Reference	BOT21/JUL/3B
Date	22nd July 2021

RTPI
Royal Town Planning Institute

Board of Trustees

RTPI RISK REGISTER

Report from Director of Wales, Northern Ireland and Planning Aid England

FOR DECISION

The Board is asked to agree the amendments to Risks R04: Relationships With Governments, Not Having Impact Members Would Like to See and R17: Failure to Attract and Retain Colleagues With the Right Skills and Experience.

1. Summary

There is a rolling review timetable for each Risk within the Register to ensure every risk is reviewed at least once a year, although any risk can be reviewed at any time if circumstances require it. This report provides the latest Risks reviewed by SET for agreement by the Board.

Work continues by SET on other Risks and a further set will be brought for the Board to consider at its next meeting.

2. Amended Risks

Two Risks have been discussed by SET since the last BOT meeting and these are set out below for the Board to consider.

The

2.1. R04: Relationships With Governments, Not Having Impact Members Would Like to See

This Risk has been updated to take account of the latest activity under the Corporate Strategy, including the launch of the Politicians in Planning Network (PiPN) in June. It is considered by SET that this activity will reduce the impact and therefore propose a lower of the mitigated impact score and reducing the overall score from 12 to 8.

	IMPACT (IM)	LIKELIHOOD (LK)
Prior to risk control	3	4
Mitigated score	2	3

Net Risk (IM x LK) + IM	**8**

2.2. R17: Failure to Attract and Retain Colleagues With the Right Skills and Experience

This Risk has been updated to take account of the roll out of home / flexible working post-pandemic restrictions taking advantage of digital transformation and the People Strategy. There is no proposal to change the scores as the changes have not yet been fully implemented.

	IMPACT (IM)	LIKELIHOOD (LK)
Prior to risk control	4	4
Mitigated score	4	3

Net Risk (IM x LK) + IM	**16**

3. Audit Committee

At the meeting of the Audit Committee in June, an overview of the whole Register was undertaken and detailed comments from the Committee will be fed into the scheduled reviews of each Risk. The Committee overall accepted the Register.

4. Recommendation

The Board is recommended to:

1. agree the amendment of Risk R04: Relationships With Governments, Not Having Impact Members Would Like to See; and

2. agree the amendment to the Risk R17: Failure to Attract and Retain Colleagues With the Right Skills and Experience.

5. Health and safety implications

There are no direct health and safety implications, although the Risk Register covers health and safety factors.

6. Equality and diversity implications

In respect of R04 relationships with governments: if these relationships do not work effectively we may not be able to influence planning policy and practice on EDI factors, for the ability to impact planning policy in relation to gender mainstreaming, designing for neurodiversity or other disabilities.

7. Financial implications

The Risk Register is a corporate responsibility and resources are allocated as appropriate for each risk to the relevant budget. The majority of mitigation measures will have a cost implication and these have been built into budgets. In making decisions on budget implications the cost of not acting is taken into account.

In particular for the reviewed risks: retaining/recruiting colleagues has a financial impact however there are also potential savings in money and time if staff retention increases and fewer roles are required to be located in London.

8. Communications Implications

The revised Risk Register is communicated to colleagues to ensure there is knowledge of the mitigation and actions required and to embed ownership.

9. Governance and Compliance implications

Charities that are required by law to have their accounts audited must make a risk management statement in their trustees' annual report confirming that '...the charity trustees have given consideration to the major risks to which the charity is exposed and satisfied themselves that systems or procedures are established in order to manage those risks.' (Charities (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008). Where there are risks relating to a particular jurisdiction these are taken into account. The Risk Register includes a risk which relates to compliance with operating legislation, for example data protection.

10. Jurisdiction and devolution implications

Where there are any differences in regulations / law within the devolved Nations or Ireland, these are built into the relevant Risk. Risk R04 includes measures to address each responsible Government across the UK and Ireland.

11. Corporate Strategy - Climate action

In respect of R04 relationships with governments: if these relationships do not work effectively we may not be able to influence planning policy and practice on climate action.

12. Corporate Strategy - GROWPLAN (Corporate Strategy)

Risk 04 highlights the risk of members looking to others for influencing which in turn could impact R06 which relates to the risk relating to the decline in membership numbers, which GROWPLAN addresses.

13. Corporate Strategy - Digital Transformation

The Digital Transformation Strategy addresses a number of Risks in the Register including R15 and R18, although it does not directly relate to the Risks reviewed in this report.

Risk Register Scoring

The scoring process adopted for the RTPI Register is a standard model used and is recommended by the Charity Commission.

The methodology considers how likely the risk is to occur (Likelihood) and how severe its impact would be on the RTPI if it did occur (Impact). It enables a focus on those risks that would have a more significant impact on the RTPI; however lower impacts must not be ignored because they can trigger other risks leading to a compound of effects. Risk scoring often involves a degree of judgement or subjectivity, but wherever possible evidenced-based judgements are made.

The score is generated by (Likelihood x Impact) + Impact. This formula multiplies impact with likelihood then adds a weighting again for impact. The effect is to give extra emphasis to impact when assessing risk. However this can mean that whilst actions to reduce the Likelihood of a risk occurring are in place, there may be little change to the score, because there is an emphasis on the Impact grade.

