			LIKELIHOOD						
				Insignificant (1)	Minor (2)	Moderate (3)	Major (4)	Catastrophic (5)	
			Almost Certain (5)		5 10				5
			Likely (4)		4 8	12	10	5 20)
			Possible (3)		3 6			2 15	5
			Unlikely (2)	2	2 4		5	3	
			Almost Impossible (1)		1 2	3	4	4	5
								-	
	Mitigation, preventative action plan aimed at cause to reduce the	Contingency , protective action plan aimed at effects, to reduce the	Likelihood	Impact	Owner, person	Severity,	Progress	Review Date	Updated
	likelhood of the problem occurring	impact if problem does occur		• · · · ·	accountable	weighted factor			weighte
	o								d score
Project start could be delayed	impacts on Timescale for recruitment	Project start can be delayed until the PO is recruited	Likely (4)	Moderate	Debbie Hartman				
		. ,	, , ,	(3)					
				()					
leasures to deliver the project aims will be decided without	Build on existing relationships through area ranger contacts and	Proceed with best avaialble information from research and evidence	Possible (3)	Moderate	PO				
takeholder input	truleigh hill access area project contacts ,	gathering, allow flex in the project outputs to allow for diffcult to		(3)				1	
		reach stakeholders						1	
	relations,;							1	
	Ensure all opinions & issueare equally & openly taken account of.							1	
	build on existing successful volunteering groups and establish possible		Possible (3)	Moderate	PO and Amanda				
be achieved in stage 2 and affect the long term commitment to the	links in stage 1. The promotion of the volunteering opportuntiies	with support from volunteering groups.		(3)					
project aim.	should be widely marketed, including coastal plain communities,								
	community groups and businesses.								
Site specific work cannot go ahead	Ensure early liaison with landowners,	Undertake projects where landowner support / permission is	Likely (4)	Moderate	PO				
	Look for win win landscape design solutions where landowners could			(3)	FO				
	benefit from the project;			(3)					
	benefit from the project;	Work towards longer term engagement with hostile landowners.							
								1	
Vill affect the deliverability of the wide range of project outputs &	Identify the 'quick wins' early on in the project;	Extend project timescale if needed;	Possible (3)	Minor	PO			1	
	Regular review of work programme;	Apply for 2nd phase of the project if longer term/large projects are		(2)					
	Define project list at an early stage	identified							
					1			1	
		Project officer time still spent on SPG document and also	Possible (3)	Major	whole project				
t end of stage I there is no buy in from local landowners or	continue stage 2 to complete SPG document but reduce scope to	Project officer time still spent on SPG document and also	Possible (3)	Major (4)	whole project				
t end of stage I there is no buy in from local landowners or		interpretation. However time inputs would be less so could be	Possible (3)	Major (4)	whole project team				
t end of stage I there is no buy in from local landowners or	continue stage 2 to complete SPG document but reduce scope to		Possible (3)						
At end of stage I there is no buy in from local landowners or	continue stage 2 to complete SPG document but reduce scope to	interpretation. However time inputs would be less so could be	Possible (3)						
At end of stage 1 there is no buy in from local landowners or	continue stage 2 to complete SPG document but reduce scope to	interpretation. However time inputs would be less so could be	Possible (3)						
t end of stage I there is no buy in from local landowners or	continue stage 2 to complete SPG document but reduce scope to	interpretation. However time inputs would be less so could be	Possible (3)						
t end of stage I there is no buy in from local landowners or	continue stage 2 to complete SPG document but reduce scope to	interpretation. However time inputs would be less so could be	Possible (3)						
At end of stage I there is no buy in from local landowners or ommunity to implement action plan in stage 2.	continue stage 2 to complete SPG document but reduce scope to	interpretation. However time inputs would be less so could be	Possible (3) Possible (3)						
tt end of stage I there is no buy in from local landowners or ommunity to implement action plan in stage 2. takeholder's identify actions but cant deliver them due to timescale	continue stage 2 to complete SPG document but reduce scope to take into account no actions. early mitigation with all stakeholders including infrastructure	interpretation. However time inputs would be less so could be utilised on other projects. ongoing delivery of mitigation options may be progressed through		(4)	team				
at end of stage I there is no buy in from local landowners or ommunity to implement action plan in stage 2. takeholder's identify actions but cant deliver them due to timescale r other issues	continue stage 2 to complete SPG document but reduce scope to take into account no actions. early mitigation with all stakeholders including infrastructure companies to try and develop a wide range or buy in to ensure more	interpretation. However time inputs would be less so could be utilised on other projects. ongoing delivery of mitigation options may be progressed through SDNP if they are beyond project timescales. i.e. telecommunications		(4) Major	team whole project				
at end of stage I there is no buy in from local landowners or ommunity to implement action plan in stage 2. takeholder's identify actions but cant deliver them due to timescale r other issues	continue stage 2 to complete SPG document but reduce scope to take into account no actions. early mitigation with all stakeholders including infrastructure	interpretation. However time inputs would be less so could be utilised on other projects. ongoing delivery of mitigation options may be progressed through		(4) Major	team whole project				

Agenda Item 15 Report PR15/18 Appendix 2