

Rank	Risk	Total Risk (Impact x Likelihood)	Lead	Progress Update / Action Taken
1	Our partners do not contribute the financial resources or support required to deliver the National Park Plan outcomes.	20.2	HT	Mid-term review carried out with partners to agree mutual priorities and focus for remaining two years of NPP. Remains a real risk as budget cuts take hold – requires ongoing engagement from MT members and other staff to keep in touch with partners’ funding positions.
2	Partners do not commit to deliver their elements of National Park Plan.	19.8	HT	Mid-term review to agree with partners their priorities in NPP delivery for the next two years has reduced risk. Primary risk now probably financial as above.
4	Our partners do not demonstrate leadership behaviours in relation to the NP so that we collectively achieve the Park Plan Vision.	18.4	HT	2009 Strategy Group meeting and mid-term review reinforced expectation on partners. An increasing risk as time goes on and partners assume that they can step back as CNPA established – and as budgets reduce, a risk of partner focus shifting to central belt priorities. Key opportunity to use the Ministerial Strategy Group to reinforce expectation on partners to lead in relevant areas.
5	Flagship planning and development cases do not deliver the high standards expected leading to loss in public confidence.	17.2	DM	We are currently reviewing all aspects of our development management process to ensure both the soundness and quality of decisions. Internal Audit is carrying out some work which will feed into this. We are progressing the Local Plan and Supplementary Guidance (especially Design Guide) as quickly as possible. This will give a more robust context for decisions.
6	The Authority's limited cash and staff resources are too stretched by 46 differing achievements and consequently we fail to deliver a substantial number of achievements by March	17.2	JH	MT planning day on 19 Nov to address priorities and organisational structure, as well as consequences of potential budget reductions. Paper to Board on mid-

Rank	Risk	Total Risk (Impact x Likelihood)	Lead	Progress Update / Action Taken
	2011.			term health check on NP Plan
7	Reduction in EU funding for future programmes.	17.2	DC	Remains a very real risk, both in terms of reducing availability of funds from EU and also lack of match funding from potential partners. Movement to work through a Charitable Trust structure for access appears to be successful in opening up routes to funding not previously open to the CNPA as an NDPB – consider as a model for other areas of activity. Investing staff time in HIPP decision-making structures in order to maintain awareness of policy developments and seek to influence investment in CNP where possible and appropriate to do so.
8	CNPA does not achieve the sought after national profile for the park.	17.2	DC	<p>The CNPA communications team is implementing a number of measures (that will build on and develop its current work) that will raise its profile both locally and nationally and highlight NPs importance and contribution to Scotland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A campaign-led communication strategy which will focus on key messages, events and other activities (including working with national and specialist media) during the year; • Working with LLTTNP to identify opportunities to raise the profile of NPs and their contribution/importance to Scotland • Working with UK National Parks and SEARS partners to identify opportunities to celebrate and promote CNP at a national level <p>This will work alongside the current web, media and events activities undertaken by the comms team.</p>

Rank	Risk	Total Risk (Impact x Likelihood)	Lead	Progress Update / Action Taken
9	Lack of public understanding of CNPA objectives.	16.9	DC	See comments in risk 8 (above). Review format of annual report and NPP progress report. Ongoing work on Parklife, press releases and e-bulletin to communicate objectives. Review of Coms Team structure and move towards Web Officer and more inter-active web communication methods. Providing support to staff and board that will allow them to interact with key audiences regarding the CNPA's objectives and achievements in these areas.
10	Developments which damage the special qualities of the Park through lack of enforcement.	16.8	DM	We have an enforcement officer and enforcement charter in place. Compliance with planning permission and monitoring of development without planning permission are being rigorously pursued.
11	Managers and staff do not place sufficient regard on the Corporate Plan and the 46 achievements when planning resource deployment, and consequently we fail to deliver a substantial number of achievements by March 2011.	16.6	JH	To be addressed through annual Operational planning round, and papers to Board, including regular reports on NP Plan delivery (3x year)
13	The Park's special qualities may be undermined due to Government pressure to encourage development.	15.6	DM	The aims of the Park and the National Park Plan (which reflects the special qualities) will be at the heart of the local plan and supplementary guidance which in turn will be used as the basis for determining applications for planning permission. Structures are therefore in place to address this risk.
14	Development of a sustainable design guide is delayed to an extent that it is not possible to demonstrate its contribution to supporting consistently high standards in design by 2011.	15.6	DM	Design guide to be published, consulted on and eventually adopted in September 2010. It will be able to make a modest contribution to raising standards for 2011. In the years following 2011 there will be a

