# National Park Authority

# Corporate Risk Register

Risks from 2014-15 Register proposed to be removed from 2015-16 Register

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Current Status/ Reason(s) for suggested removal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| 4. | Delivery and Reputation | NPA does not adequately engage with and address stakeholder opinion in design/delivery/communication/ consultation of projects or initiatives resulting in non-delivery/delays to projects and damage to reputation. | 4 | 4 | 16 | • Ensure every project embeds stakeholder engagement and management and a communications plan as part of project management.<br>• Ensure stakeholder consultation is meaningful and effective and support stakeholders' (Board/staff/ business and local communities/Strategic Partners/SG/Ministers) capacity to respond.<br>• Continue to prioritise stakeholder engagement. | Project Manager<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Executive Heads of Service | Current Status:<br>Impact – 3, Likelihood – 2 = 6<br><br>• All projects are part of the revised Project Management process, which incorporates stakeholder engagement.<br>• All high risk projects are reported to the quarterly Delivery Group.<br>• The 2015-16 Register incorporates a risk around non-delivery of high risk projects.<br>• Recent engagements with stakeholders (Wild Park, LIVE Park and Your Park) |

# National Park Authority

# Corporate Risk Register

Risks from 2014-15 Register proposed to be removed from 2015-16 Register

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Current Status/ Reason(s) for suggested removal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | | | | | | | evidences a sound methodology is in place. |
| 7. | Delivery and Reputation | As a result of new and/or high volume of significant priorities/projects there is insufficient staff capability and capacity to deliver on expectations, resulting in projects/objectives/priorities not being delivered upon and negatively impacting our reputation. | 4 | 4 | 16 | • Update the Operational Plan on an annual basis to take into account any new/changing priorities and reflect this within the resource plans/budgets<br>• Ensure project management documentation fully considers staffing capacity, risks and interdependences/timescales for delivery so that the project plan highlights/addresses capacity issues.<br>• Regularly monitor and report on project plans and escalate issues, as necessary where key project objectives will be affected. | Operational Managers Project Managers<br><br>Project Managers<br><br><br><br>Executive Delivery Group/ Board | Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 3 = 9<br><br>• The 2015-16 Annual Operational Plan was prepared on the basis of deliverability with planned resources in place.<br>• Project Plans incorporate staffing resource requirements and a cross-team-working approach to delivery.<br>• Where new or significant changes to projects/ priorities result in staff capacity challenges this will |

# National Park Authority

# Corporate Risk Register

Risks from 2014-15 Register proposed to be removed from 2015-16 Register

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Current Status/ Reason(s) for suggested removal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | | | | | • Ongoing consideration of fixed term contracts and secondments for recruitment, supported by appropriate HR strategy and policies. Investment in training ongoing to support flexible deployment.<br>• Embed an effective Staff Performance Development Review systems and processes. | HR Manager<br><br><br><br><br><br>Operational Managers | be identified as a risk as part of the quarterly Executive review process. |
| 8. | Systems and Processes | Broadband and telecom technologies do not develop within the rural communities within the NP resulting in loss of visitors to the NP, impacting on ability to attract commercial, partnership and alternative funding streams, decline in | 3 | 4 | 12 | • With support from Board members, influence NP broadband technological development proposals at SG/Ministerial level.<br>• Facilitate communities to take advantage of funding streams and opportunities that support | Executive Board | Current Status:<br>Impact – 3, Likelihood – 2 = 6<br><br>• This is a Nationally led project where the NPA plays a supporting rather than a leading role.<br>• As part of SG's |

# National Park Authority

# Corporate Risk Register

Risks from 2014-15 Register proposed to be removed from 2015-16 Register

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Current Status/ Reason(s) for suggested removal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | economic development potential, resulting in reduced SG support. | | | | connectivity developments. | | "Programme for Government" there is a commitment to Scotland's Digital Future to ensure a world-class, future-proofed infrastructure across the whole of Scotland by 2020. |
| 9. | Systems and Processes | Sustained IT systems failure has a critical impact on NPAs service delivery. | 5 | 2 | 10 | • Continue to build service robustness through shared service arrangements with CNPA which includes backup, server infrastructure and staff capacity.<br>• Incorporate the key IT supported business systems (finance, telecommunications, email, e-Planning, primary data and website) into our business continuity plans. | IT Manager | Current Status:<br>Impact – 3, Likelihood – 2 = 6<br><br>• At the end of 2013-14 we were able to invest in our backup and infrastructure hardware.<br>• A revised and robust business continuity plan was implemented in 2014-15<br>• Excellent levels of IT |

