## Appendix 1 – Proposed 2017/18 Corporate Risk Register

The following 2017/18 Corporate Risk Register has been developed through an assessment of the risks to achieving year two of our 2016-2019 corporate strategy. This assessment has also included an assessment of:

- 2016/17 corporate risks remaining at amber at the 2016/17 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.

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 for the White Peak, including engaging with the farming community and land managers	<ul> <li>Follow a clear quality process</li> <li>Ensure clear strategic vision for what we want to achieve</li> <li>Log of who to involve</li> <li>Explore using the White Peak as a Brexit case study – SLF with National Trust &amp; Natural England</li> </ul>	High Impact Medium Likelihood	AMBER	JRS
Shift 1 the place and the park on a landscape scale	2. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding	<ul> <li>Capping Sterling budget</li> <li>Using budget to map against hedging transaction</li> </ul>	Medium Impact Medium Likelihood	AMBER	PN
Shift 1 the place and the park on a landscape scale	3. Insufficient capacity to deliver Moors for the Future Partnership programme	<ul> <li>Programme and project management processes in place, including Strategic Management Group and project board</li> <li>Partner analysis</li> <li>Advocacy plan based on partner analysis</li> <li>Compliance monitoring of existing controls</li> </ul>	Medium Impact Low Likelihood	GREEN	JRS
Shift 1 the place and the park on a landscape scale	4. Area of NP land safeguarded in agri- environment schemes reduces because of Brexit uncertainty and continuing issues with Countryside	<ul> <li>National influencing for post Brexit agri/ environmental policies and support systems</li> <li>Local communications across the farming &amp; land management</li> </ul>	High Impact High Likelihood	RED	JRS

## Table 1: Proposed 2017/18 corporate risks and position at start of year

	Otaura mela la la	in dura t			
Shift 2 Connectin	Stewardship 5. Failure to inspire people to give to the	<ul> <li>industry</li> <li>NPMP work</li> <li>Increase promotion of the service provided, working closely with other agencies such as NFU, CLA, NE, EA, FC.</li> <li>Public payment for public goods/ benefits</li> <li>Influencing role through PDNPA links and NPE's Future of Farming</li> <li>Commercial Development &amp;</li> </ul>	Medium Impact	AMBER	SM
g people to the place	Peak District National Park Authority	<ul> <li>Outreach strategic plan</li> <li>Commercial Development &amp; Outreach Operational plan</li> <li>Authority-approved budget</li> <li>Implementation of plan</li> </ul>	High Likelihood		
Shift 4 Grow our income and supporters	6. Failure to implement the integrated strategic commercial plan	<ul> <li>Commercial Development &amp; Outreach strategic plan</li> <li>Commercial Development &amp; Outreach Operational plan</li> <li>Authority-approved budget</li> <li>Full suite of HoS to drive delivery in place by Q2</li> <li>Full suite of managers and Tier 5 resource in place and integrated by Q4</li> </ul>	High Impact Medium Likelihood	AMBER	SM
Cornersto ne 1 Our people	7. Failure to design the organisation at all levels so it has the skills and capability to deliver	<ul> <li>Corporate Strategy 2016-19 in place</li> <li>Design principles in place</li> <li>Job description and person specification templates</li> <li>Competency framework</li> <li>Experience gained and shared from tier 2 and 3 design</li> <li>Change process understood by managers and good practice shared</li> <li>Qualified HR team and Learning &amp; Development Officer to coach and give</li> </ul>	High Impact Low Likelihood	AMBER	DH

		guidance			
Cornersto ne 1 Our people	8. Failure to support staff going through a time of change	Clear comms on change Ir     UNISON & Staff	Aedium mpact Aedium .ikelihood	AMBER	DH
Cornersto ne 2 Our services	9. Failure to deliver an integrated conservation service for land managers and communities which increases awareness, understanding and support for the National Park's special qualities and the public goods delivered by the place	<ul> <li>Existing advice service M delivered by teams Ir</li> <li>Neighbourhood and M</li> </ul>	Aedium mpact Aedium .ikelihood	AMBER	JRS
Cornersto ne 3 Our organisati on	10. Failure to influence the transposing of EU laws and legislation for landscape and the environment into UK law after Article 50	Failure to influence the transposing of EU laws and legislation for	ligh mpact .ow .ikelihood	AMBER	SF
Cornersto ne 4 our people	11. Failure to deliver against our Performance and Business Plan in a time of change	OLT in place     Pacing delivery with capacity	Aedium kelihood Aedium mpact	AMBER	SF

•	<ul> <li>JPAR guidance to have regular meetings with line manager to monitor and prioritise work</li> <li>Wellbeing at work policy &amp; agenda to promote smarter working practice</li> </ul>		
---	--	--	--

	•	closely monitor	manage and monitor	significant focus	
IMPACT	High	<ul> <li>3. Insufficient capacity to deliver Moors for the Future Partnership programme</li> <li>7. Failure to design the organisation at all levels so it has the skills and capability to deliver</li> <li>10. Failure to influence the transposing of EU laws and legislation for landscape and the environment into UK law after Article 50</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Failure to create a common understanding for the White Peak, including engaging with the farming community and land managers</li> <li>Failure to implement the integrated strategic commercial plan</li> </ol>	4. Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of Brexit uncertainty and continuing issues with Countryside Stewardship	
	Medium	<u>accept but monitor</u>	<ul> <li><u>management effort worthwhile</u></li> <li>2. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding</li> <li>8. Failure to support staff going through a time of change</li> <li>9. Failure to deliver an integrated conservation service for land managers and communities which increases awareness, understanding and support for the National Park's special qualities and the public goods delivered by the place</li> <li>11. Failure to deliver against our Performance and Business Plan in a time of change</li> </ul>	<u>manage and</u> <u>monitor</u> 5. Failure to inspire people to give to the Peak District National Park Authority	
	Low	<u>accept risks</u>	accept but review periodically	<u>accept but</u> <u>monitor</u>	
		Low	Medium	High	
		LIKELIHOOD			

## Table 2: 2017/18 Corporate Risk Register – risk starting point following existing mitigating action