SCREENING FOR NATURAL HAZARDS TO INFORM

A CLIMATE CHANGE RISK ASSESSMENT

OF THE PROPERTIES IN CARE OF HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND



HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND

ÀRAINNEACHD EACHDRAIDHEIL ALBA

PURPOSE AND SCOPE ADHBHAR IS LEUDACHD

This document presents the results of an initial baseline assessment of natural hazard risk to inform a Climate Change **Risk Assessment of Historic** Environment Scotland's (HES's) Properties in Care. It uses a number of existing natural hazard datasets, which determine the risk of damage and loss to sites. as indicators of susceptibility to climate change. The report outlines the drivers behind carrying out the study as well as the basic methodology of the assessment itself. This study represents the first step in a comprehensive and ongoing exercise to understand, monitor and manage environmental risk to the HES Estate. This study is part of HES's ongoing work

to develop best practice and integrate climate change actions into its operations, in line with the Public Bodies Duties under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 and Climate Ready Scotland: Scottish Climate Change Adaptation Programme.

The Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (the Act) places duties on public bodies to contribute to emission reduction targets, deliver programmes for adaptation, to increase resilience, and to act in a sustainable way. HES is identified as a 'Major Player' under the Act, due to its size and influence. Guidance on these duties published in 2011 makes it clear that public bodies are expected to assess the impact of climate change on their areas of responsibility and their daily operations, and build resilience. The Scottish **Climate Change Adaptation** Programme specifically tasks HES with quantifying heritage assets affected by climate change using GIS and creating a climate change risk register for the Properties in Care. These formal obligations are reflected in the actions set out in our own Corporate Plan (2016), For All Our Futures, and our Climate Change Action Plan (2012-2017).

Front Cover: Brough of Birsay



CONTRIBUTORS

This report was prepared by the Historic Environment Scotland Climate Change Team with contributions from Emily Tracey (British Geological Survey). Principal authors: David Harkin, Dr Mairi Davies and Dr Ewan Hyslop (Historic Environment Scotland).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project has benefited from partnership working with British Geological Survey and Scottish Environment Protection Agency. Particular thanks are due to Dr Fiona McLay of SEPA for facilitating data access.

We are grateful for the invaluable advice and support we received during this project from Adaptation Scotland, particularly Dr Joseph Hagg, Science and Skills Manager. The project benefited from discussions with our colleagues in the Adaptation Learning Exchange Risk Task Group.

CONTACT INFORMATION

For more information please get in touch with us by emailing climatechange@hes.scot or phoning 0131 668 8600.

DATA LICENSES

© All images Crown Copyright HES or Historic Environment Scotland, except map images, where copyright is as follows:

Contains Historic Environment Scotland and Ordnance Survey Data © Historic Environment Scotland © Crown copyright and database rights 2017 Ordnance Survey [100057073] Ordnance Survey Data.

Materials derived from the British Geological Survey's work included in this publication are reproduced with the permission of BGS. Copyright Natural Environment Research Council (NERC). All rights reserved.

© 2017 Scottish Environment Protection Agency. Some features of this map are based on digital spatial data licensed from the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, © CEH. Includes material based upon Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of H.M. Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Licence number 100016991.

 $\frac{1}{3}$

PREFACE RO-BHRIATHAR

Scotland's climate is changing at an unprecedented rate. The last century has been characterised by a continuous increase in temperatures, altering patterns of precipitation and increased frequency of unpredictable and extreme weather events. Since the early 1960s, annual precipitation levels have increased by over 20%; it is now 1°C warmer, the growing season has been extended by over a month and sea levels continue to rise at over 3mm a year (Sniffer 2014). This has implications for the historic environment. Changing climatic conditions can alter and accelerate decay processes of historic monuments and archaeological sites. Historic buildings that have survived well in the past and in current climatic conditions may become less able to cope with changing weather patterns caused by climate change (Historic Environment Scotland 2016). To better understand the impacts of current climate threats to the Historic Environment Scotland (HES) Estate, we have undertaken a Climate Change Risk Assessment (CCRA) focusing initially, for the purpose of this

project, on natural hazard risk. This represents the first steps in the development of: (i) a current climate risk register for the HES Estate, and (ii) a methodology for assessing the impacts of climate change on heritage assets in the wider historic environment. In partnership with the British Geological Survey (BGS) and the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA), we have conducted a desk-based, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis of natural hazard risk to the 336 Properties in Care (PICs) of Historic Environment Scotland. By overlaying spatial data pertaining to our own PICs with natural hazard data sets, supplied by the BGS and SEPA, we have been able to conduct the most thorough baseline analysis of natural hazard risk carried out to date on the HES Estate. This has allowed us to identify the properties we now believe to be most at risk from climate change. At this stage, we have focused on the impacts to the physical fabric and cultural significance of the properties themselves. As such the results of this report are strictly limited

to the risks identified within our PIC boundaries, and do not consider risks that may occur just beyond these boundaries. The impacts on staff and visitor safety, internal collections, site operations and access are outside the scope of this work. However, these may form the basis of future phases of the ongoing project.