The heat map below illustrates the grading for Impact and Likelihood and the range of scores.

Risk Assessment - Heat Map

Impact					
5 = Extreme /Catastrophic	10	15	20	25	30
4 = Major	8	12	16	20	24
3 = Moderate	6	9	12	15	18
2 = Minor	4	6	8	10	12
1 = Insignificant	2	3	4	5	6
	1 = Remote	2 = Unlikely	3 = Possible	4 = Probable	5 = Highly Probable
	Likelihood				

Annex 2

Revised Risks

RTPI Corporate Risk Register Draft

R04	**Relationships With Governments, Not Having Impact Members Would Like to See**

			IMPACT (IM)	LIKELIHOOD (LK)
Category	External	**Prior to risk control**	3	4
CSIP Ref	Raising the Profile of Planning	**Mitigated score**	2	3
Service Plan	PPRN & Nations			
Owner	DC	**Net Risk** (IM x LK) + IM		**8**
Dependencies	Dirs Nations, Dir Education & Profession			

Mitigated impact score reduced from 3 to 2; reducing overall score from 12 to 8.

Cause(s) and potential impact of risk event

- Unable to secure meetings with key stakeholders
- Key influencers unaware of the RTPI
- Members look to others for influencing
- Other organisations securing key positions of influence
- Failure to have a meaningful impact on primary legislation (e.g. Planning Bill England)
- Politicians (of all levels) unaware of importance of properly resourced planning affecting their decisions

Description of controls to mitigate risk

- Employment of a Parliamentary Affairs Officer
- Active engagement and profile in devolved nations
- CE prioritising engagement and raising regular meetings with key stakeholders to develop personal relationships
- National Directors engaging with key stakeholders to develop personal relationships in the devolved nations and Ireland
- Implementation of ComRes surveys and development of a KPI to measure influence
- Communication of activity through website and other channels increased
- Maximise potential of attendance at Party Conferences including fringe events, by taking an active role
- Secretariat of the APPG for Planning
- Quick response to announcements and changes
- Stakeholder Bulletin
- Launch of PiPN and associated activity
- Arrangement of annual Parliamentary Reception(s)

Actions		**Who**	**Target Date**
1	Further investment in Parliamentary Affairs resource	SET / Director of Comms	ongoing 2021
2	Responding to MHCLG, devolved Nations, Ireland and other consultations	CEX & Nations' Directors	ongoing 2021
3	Development of a KPI to measure influence (Perception Survey)	Director of Comms	September 2021

Notes

Date last reviewed:	Jun-21
Review date:	Jan-22

RTPI Corporate Risk Register Draft

R17	Failure to Attract and Retain Colleagues With the Right Skills and Experience

Category	Governance
CSIP Ref	F8 Resource mgt model
Service Plan	HR
Owner	COO
Dependencies	Head of HR and Compliance

	IMPACT (IM)	LIKELIHOOD (LK)
Prior to risk control	4	4
Mitigated score	4	3
Net Risk (IM x LK) + IM	16	

No alteration to score

Cause(s) and potential impact of risk event	**Previous version**
• Remuneration and/or benefits package insufficient to attract employees with relevant skills and experience	Insufficient resources available to attract future employees
• RTPI brand or reputation doesn't attract prospective employees or deters applicants	Brand fails to attract future employees
• Employment practices deters prospective applicants	Poor staff morale leads to resignations
• Poor staff morale leads to resignations	Benefits package uncompetitive
• Lack of career or personal development opportunities leads to resignations	Employment practices uncompetitive
	Career opportunities insufficient to retain colleagues

Description of controls to mitigate risk	**Previous version**
• Membership sector salary benchmarking procedure in place	Development of the People Strategy
• Annual salary review to maintain competitiveness	Salary bench marking review to establish the market benchmark
• Benefits reviewed against CIPD benchmarks	Job evaluation and competency framework supports personal development and colleague
• Annual staff survey to measure colleague feedback	Annual staff survey in place
• Job evaluation and competency framework supports career and personal development programmes	Changes to 'smart working' create a more attractive working environment
• Changes to 'smart working' create a more attractive working environment	Benefits review to ensure offer is competitive
• Introduction of blended and flexible 'smart' working arrangements in line with benchmarks	Flexible working review to offer competitive employment packages
• Move to homeworking increases geographical coverage for employment	Move to homeworking increases geographical coverage for employment
• Improvement to post covid health and safety arrangements to reassure colleagues using offices	
• Digital Transformation automation makes roles more fulfilling	
• Modernisation of recruitment website and application process has improved candidate attraction	

Actions		**Who**	**Target Date**	
1	Implementation of new People Strategy	Head of HR	Dec-21	
2	Roll out of 'smart working' programme	Head of HR	Dec-21	
3	Implementation of outsourcing approach	SET	Dec-21	
4	Pay and reward package benchmarking project	Head of HR	Sep-21	Additional

Notes

Date last reviewed:	May-21
Review date:	Nov-21