

## Risk Register and Records

Risk Category	Risk Description	Current Status	Planned Status
<b>External Forces</b>	1. Inability to maintain and conserve the built historic environment : craft skills	Extreme	Extreme
	2. Inability to maintain and conserve the built historic environment : knowledge	Extreme	Extreme
	3. Inability to maintain and conserve the built historic environment : materials	Extreme	Extreme
	4. Loss of reputation	High	High
	5. Failure of Pay Negotiations	High	Low
<b>Stakeholders</b>	6. Poor definition and assessment of stakeholder relationship leading to a lack of understanding, lack of support and poor working relationships.	Extreme	High
	7. Absence or loss of stakeholders or partners.	Extreme	High
<b>Business Processes</b>	8. Poor quality information system for controlling statutory casework handling.	Extreme	Moderate
	9. Lack of/poor disaster planning/continuity - PIC	High	Moderate
	10. Lack of business continuity planning – key IT systems	Extreme	Moderate
<b>Internal Forces</b>	11. Lack of resources to shift towards “upstream” engagement in statutory casework and statutory protection processes.	Extreme	Moderate
	12. Poor quality internal management information systems leading to poor	Extreme	High

	management control and ability to respond to performance/resource issues.		
	13. Poor access to training resources to allow culture change, business improvement and succession planning (eg management and customer services training).	Extreme	Moderate
	14. Inability to recruit / retain key staff - ISU	Extreme	Moderate
<b>Core Services</b>	15. Failure to meet obligations as SEA/EIA Consultation Authority	High	High

**Risk**  
 Inability to maintain and conserve the built historic environment : craft skills

**Owner**  
 TCRE - HSCB Manager

**Item #**  
 1. External Forces

**Cause**

- Lack of craft skills
- Lack of cross agency communication and shared objectives in formulated strategy.

**Controls**

- TCRE continue to influence and facilitate Scottish craft skills, materials and knowledge initiatives.
- SCFTE, Learn Direct and Build.

**Assessment**  
 Significant and fundamental risk to our activity as an Agency. Some progress being made but in a narrow spectrum.

**Further Actions**

- HS Craft skills initiatives – Fellowship and Internship programmes – alter focus.
- HLF Bursary Scheme.
- Use the findings of the 2006 HS NHTG craft skills audit to direct Fellowship programme.
- Work with NHTG and develop formal sector skills agreement.

**Reporting Mechanism**  
 Group Meeting How do you report this to SMT?

Consequence Assessment				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			*	

Likelihood Assessment				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
				*

Overall Risk Rating			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
			*

**Risk**  
 Inability to maintain and conserve the built historic environment : specialist technical knowledge

**Owner**  
 HSCB Manager - TCRE

**Item #**  
 2. External Forces

- Cause**
- Lack of specialist technical knowledge
  - Lack of cross agency communication and shared objectives in formulated strategy.
  - Resources to fund research.

- Controls**
- TCRE continue to influence and facilitate Scottish craft skills, materials and knowledge initiatives.
  - Research programme
  - Outreach activity (seminars, conferences, lectures).

**Assessment**  
 Significant and fundamental risk to our activity. Good research undertaken to date. Delivery to a wider audience is the major challenge.

- Further Actions**
- Information and knowledge sharing via publications, electronic and outreach activity.
  - Participate in developing Agency research strategy
  - Outreach activity via City Heritage Trusts.
  - Use HSCC specialisms to train and influence others.

**Reporting Mechanism**  
 Group Meeting

Consequence Assessment				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			*	

Likelihood Assessment				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
				*

Overall Risk Rating			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
			*

<b>Risk</b>
Inability to maintain and conserve the built historic environment : materials

<b>Owner</b>
TCRE Director

<b>Item #</b>
3. External Forces

<b>Cause</b>
Lack of materials Lack of cross agency communication and shared objectives in formulated strategy.

<b>Controls</b>
TCRE continue to influence and facilitate Scottish craft skills, materials and knowledge initiatives. Research to understand materials needs and availability. SSLG

<b>Assessment</b>
Significant and fundamental risk to our activity. Often poor understanding of material needs and conflicting policy (e.g. quarrying activity) in SE

<b>Further Actions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS Craft skills initiatives to consider material supply chain needs.</li> <li>• Use the findings of the 2006 HS NHTG craft skills audit to further explore this area.</li> <li>• Information and knowledge sharing via publications, electronic and outreach activity.</li> <li>• Continue to pilot work in key materials – stone, timber, metals.</li> </ul>

<b>Reporting Mechanism</b>
Group Meeting

<b>Consequence Assessment</b>				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			*	

<b>Likelihood Assessment</b>				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
				*

<b>Overall Risk Rating</b>			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
			*