Rank	Risk	Total Risk (Impact x Likelihood)	Lead	Progress Update / Action Taken
				more significant impact.
15	Failing to exploit IT functionality.	14.6	DC	Development strategy for IT services being drawn up to build on move to SNH network, once this implemented by end Autumn 2009
16	Incorporation of Highland Perthshire into the Park slows or complicates delivery due to further consultation on strategies or policies in that area.	14.5	MF	Ongoing programme of liaison with Perth and Kinross Council. Encouraging communities to engage with SG led consultation exercises. Priority work is on boundary markers with Board paper in January. Strategic work is already being adopted to take account of planned expansion of Park.
17	Financial resources are not made available by the Government because of their changing priorities leading to an inability to deliver the Corporate Plan.	14.3	DC	Draft 2010/11 budget appears broadly in line with expectation. Financial modelling developed to manage future uncertainty. MT meeting Nov 09 to focus on long-term priorities.
18	The rural economy continues to deteriorate.	14.2	HT	CNP priorities in this context clearly expressed through mid-term review. Investment and support being given to business community through CBP to build their capacity and resilience. Economic Baseline Study and Business Barometer provide basis for further analysis of where intervention/support may be required – to be addressed explicitly through NPP and LDP development.
19	Dissatisfaction with and legal challenge to, planning decisions.	14	DM	All procedures being reviewed and local plan will be adopted late 2010. The soundness of decisions will be further enhanced and less likely to be challenged.
20	Realignment of the public sector leads to inertia in the bodies	13.9	HT	No significant change emerging at present. Minor

Rank	Risk	Total Risk (Impact x Likelihood)	Lead	Progress Update / Action Taken
	required to deliver the Park Plan.			realignments in SNH and SEPA having some impact in delaying implementation of more effective planning arrangements but not a significant effect.
21	We do not secure the buy in of land managers to deliver a range of outcomes within the National Park Plan	13.9	HT	Ongoing communications with land managers developing. Establishment of Farmers Forum connects with a key group with which we needed more contact. Revised Land Management Forum in 2010 will be another mechanism to secure ongoing buy-in and reduce risk.
22	Major external initiatives or enquiries dilute resource availability and have adverse effect on delivery of goals.	13.9	MT	Ongoing MT and HR review of resource allocation. Ongoing monitoring of Corporate Plan delivery to help assess whether any adverse inputs on delivery.
23	The reputation of CNPA is adversely affected through inadequate enforcement of planning decisions.	13.9	DM	See 10.
24	We are unable to show change over the course of the Park Plan period due to inadequate monitoring/data provision which undermines confidence in its delivery.	13.7	HT	Remains a risk. Being tackled in some areas, notably through Economic Baseline Study. Forthcoming Sustainable Tourism Strategy redevelopment will also contribute. Action still required to draw together a headline set of indicators.
25	Lack of project management skills.	13.6	DC	Significant previous training in this area will continue to be followed up by HR review of training requirements from appraisals.
27	Tourism businesses do not engage with the concept of the National Park in a meaningful and effective way [added by Audit Cttee Apr 09)	13.3	HT	Being addressed primarily through support of the CBP and work packages including 'Park Aware'. Redevelopment of the Sustainable Tourism Strategy in 2010 is a key opportunity to build this engagement and reduce the risk.
new	Relatively small scale of organisation makes delivery vulnerable to losing staff and does not give scope for sufficient		MT	Monitoring turnover/retention statistics. Work with LLT NPA in past to provide absence cover in key

Rank	Risk	Total Risk (Impact x Likelihood)	Lead	Progress Update / Action Taken
	spare capacity to cover staff losses or long-term absences			corporate ideas.