

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015



| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|----|-------------------------|---|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| 1. | Reputation and Delivery | The timing of appointment(s) or changes within the new senior management structure does not provide for a streamlined transition resulting in capacity challenges within the senior team to deliver current priorities. | 4 | 5 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a confident and robust messaging campaign both internally and externally providing reassurance to stakeholders, staff and Board. Produce a transition/new structure and recruitment plan, incorporating changes to roles and new responsibilities/communications/handover/induction programme. | CEO and Convenor. | Current Status: Impact – 4, Likelihood – 4 = 16 The appointment of Gordon Watson as the CEO removes significant risk to the business. Structuring of the new senior team will take time to implement and embed, requiring astute management and continued excellent communication and engagement with staff and Board. |
| 2. | Reputation and Delivery | Your Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As result of the consultation process there is an unexpected surge of | 5 | 4 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to manage Your Park as a potentially high risk project incorporating regular project Board meetings and | Executive, Project Board and Board | Current Status: Impact – 4, Likelihood – 4 = 16 The recent public display of |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|--|----------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--|------------|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | negative feedback and campaigning against Your Park proposals resulting in damage to reputation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPA is perceived as not managing conflicts resulting in damage to reputation. • The volume of work required to manage the consultation process and subsequent implementation of byelaws is unsustainable resulting in delays to the project delivery and damage to reputation. • Partners fail to co-operate in delivering the project or do not support the proposals resulting in damage to | | | | monitoring by the Delivery Group. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to focus efforts into managing stakeholders over the next year. • Manage communication campaign to ensure full understanding of issues and intended outcomes • Prioritise staff resources into the delivery of a successful Your Park project, and reprioritise other projects, as necessary. • Continue to ensure that Board members and Executive staff exemplify good governance practice in complying with the | | disagreement with the Your Park consultation proposals reinforces the need to continue to prioritise opportunities for engagement with our communities and stakeholders. The robust and thoughtful analysis of consultation responses will be vital to reassure stakeholders of the integrity of the consultation process. The focus of work has shifted from managing the consultation process to analysis of responses and developing operational management planning, capital |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|----|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--|------------|--|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | reputation and delay in project delivery | | | | code of conduct in terms of conflicts or declaration of interest. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to review project timeline/milestones in light of tasks and resources Continue close partnership working to identify and foster excellent SG/Ministerial relationships and resolve issues at an early stage. | | development and policy thinking. A significant and intense level of staff resources continues to be prioritised to the various Your Park workstreams. |
| 3. | Financial and Delivery | Significant reduction in SG funding (Grant in Aid and/or Capital) resulting in the inability to deliver NPP and Corporate Plan objectives. | 5 | 5 | 25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to engage effectively with SG Sponsor Team, SG Ministers to maintain/enhance NPA reputation. Develop strategies to enhance alternative/additional sources of funding; SG year | Executive | Current Status: Impact – 5, Likelihood – 3 = 15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputation of the NPA within SG remains high. It is now very unlikely that |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015

| Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|----------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | | | | end/Shovel ready, charging schemes, commercial income, partnership funded projects, LEADER. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to deliver on NPP and Corporate Plans objectives to evidence excellence in delivery of SG priorities • Ongoing focus on and targeting of efficiency savings. | Director of Corporate Services | there will be any additional release of capital or revenue funding in the current financial year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2015-16 Annual Operational Plan explicitly refers to achievement of SG priorities and meeting SG agenda. • Within 2015-16, the draft Annual Operational Plan emphasises the need for innovative approaches to addressing priorities through effective partnership working and attracting alternative funding/grant sources. |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|----|-------------------------|---|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|
| | | | 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure every project embeds stakeholder engagement and management and a communications plan as part of project management. Ensure stakeholder consultation is meaningful and effective and support stakeholders' (Board/staff/business and local communities/Strategic Partners/SG/Ministers) capacity to respond. | Project Manager | Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 3 = 9 |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|----|------------------------|---|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to prioritise stakeholder engagement. | Executive Heads of Service | |
| 5. | Reputation and Finance | NPA does not deliver high-profile projects in accordance with the Project Plan, resulting in damage to reputation and loss/reduction of future funding opportunities. | 4 | 4 | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure experienced and competent Project Managers are allocated to all high-profile projects and there is capacity to deliver within the project team. Ensure project management methodologies are embedded, project risks are identified and managed. | Executive Project Manager | Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 3 = 9 (also refer to 2. above) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High reputation, financially and operationally significant projects continue to be reported and monitored by the Executive and the Delivery Group. These projects are; Your Park, LIVE Park, Pontoon and Gateway Centre. |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014

Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|----|-------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| 6. | Reputation and Finance | NPA does not achieve its aspirations for generating increased/new sources of income/profits or transference of costs to third parties as part of the commercialisation strategy, resulting in real-time reduction in turnover due to reducing availability of public funding thereby limited our capacity/ability to deliver NPA aims. | 4 | 3 | 12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to support and prioritise the identity and implementation of alternative/ongoing/new funding streams as a key strategy. Continue to engage with other like-minded NPAs throughout the UK to exploit opportunities for commercialisation joint working. | Executive Heads of Service | <p>Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 3 = 9</p> <p>The Executive recognise this in future years as a growing area of risk. Innovation and commercial thinking feature strongly in individual team and Park Authority-wide Annual Operational Plans.</p> |
| 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 | 4 | 4 | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update the Operational Plan on an annual basis to take into account any new/changing priorities and reflect this within the resource plans/budgets Ensure project management | Operational Managers Project Managers Project Managers | <p>Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 3 = 9</p> <p>The Draft 2015-16 Annual Operational Plan is being presented to the Delivery Group and Board with one of</p> |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015

| Category | Risk and Impact being delivered upon and negatively impacting our reputation. | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) the "Key Themes" being prioritisation of staffing resource and funding. |
|----------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--|--|---|
| | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | | | | <p>documentation fully considers staffing capacity, risks and interdependences/timescales for delivery so that the project plan highlights/addresses capacity issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly monitor and report on project plans and escalate issues, as necessary where key project objectives will be affected. 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. | <p>Executive Delivery Group/ Board</p> <p>HR Manager</p> | |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014

Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|----|-----------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---|----------------------|--|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embed an effective Staff Performance Development Review systems and processes. | Operational Managers | |
| 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 economic development potential, resulting in reduced SG support. | 3 | 4 | 12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With support from Board members, influence NP broadband technological development proposals at SG/Ministerial level. Facilitate communities to take advantage of funding streams and opportunities that support connectivity developments. | Executive Board | Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 4 = 12 |
| 9. | Systems and Processes | Sustained IT systems failure has a critical impact on NPAs service delivery. | 5 | 2 | 10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to build service robustness through shared service arrangements with | IT Manager | Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 2 = 6 |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|-----|----------|---|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--|------------|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | | | | | CNPA which includes backup, server infrastructure and staff capacity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate the key IT supported business systems (finance, telecommunications, email, e-Planning, primary data and website) into our business continuity plans. | | |
| 10. | Policy | Changes to the political landscape, key policies, SG priorities and agenda have a detrimental impact on the NPA's relevance to addressing National priorities, strategies and objectives and results in significant changes to NPP and Corporate Plans and funding. | 4 | 4 | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to ensure that NPP and Corporate Plan objectives are regularly reviewed, updated and clearly articulated to SG priorities. Continue to engage with ENFOR regarding policy thinking around Public Sector Reform. | Executive | Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 3 = 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new CEO is involved strategically in ENFOR discussions. The new CEO is successfully taking advantage of the range of |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|-----|------------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As referenced in 1. Continue to engage effectively with SG Sponsor Team, SG Ministers to maintain/enhance NPA reputation. As referenced in 2. Continue to prioritise stakeholder engagement. | | <p>opportunities to engage with our new Minister, SG Director and other key stakeholders to maintain our excellent reputation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a possibility that Scotland' National Parks will offer an excellent opportunity for ENFOR to exemplify and evidence genuine shared partnership working to deliver real benefits to our communities. |
| 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 | 5 | 4 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to engage effectively with SG Ministers to highlight relevance and to encourage/ broker continually improving partnership working. | Executive | Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 3 = 9 |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014

Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|-----|----------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | objectives and potentially resulting in a loss of reputation, credibility and funding. | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to prioritise stakeholder engagement, especially with IPA partners. Monitor and report on the delivery of the Individual Partnership Agreements. | | |
| 12. | Delivery | Staff Engagement is poor resulting in low morale and motivation and increased levels of staff turnover, sickness absence and ultimately has an adverse impact on our ability to deliver the NPP and Corporate Plans. | 4 | 4 | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to develop effective Heads of Service and Managers. Revise and update staffing policies to ensure their effectiveness and relevance. Ensure values and behaviours are understood, embraced and embedded throughout the organisation. Propose, implement and embed agreed actions in | Executive and specifically Director of Corporate Services | <p>Current Status: Impact –3, Likelihood – 2 = 6</p> <p>We are delighted that we have been recognised as one of the Top 100 not-for-profit companies to work for in the UK which is based on confidential feedback from 80% of our staff on how engaged they are.</p> |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|-----|----------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| | | | | | | response to the annual staff engagement survey feedback. | | |
| 13. | Board and Governance | Significant changes in Board membership results in loss of continuity in leadership, Board cohesiveness and direction. | 5 | 4 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with Board members to provide necessary, relevant and valuable induction, training and development. Introduce a “buddy” system for new Board members with experienced role models. | Convener and Executive | <p>Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 5 = 15</p> <p>The appointments to the roles of Vice Convener, Head of Planning and Access Committee and LRB will be critical appointments in maintaining an effective and high-performing Board.</p> <p>The induction of the new Ministerially appointed Board member will be a priority for the Convener and Governance Manager.</p> |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014

Progress Update: February 2015

| | Category | Risk and Impact | Original Rating | | | Action(s) to transfer, tolerate, treat and/or terminate the risk | Risk Owner | Progress Update (high risks only) |
|-----|----------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | Impact score | Likelihood score | Total Risk Score | | | |
| 14. | Board and Governance | The role and responsibilities of a NPA Board member are not clearly understood and therefore not consistently adopted by Board members resulting in conflicts of interest and personal priorities negatively impacting on the ability of the NPA to progress as a collective towards a shared agenda and priorities. | 4 | 4 | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement regular Board member training on the role and responsibilities of a Board member. Provide refresher training on the OnBoard guidance as it relates to NDPB Board members. Implement self-evaluation of Board members, the Board and Committees. Convener to continue to enhance and undertake effective Board Member appraisals. | Convener | <p>Current Status: Impact – 5, Likelihood – 3 = 15</p> <p>The refreshed OnBoard has not yet been published however it is recognised that we must push ahead with providing refresher training on the recently approved Code of Conduct</p> |
| 15. | Board and Governance | Collectively the Board does not have adequate coverage of skills and experience to deliver the required direction or | 4 | 3 | 12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the appointment/ election process, articulate, through communication and | Convener and Executive | <p>Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 2 = 6</p> |

National Park Authority

Corporate Risk Register

Approved: March 2014
 Progress Update: February 2015

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | governance scrutiny over the Executive team, potentially resulting in poor decision-making and inappropriate policies/strategies. | | | | engagement strategies, the skills sets and experience required for vacant posts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As in 12. Ongoing Board appraisal by Convener to identify training and development. | | |
| 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to be actively engaged in ANPA decision making to support and influence the national agenda. | Executive Head of Commercial Development | Current Status: Impact – 3, Likelihood – 3 = 9 |

| | | | | | |
|------------|---|----|----|----|----|
| 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

NPA – National Park Authority
 NP – National Park
 NPP Plan – National Park Partnership Plan
 SG – Scottish Government