Risk
Loss of reputation

Owner
Pat Connor –Press and Communications

Item #
4. External Forces

Cause
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targeted media campaign</li> <li>• Failure to engage effectively with stakeholders.</li> <li>• Decisions by the Inspectorate.</li> <li>• Decisions to award/not award grant funding.</li> <li>• Targeted campaigns by pressure/interest groups or individuals.</li> </ul>

Controls
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C&amp;M attends Policy Group and Inspectorate management meetings to identify potential risks.</li> <li>• Head of C&amp;M (HC&amp;M) sits on the Senior Management Team</li> <li>• Stakeholder Management Group chaired by HC&amp;M.</li> <li>• Programme of awareness raising at a local level through exhibitions and local history bodies.</li> <li>• Web – major platform for the agency to counter misinformation.</li> <li>• Regular contact between C&amp;M and members of agency staff involved in the decision-making process.</li> </ul>

Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most actions and decisions made by the agency have the potential to damage reputation.</li> <li>• Head of C&amp;M attends SMT, but not HSB. This is a potential weak spot, which could result in failure to identify risk.</li> <li>• C&amp;M has a number of separate mechanisms in place to identify and deal with potential risk to reputation. These mechanisms work in support of each other to minimise risk.</li> </ul>

Further Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open and transparent communication</li> <li>• A high degree of public involvement</li> <li>• Proportionate and consistent decision-making</li> <li>• Ensuring that communication is integrated into policy-making and working to improve involvement of the public in policy-making.</li> <li>• Recognising the role of communications in building trust and managing the risks to reputation, and making links between communications and overall strategic aim.</li> <li>• Working towards increased openness and transparency in communicating with the public.</li> </ul>

**Reporting Mechanism**

Members of the Communications team attend meeting of the Policy Group and Inspectorate management groups to identify potential areas of risk. Any potential risk is brought to the attention of SMT, either by HC&M at meetings of the SMT or immediately if the matter is urgent.

Consequence Assessment				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			x	

Likelihood Assessment				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
			x	

Overall Risk Rating			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
		x	

<b>Risk</b>
Failed Pay Negotiations

<b>Owner</b>
HR Policy Manager

<b>Item #</b>
5.

<b>Cause</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient funding to support an appropriate settlement</li> <li>• Militant Trade Union</li> <li>• Limited bargaining scope</li> <li>• Inadequate planning</li> <li>• Poor negotiation skills</li> </ul>

<b>Controls</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robust paybill model – not yet in place</li> <li>• Clear bargaining position supported by Senior Management Team – not yet in place</li> <li>• Proper planning and preparation, including pay remit clearance from SE Admin and Finance</li> <li>• Experienced negotiating team</li> <li>• Good relationship with Trade Union representatives</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current negotiation teams is experienced</li> <li>• Early and informed preparation is underway</li> <li>• SE have not agreed for 2005/6 yet</li> </ul>

<b>Further Actions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain close links with SE Main and other Agencies/Departments pay negotiations/strategies</li> <li>• Brief and consult SMT on HS negotiating remit.</li> </ul>

<b>Reporting Mechanism</b>
SMT will be kept informed of progress

<b>Consequence Assessment</b>				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			✓	

<b>Likelihood Assessment</b>				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
		✓		

<b>Overall Risk Rating</b>			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
		✓	

**Risk**  
 Poor definition and assessment of stakeholder relationship leading to a lack of understanding, lack of support and poor working relationships.

**Owner**  
 Directors of Policy, TCRE and PIC and the Chief Inspector all have responsibility for stakeholders. The Inspectorate view this risk as extreme.

**Item #**  
 6. Stakeholders

**Cause**  
 • Poor relationship definition and curation

**Controls**  
 • Definition, prioritisation and monitoring by team leaders.  
 • Monitoring of adverse comments.

**Assessment**  
 Some weaknesses

**Further Actions**  
 Training for team leaders and integration of monitoring into team leaders' forward job descriptions.

**Reporting Mechanism**  
 Management team meetings and 1:1s

Consequence Assessment				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			*	

Likelihood Assessment				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
			*	

Overall Risk Rating			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
			*

Risk
Absence or loss of networking stakeholders or partners, and succession planning.

Owner
TCRE Group Director

Item #
7. Stakeholders

Cause
Retiral of Group Director Resourcing issues (staff time) leading to low profile of TCRE staff in outside world.