Initial analysis of the results has indicated that out of the 352 'sites' investigated, 89% are exposed to high, or very high levels of risk (some of our 336 PICs have more than one area of 'guardianship' or 'ownership', meaning we ran the assessment for 352 'sites'). When we then consider the mitigating factors and controls already in place, such as routine maintenance and ongoing conservation work, the number of sites classified as 'at risk' is reduced to 53%. With this new information, we can now conduct a more in-depth analysis of climate change risk at these high-risk sites identified in the baseline study. For our own requirements, this evaluation of climate change risk will provide improved evidence-based

decision-making in order to better prioritise ongoing investment through our conservation and maintenance programmes, thus ensuring the long-term survival of the properties in our care. This report outlines the policy context and drivers behind our assessment, including the statutory duties placed on us as a public body. The report then details the basic methodology which has been developed for the assessment, likely to be the first of its kind for a heritagefocused organisation. The baseline results of the assessment are then presented, including a breakdown of the risk posed by the six different natural hazards considered in this study; those being flooding (fluvial, pluvial, groundwater and coastal), slope instability and coastal erosion. These are supplemented by tables, charts, graphs and images to explain the nature of hazards, illustrate the data analysis and highlight the unique nature of the sites in our care. The report also provides case studies of four sites, exploring the specific hazards and

risks to these in more detail and explaining site-specific mitigants and controls. The Threave Castle case study demonstrates a site that was designed with flooding in mind. The Blackness and Fort George case studies give examples of sites at high risk from natural hazards where we have intervened to mitigate against these risks. Finally, the Kilchurn Castle case study provides an example of a site that has an inherent resilience to changing environmental conditions of the landscape in which it is situated.



The location of Historic Environment Scotland's Properties in Care.

CONTENTS CLÀR-INNSE

PURPOSE AND SCOPE	
PREFACE	
CONTENTS	
FIGURES	
TABLES	
DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN THE TEXT	
GLOSSARY	

1	IT.	DY			~ 7	- 7	 M
		•	• 1				

1.1 Aims and Objectives	14
1.2 The Risk Assessment and Partnership Working	14
1.3 Why Focus on Natural Hazards?	15
1.4 Outputs and Use of the CCRA	15

3. RESULTS	26
3.1 Data Limitations	27
3.2 Fluvial Flooding	28
3.3 Pluvial Flooding	29
3.4 Coastal Flooding and Coastal Erosion	30
3.5 Groundwater Flooding	32
3.6 Slope Instability	33
3.7 Sites at Risk	34

4. FUTURE RISK	35
4.1 Climate Change in Scotland	35
4.2 Impacts on the Historic Environment	37

2. METHODOLOGY	16
2.1 Overview	16
2.2 Datasets Sources and Information	17
2.3 Calculating Risk Scores	18
2.3.1 Generating and Assigning Likelihood Scores	19
2.3.2 Generating and Assigning Impact Scores	22
2.3.3 Inherent and Residual Risk Scores	25

5. NEXT STEPS	42
6. CONCLUSION	43
7. REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING	44

THREAVE CASTLE	45
BLACKNESS CASTLE	49
FORT GEORGE	53
KILCHURN CASTLE	57

Appendix A – The Climate Change Risk Register 60

FIGURES

Figure 1:	Changes in Scotland's climate since the 1960s	13
Figure 2:	Arbroath Abbey site plan	16
Figure 3:	Risk assessment results	26
Figure 4:	Risk assessment results - Fluvial Flooding	28
Figure 5:	Risk assessment results - Pluvial Flooding	29
Figure 6:	Risk assessment results - Coastal Flooding	31
Figure 7:	Risk assessment results - Coastal Erosion	31
Figure 8:	Risk assessment results - Groundwater Flooding	32
Figure 9:	Risk assessment results - Slope Instability	33
Figure 10:	Summary of projected changes in Scotland's Climate by 2050	35
Figure 11:	Projected change in Scotland's climate — temperature and precipitation maps	36
Figure 12:	Old Caerlaverock Castle illustration	37
Figure 13:	Rainfall and landslide occurrence rate relationship	39
Figure 14:	Hazard maps - Threave Castle	46
Figure 15:	Annual rainfall totals, Threave Gardens, 1961 to 2015	47
Figure 16:	Stone decay types, and relationship with temperature and rainfall	48
Figure 17:	Hazard maps - Blackness Castle	50
Figure 18:	Blackness Castle - shore front wall	51
Figure 19:	Annual rainfall totals, Central Scotland, 1961 to 2015	51
Figure 20:	Hazard maps - Fort George	54
Figure 21:	Construction of Fort George rock armour	55
Figure 22:	Fort George - coastal erosion	56
Figure 23:	Fort George - coastal erosion	56
Figure 24:	Timothy Pont map – Loch Awe	58
Figure 25:	Hazard maps – Kilchurn Castle	59

