low	<b>GREEN</b> (accept)	<b>GREEN</b> (accept/ review periodically)	<b>GREEN</b> (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					
C1 Our people	10. Failure to support staff going through a time of change	Refreshed existing managing change policy in place.	M x H  AMBER: manage and monitor	<p>a. Additional resources identified for HR</p> <p>b. Resilience training a key part of learning and development programme.</p> <p>c. Continuing implementation of internal communications plan.</p>	<b>Impact</b>	High	High	High	Medium		<p>a. Ongoing to end July 2016</p> <p>b. End Dec 2016</p> <p>c. End Dec 2016</p>	RMM (Director or of Corporate Strategy and Development)	<p>a. Director 1-2-1 with Head of HR</p> <p>b. Training reports in ¼ ly performance outturn</p> <p>c. Staff Committee/ UNISON/ MT discussion</p>	<p>a. resilience coaching sessions have been provided and we are now moving on to providing resilience for managers workshops in February .</p> <p>b. counselling support is available on request</p> <p>c. Communications with staff committee/ UNISON are constructive and positive.</p> <p>d. Programme of communication using different channels continues</p>
					<b>Likelihood</b>	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low					
					<b>Rating</b>	AMBER	AMBER	AMBER	GREEN					

# Appendix 2

## Q3 Corporate Risk Register 2016/17

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

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	15. Insufficient capacity to deliver the South West Peak project and secure additional match funding	Program me and project management processes in place.	M x H  AMBER: Manage and monitor	a. Recruitment to establishment agreed and progressing.  b. Match funding bids to be submitted	Impact	New at Q3			High		a. Mar '17  b. Mar '21	JRS (Director of Conservation and Planning)  SLT	Through Director of Conservation and Planning  SLT	New risk at Q3.	
				Likelihood					Medium						
				Rating					Amber						