

Reference	BOT21/SEP/07
Date	15 <sup>th</sup> September 2021

## 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 R03: Brand and Reputational Damage.

## 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

One Risk has been considered by SET since the last BOT meeting and this is set out below for the Board to consider.

### 2.1. R03: Brand and Reputational Damage

This Risk has been updated to clarify all areas of the Risk and to update it with new actions which are underway or planned. It is considered by SET that the impact score should be increased to 5 (from 4) given the serious implications which reputational damage can cause.

	IMPACT (IM)	LIKELIHOOD (LK)
Prior to risk control	5	4
Mitigated score	5	2

Net Risk (IM x LK) + IM	15
-------------------------	----

## 3. Recommendation

The Board is recommended to agree the amendment of Risk R03: Brand and Reputational Damage.

## 4. Health and safety implications

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

## 5. 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.*

## 6. 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 risk there could be cost implications if there was serious reputational damage, including potentially from loss of membership.*

## 7. 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.*

## 8. 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.*

## 9. 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.*

## 10. Corporate Strategy - Climate action

*Given the RTPI's commitment to climate action, it is essential that our reputation on this topic is not damaged through inappropriate action.*

## 11. Corporate Strategy - GROWPLAN (Corporate Strategy)

*Reputational damage could lead to an impact on membership levels and could have serious implications for GROWPLAN.*

## 12. 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 Risk 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  $(\text{Likelihood} \times \text{Impact}) + \text{Impact}$ . 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 Risk

#### RTPI Corporate Risk Register

Draft

<b>R03</b>	<b>Brand and Reputational Damage</b>
------------	--------------------------------------

		IMPACT (IM)	LIKELIHOOD (LK)	
Category	External	Prior to risk control	5	4
CSIP Ref	Brand	Mitigated score	5	2
Service Plan	Comms, Marketing			
Owner	COO			
Dependencies	Comms			
		Net Risk (IM x LK) + IM	15	
Impact score increased to 5 from 4. Net Risk increased from 12 to 15				

<b>Cause(s) and potential impact of risk event</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of <a href="#">members (and resultant income)</a> due to reputational damage to the brand</li> <li>Misuse or loss of control of brand assets</li> <li>Inappropriate actions become associated with the brand assets permanently downgrading their value or use</li> <li><a href="#">Reputational damage to brand via misuse by third party or brand association with a third party's activities which become discredited</a></li> <li>Adverse publicity /damage to the RTPI's brand reputation through inappropriate employee or volunteer / member behaviour or behaviour that undermines RTPI's brand values, or is of a nature that brings the organisation into disrepute</li> <li><a href="#">Association with inappropriate third party that does not uphold or works against RTPI brand values</a></li> <li>Loss of confidence in brand from members leads to resignations</li> <li><a href="#">Association of the RTPI brand with another toxic brand, or a brand that becomes toxic</a></li> </ul>				

<b>Description of controls to mitigate risk</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Communications crisis management policies</a></li> <li>Qualified professionals employed to ensure marketing and communications <a href="#">protect the brand</a></li> <li><a href="#">All volunteers and staff understand brand values and importance of brand adherence</a></li> <li><a href="#">Limiting the number of spokespeople for the Institute and media training them</a></li> <li><a href="#">Brand strategy in plan</a></li> <li>Campaign strategy and campaign priorities in place and regularly reviewed</li> <li>Social media policy in place and monitored for compliance</li> <li>Planning 'space' press channels monitored</li> <li>Institute's brand guidelines in place, monitored <a href="#">and upheld</a></li> <li><a href="#">Joint working guidelines in place</a></li> <li>All Institute's key brand assets protected by trade marking</li> <li><a href="#">World class research undertaken to provide robust evidence to support positions and campaigns</a></li> </ul>				

Actions	Who	Target Date
1 <a href="#">Media train key spokespeople</a>	DoC	end 2021
2 Reduction in secondary brands and controls over the use of brand equity	COO	<a href="#">end 2021</a>
3 <a href="#">Implement full comms strategy and social media coordination policy across all branded platforms</a>	DoC	Q1 2022
4 Brand strategy project delivery (CSIP)	COO	end 2022
5 Phase II trade mark investment programme	COO	end 2021
6 <a href="#">Precautionary suspension of members to strengthen opportunities to manage the risk of reputation of being associated with members alleged to have broken the law</a>	DoE&P	<a href="#">end 2022</a>

<b>Notes</b>
A clear brand strategy is needed to mitigate the risks above which included all staff and all volunteers signing up to promote RTPI brand values and <a href="#">protect the brand</a>

<b>Date last reviewed:</b>	Aug-21
<b>Review date:</b>	Feb-22