TABLES CLÀRAN

Table 1:	The Risk Matrix	18
Table 2:	Risk level breakdown descriptions	19
Table 3:	Assigning likelihood scores to hazard datasets	20
Table 4:	Groundwater Flooding - likelihood breakdown	21
Table 5:	Slope Instability – likelihood breakdown	22
Table 6:	Impact scale	23
Table 7:	Fixed impact scores for different hazards	24
Table 8:	Impact modifier	25
Table 9:	Sites at risk	34
Table 10:	Threave Castle - risk scores	46
Table 11:	Threave Castle - projected changes in climate by 2050s	47
Table 12:	Blackness Castle - risk scores	50
Table 13:	Blackness Castle - projected changes in climate by 2050s	52
Table 14:	Fort George – risk scores	54
Table 15:	Fort George - change in climate since 1960s	55
Table 16:	Fort George - projected changes in climate by the 2050s	56
Table 17:	Kilchurn Castle – risk scores	58

DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN TEXT Sgrìobhan às an tàinig iomraidhean san teacsa

SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT

- Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009
- Public Bodies Climate Change Duties: Putting them into Practice (2011)
- Climate Ready Scotland: Scottish Climate Change Adaptation Programme (2014)
- Climate Change (Duties of Public Bodies: Reporting Requirements) (Scotland) Order 2015
- Our Place in Time The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland (2014)

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND¹

- Historic Scotland Climate Change Action Plan 2012-17. Historic Scotland, April 2012
- For All Our Futures (Historic Environment Scotland Corporate Plan 2016-19)
- Historic Environment Scotland Sustainability Report 2015-16
- Scotland's Historic Environment Audit, 2016
- Historic Environment Scotland, 2016, Short Guide 11: Climate Change Adaptation for Traditional Buildings

- Historic Environment Scotland, Schemes of Delegation (published October 2015)
 - Condition Monitoring System for the Properties in Care of Scottish Ministers and their Associated Collections
 - Asset Management Plan for the Properties in Care of Scottish Ministers – Interim Statement
 - Baseline Condition of the Properties in Care of Scottish Ministers
 - Conservation Principles for the Properties in Care of Scottish Ministers

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

- Adaptation Scotland 2013
 Five Steps to Managing Your
 Climate Risks: A Guide for
 Public Bodies in Scotland
- Committee on Climate Change

 UK Climate Change Risk
 Assessment 2017
- 'Action on Climate Change' Joint statement from SEPA, Scottish Natural Heritage, Forestry Commission Scotland and Historic Scotland.

¹The responsibilities and commitments of Historic Scotland were transferred in 2015 to Historic Environment Scotland under the Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014.



GLOSSARY BRIATHRACHAN

BGS - British Geological Survey. **CCRA** - Climate Change Risk Assessment.

Coastal Erosion - The gradual destruction of susceptible coastline rock and sediments by wave action, tidal currents and storms.

Coastal Flooding - Inundation of seawater onto low lying, normally dry areas of land.

Fluvial Flooding - Inundation of normally dry land, caused by a river exceeding its normal capacity.

GIS - Geographic Information Systems.

Groundwater Flooding - Flooding caused by a rise in the water table, generally during periods of above average rainfall.

HES - Historic Environment Scotland.

Impact - The 'impact' score is based on a subjective assessment of what the impacts of a hazard occurring, at any given site, could be. Ranked in a similar way to likelihood, with one being defined as the lowest impact and five the highest.

Impact Modifier - An assessment of the mitigants and controls, in place at any given site that changes the impact score. This gives the change from inherent to residual risk.

Inherent Risk - This is the first of two risk scores generated for each PIC. It is generated by multiplying the 'likelihood' of an event occurring by the 'impact'. **Likelihood** - This is the estimated probability of a specific event occurring, ranked one to five, with five representing the greatest probability and one the lowest.

Mitigants and Controls -Measures implemented by HES to intervene and reduce the risk(s) and associated impact(s). This includes presence of site staff, conservation teams and routine (and planned) maintenance and site operations.

Natural Hazards - For the purpose of this project, the term 'natural hazards' refers to flooding (coastal, groundwater, fluvial and pluvial), slope instability and coastal erosion.

Pluvial Flooding - Occurs where artificial drainage systems are saturated to levels they cannot cope with.

Property Type -Each of the 336 PICs of HES, fall into one of six 'monument type' categories. These are:

- (A) Roofed Monuments (occupied or staffed)
- (B) Roofed Monuments (unoccupied or not staffed)
- (C) Unroofed Monuments (masonry >1.5m)
- (D) Unroofed Monuments (masonry <1.5m)
- (E) Standing Stones and Carved Stones
- (F) Field Monuments.