Controls
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development and raise profile of senior staff with key stakeholders and partners.</li> <li>• Encourage Group philosophy to be outward looking, enabling and providing support.</li> <li>• Continue to develop and refresh formal networking groups.</li> <li>• Ensure staff stability an operational structure.</li> </ul>

Assessment
Significant risk, but manageable

Further Actions
Identify future key staff for development

Reporting Mechanism
Group Meeting

Consequence Assessment				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			*	

Likelihood Assessment				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
			*	

Overall Risk Rating			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
			*

**Risk**  
 Poor quality information system for controlling statutory casework handling.

**Owner**  
 Director of Casework - Inspectorate

**Item #**  
 8.

**Cause**  
 Existing system does not fully meet requirements

**Controls**  
 • New system to be put in place

**Assessment**  
 System is in place but must be upgraded / amended

**Further Actions**  
 Scope develop and implement new computer-based system

**Reporting Mechanism**  
 To senior management team

Consequence Assessment				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			*	

Likelihood Assessment				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	
			*	

Overall Risk Rating			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
			*

<b>Risk</b>
Lack of major incident planning - PIC.

<b>Owner</b>
PIC Regional Architect - Gregor Stark

<b>Item #</b>
9. Business Processes

<b>Cause</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural or other disaster on site leading to loss of fabric or dangerous situation.</li> </ul>

<b>Controls</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disaster preparedness process being established.</li> <li>Regional call-out processes in place.</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are currently exposed in this area more than others and, whilst the risk will ultimately be moderate to low, our current exposure deems it as currently 'High'.</li> </ul>

<b>Further Actions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue with current disaster preparedness plan</li> <li>Develop strong links from Regional call-out procedures to national PIC coverage.</li> <li>Link PIC work to overall agency call-out planning (yet to be finalised).</li> </ul>

<b>Reporting Mechanism</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Through Regions to PICMG and, ultimately SMT.</li> </ul>

<b>Consequence Assessment</b>				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
		x		

<b>Likelihood Assessment</b>				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
			x	

<b>Overall Risk Rating</b>			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
		x	

**Risk**  
Lack of resources to shift towards “upstream” engagement in statutory casework and statutory protection processes.

**Owner**  
Chief Inspector

**Item #**  
10. Internal Forces

**Cause**  
• Inflexibility in current structures and resources.

**Controls**  
• Not identified

**Assessment**  
Controls do not exist

**Further Actions**  
Discussion with Chief Executive and Director of Finance

**Reporting Mechanism**  
with Chief Executive and SMT

Consequence Assessment				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			*	

Likelihood Assessment				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	
			*	

Overall Risk Rating			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
			*

Risk
Poor quality internal management information systems leading to poor management control and ability to respond to performance/resource issues.

Owner
Director of Casework Inspectorate

Item #
11.

Cause
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor it systems and lack of investment</li> </ul>

Controls
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>

Assessment
No Controls in place

Further Actions
Identify upgraded systems

Reporting Mechanism
To Inspectorate Management Team

Consequence Assessment				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			*	

Likelihood Assessment				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	
			*	

Overall Risk Rating			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
			*

**Risk**  
 Poor access to training resources to allow culture change, business improvement and succession planning (eg management and customer services training).

**Owner**  
 Head of Strategy - Inspectorate

**Item #**  
 12.

**Cause**  
 • Poor definition and investment

**Controls**  
 • none

**Assessment**  
 No Controls in place

**Further Actions**  
 Identification and implementation of long-term management training programme across all Inspectorate staff

**Reporting Mechanism**  
 To Inspectorate Management Team

Consequence Assessment				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			*	

Likelihood Assessment				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	
			*	

Overall Risk Rating			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
			*

<b>Risk</b>
Failure to meet obligations as SEA/EIA Consultation Authority

<b>Owner</b>
Head of Development Assessment - Policy Group

<b>Item #</b>
13.

<b>Cause</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rising demand in a rapidly developing/changing area</li> <li>• Lack of staff resources</li> <li>• Poor staff understanding/training to keep abreast of the subject area</li> <li>• Complexity of cases received</li> </ul>

<b>Controls</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective caseload statistics and analysis</li> <li>• Prioritising work</li> <li>• Keeping staff resources under review</li> <li>• Continuous on the job staff training to meet rapidly changing circumstances</li> <li>• Mentoring/sharing and learning from experience</li> <li>• Effective line management</li> <li>• Standardise procedures where feasible and appropriate</li> <li>• Agreed procedures for engaging with Inspectorate (SEA)</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment</b>
Some weaknesses

<b>Further Actions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve casework statistics and analysis</li> <li>• Formalise internal reporting mechanisms</li> <li>• Strengthen HS policy in areas of marine, coastal and historic landscape policy</li> </ul>

<b>Reporting Mechanism</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly staff meetings to review work load/flow and any new initiatives</li> <li>• Formal 6 monthly Report to Director of Policy on EIA and SEA work undertaken together with early briefing on key issues as they arise throughout the year.</li> </ul>

<b>Consequence Assessment</b>				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			x	

<b>Likelihood Assessment</b>				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	
		x		

<b>Overall Risk Rating</b>			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
		x	

<b>Risk</b>
Inability to recruit, retain and develop staff – resulting in the non-delivery of HS objectives.