# National Park Authority

# Corporate Risk Register

Risks from 2014-15 Register proposed to be removed from 2015-16 Register

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Current Status/ Reason(s) for suggested removal |
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | systems uptime evidence robust processes are in place. <br>• Instances of system problems as a result of unsupported or outdated versions of software (e-Planning/website/ telecommunications) have been well managed so that they have not resulted in any critical impact. |
| 11. | Reputation | Our Key Partners do not engage with the delivery of the NPP Plan "priorities for action" impacting on our ability to deliver on priorities and objectives and potentially resulting in a loss of reputation, | 5 | 4 | 20 | • Continue to engage effectively with SG Ministers to highlight relevance and to encourage/ broker continually improving partnership working. <br>• Continue to prioritise stakeholder engagement, | Executive | Current Status: <br>Impact – 3, Likelihood – 2 = 6 <br><br>• We have evidenced high levels of engagement with Key Partners over the last year. |

# National Park Authority

# Corporate Risk Register

Risks from 2014-15 Register proposed to be removed from 2015-16 Register

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Current Status/ Reason(s) for suggested removal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Original Rating | | | | |
| | | credibility and funding. | | | | especially with IPA partners. <br>• Monitor and report on the delivery of the Individual Partnership Agreements. | | • Stakeholder engagement driven by the changes in SG; new FM, Minister, Director, new/acting CEOs is enabling excellent opportunities for effective partnership working. <br>• The formation of the RAFE Delivery Group has a focused vision and mission which will drive joint delivery. <br>• The delivery of "Your Park" continues to support the focus of joint delivery with our Key Partners. |
| 12. | Delivery | Staff Engagement is poor resulting in low morale and motivation and increased levels | 4 | 4 | 16 | • Continue to develop effective Heads of Service and Managers. | Executive and specifically | Current Status: <br>Impact –3, Likelihood – 2 = 6 |

# National Park Authority

# Corporate Risk Register

Risks from 2014-15 Register proposed to be removed from 2015-16 Register

| Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Current Status/ Reason(s) for suggested removal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | of staff turnover, sickness absence and ultimately has an adverse impact on our ability to deliver the NPP and Corporate Plans. | | | | • Revise and update staffing polices to ensure their effectiveness and relevance.<br>• Ensure values and behaviours are understood, embraced and embedded throughout the organisation.<br>• Propose, implement and embed agreed actions in response to the annual staff engagement survey feedback. | Director of Corporate Services | • The annual Best Companies staff engagement survey has identified us as a Top 100 not-for-profit company to work for in the UK.<br>• A number of key staffing policies have been revised and enhanced over the year.<br>• The revised "My Performance Review" system incorporating annual review and monthly one-to-ones and refreshed values and behaviours have been rolled out throughout the Park.<br>• Staff absences are being |

# National Park Authority

# Corporate Risk Register

Risks from 2014-15 Register proposed to be removed from 2015-16 Register

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Current Status/ Reason(s) for suggested removal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | | | | | | | actively managed. |
| 15. | Board and Governance | Collectively the Board does not have adequate coverage of skills and experience to deliver the required direction or governance scrutiny over the Executive team, potentially resulting in poor decision-making and inappropriate policies/strategies. | 4 | 3 | 12 | • As part of the appointment/ election process, articulate, through communication and engagement strategies, the skills sets and experience required for vacant posts.<br>• As in 12. Ongoing Board appraisal by Convener to identify training and development. | Convener and Executive | Current Status:<br>Impact – 3, Likelihood – 2 = 6<br><br>• The recent Ministerial appointment process incorporated a skills matrix as part of the recruitment and selection process. |
| NEW | Reputation and Finance | National commercial sponsorship through ANPA does not achieve its aspirations for generating sponsorship income or does not align with our NPA aims or objectives. | 3 | 3 | 9 | • Continue to be actively engaged in ANPA decision making to support and influence the national agenda. | Executive Head of Commercial Develop-ment | Current Status:<br>Impact – 3, Likelihood – 2 = 6<br><br>• The reliance on sponsorship income in 2015-16 is low.<br>• The risk of National Parks sponsorship not aligning to |

# National Park Authority

# Corporate Risk Register

Risks from 2014-15 Register proposed to be removed from 2015-16 Register

| | | | | | | | | our aims or objectives is low. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | |

| Impact | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Likelihood

| High |
|---|
| Medium |
| Low |

Acronyms
HLF – Heritage Lottery Fund
LEADER – French meaning: Links between actions for the development of the rural economy
NPA – National Park Authority
NP – National Park
NPP Plan – National Park Partnership Plan
RAFE - Rural Affairs, Food and the Environment
SG – Scottish Government