<b>Owner</b>
Director of HR

<b>Item #</b>
14. Possible Risk

<b>Cause</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Competitive labour market – difficulty in recruiting &amp; retaining qualified/experienced staff</li><li>• Staff turnover and loss of specialist knowledge &amp; skills</li><li>• Diverse nature of the work – HS has to compete in a wide employment market</li><li>• Poor perception of public sector pay &amp; conditions</li><li>• Incorrect recruitment decisions</li><li>• Lack of development opportunities /CPD investment.</li></ul>

<b>Controls</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use of appropriate mixed economy of advertising (eg specialist press, web; national and local press)</li><li>• Trained recruitment panels, supported by HR</li><li>• Staffing Committee approval required for all new posts and vacancies</li><li>• Performance Management System (covering probation; capability; performance review &amp; development; competency framework)</li><li>• In-house training &amp; development team</li><li>• Training Plan produced to ensure staff are aware of developmental opportunities</li><li>• Specialised skills &amp; apprenticeship schemes in operation</li><li>• Exit interviews held with all leavers</li><li>• Statistics maintained on turnover; absences; accidents at work.</li></ul>

<b>Assessment</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sound controls already in place, but important further developments planned.</li></ul>

<b>Further Actions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Development of a total reward system</li><li>• Development of an Alternative Working Pattern policy</li><li>• More detailed analysis of the reasons for turnover of staff &amp; absences</li><li>• Negotiate and implement pay settlements that reflect market forces, subject to public sector pay policy constraints you can't deliver this so don't offer it as potential solution</li><li>• Respond, as appropriate, to issues on pay &amp; conditions raised in Staff Surveys likewise.</li></ul>

### Reporting Mechanism

- Annual Report to HSB (due in July '06), including Training & Development Report
- Training Board meets 4 times each year
- All new HR policies are approved by SMT
- SMT kept aware of key issues on pay, central HR initiatives (eg professional skills for government)
- HR Managers attend Group Management Teams Meetings, as required
- T & D Manager supports Groups in the development of Training Plans.

Consequence Assessment				
Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
		✓		

Likelihood Assessment				
Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
		✓		

Overall Risk Rating			
Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
	✓		

Consequence Definitions		Financial	Effort		Reputation		
		Cost	Time Management Effort	Customers	Ministerial/ Govt.	Media	Health and Safety
5	Catastrophic	Requires significant additional funding (£5m on top of current funding)	An incident with potential to threaten viability of Historic Scotland	Catastrophic effect on customer relationships and loss of key contracts.	Serious long term disruption to ministerial confidence	Extensive negative national media coverage	Staff or public fatalities
4	Major	Requires additional funding beyond normal arrangements (£1m on top of current funding)	A critical event which with proper management can be endured	Serious impact on customer relationships and definite loss on contracts. High level of resource to remedy	Significant disruption to ministerial confidence	Short term national negative media coverage	Injury or ill health resulting in permanent disability
3	Moderate	Manageable through normal funding arrangements but requires diversion of funds up to £0.5m of other activities	A critical event which can be managed under normal circumstances	Substantial impact on customer relationships and definite loss of business	Disruption to ministerial confidence in short to medium term	Extended negative local/industry media coverage	Injury or ill health resulting in more than 5 days absence
2	Minor	Manageable through normal funding arrangements through diversion of £200k.	An event, the consequences of which can be absorbed but management effort is required to minimise the impact	Some impact on customer relationships and possible loss of business	Disruption to ministerial confidence in short term with minor impact	Series of articles in local/industry press	Injury or ill health resulting in more than 1 but less than 5 days absence
1	Insignificant	Negligible impact on funding. £50k required.	An event, the impact of which can be absorbed through normal activity	Negligible impact on customer relationships	Negligible impact on ministerial confidence	Letters to local/industry press	No significant time lost

### Likelihood definitions

The number of times within a specified period which a risk may occur either as a consequence of business operations or through failure of operating systems, policies or procedures.

	Rating	Description	Occurrence
5	Almost certain	Event is expected occur in most circumstances	Multiple / 12 months
4	Likely	Event will probably occur in most circumstances	Once / 12 months
3	Possible	Event should occur at some time	Once / 13 months – 3 years
2	Unlikely	Event could occur at some time	Once / 3 – 10 years
1	Rare	Event may occur under exceptional circumstances	Once / > 10 years

## Risk Prioritisation

The combination of consequence and likelihood rating provides a mechanism to prioritise each risk.

Catastrophic					
Major					
Moderate					
Minor					
Insignificant					
	Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain

	Immediate action required
	Action required
	Management responsibility and monitoring
	No immediate action required