PICs - Properties In Care – means any heritable property which is of historical, archaeological, architectural or cultural significance or interest and which is owned or occupied, under the guardianship of, or otherwise under management and control of the Scottish Ministers.

PICAMS - Properties in Care Asset Management System.

Residual Risk - This is the second risk score generated for each PIC and details the risk posed after taking into consideration our site operations. Again, it is generated by multiplying the likelihood of an event occurring by the impact, however this time the final score is adjusted based on the mitigants and controls in place.

Risk - Risk is defined as exposure to a range of environmental threats / hazards which have the potential to cause damage to the asset and its cultural significance.

Risk Rating - The likelihood score multiplied by the impact score, gives the risk rating for the property in question.

Risk Register - This is the completed CCRA dataset, detailing the risk scores for all 336 PICs, for each of the six natural hazards investigated.

SCCAP – Scottish Climate Change Adaptation Programme.

SEPA - Scottish Environment Protection Agency.

Slope Instability – (Or ground instability) describes the inherent 'strength' of a slope, and its potential to fail, causing ground movement / landslips.

SoD - Schemes of Delegation.



I. INTRODUCTION RO-RÀDH

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) is the lead public body for Scotland's historic environment with a vision that it is cherished, understood, shared and enjoyed with pride by everyone, now and in the future.

We are tasked with leading the way in ensuring Scotland's historic environment makes a strong contribution to the cultural, social, environmental and economic wellbeing of the nation and its people. We are working with others to understand and manage the impacts of climate change on the historic environment. We are also leading the way in the adaptation of the historic environment through the dissemination of information and guidance to enhance resilience against current and future changes in our climate (e.g. Historic Environment Scotland, 2016).

The Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (the Act) places duties on public bodies to contribute to emission reduction targets, deliver programmes for adaptation, to increase resilience, and to act in a sustainable way. HES is identified as a 'Major Player' under the Act, due to its size and influence. Guidance on these duties published in 2011 makes it clear that public bodies are expected to assess the impact of climate change on their areas of responsibility and their daily operations, and

build resilience. The Scottish Climate Change Adaptation Programme specifically tasks HES with quantifying heritage assets affected by climate change using GIS and creating a climate change risk register for the Properties in Care (PICs).

These formal obligations are reflected in the actions set out in our Corporate Plan (2016) and our Climate Change Action Plan (2012-2017). The latter contains a list of actions under resilience, in which we commit to developing a methodology for assessing the impact of climate change on heritage assets, and undertaking a climate change risk assessment across the HES Estate to evaluate which sites are most at threat. The latter is planned with the explicit intention of informing maintenance and conservation regimes across the Estate.

HES reports formally on its climate change adaptation activities through its Sustainability Report, published as an annex to its Annual Report and Accounts, and through the Public Sector Climate Change Duties Reporting portal, under The Climate Change (Duties of Public Bodies: Reporting Requirements) (Scotland) Order 2015.

The Schemes of Delegation from Scottish Ministers to HES require us to put in place principles, standards and procedures to ensure that the properties in the care of Scottish Ministers are conserved and maintained to a high standard. Our Conservation Principles state that our approach to dealing with climate change will be pragmatic and informed, and recognises that in some cases, we will need a flexible approach in reducing risks to the assets. They recognise that understanding these risks and their impacts is a key priority. They commit us to assessing the vulnerability of our assets and considering climate change as one of the criteria in our resource management plans. An Asset Management Plan for the Properties in Care of Scottish Ministers has been developed under the Scheme. in which adaptation to the changing climate is central.

With over 300 properties of national and international importance in our direct care, we have a diverse range of historic monuments that can help us advance and demonstrate our current understanding of climate change impacts, as well as to develop new and innovative methods of understanding and adapting to future climate change risk.

The very nature of the sites we care for means many are situated in landscapes that are inherently susceptible to natural hazard risks. For example, being located close to a river was once a crucial factor in the defence of a site, along with access to water for domestic and agricultural needs and key transport routes. Case Study One, Threave Castle (included at the end of the report), is a good example of how people in the past harnessed the natural defence capability of an island in choosing their site. However, this has left the site vulnerable to fluvial flooding, which it now experiences on an almost annual basis.

An evaluation of climate change risks to the HES Estate will allow us to improve decision-making for prioritising ongoing conservation and maintenance programmes, thus ensuring the long-term survival of the properties in our care. It will also enable more efficient use of resources, which can be targeted to particular priority sites. This strategic approach will benefit us, as well as the wider historic environment through the development of methodologies to assess risks and plan for future impacts, thus strengthening climate change resilience throughout the sector. This future preparedness is essential for maintaining the economic and social benefits that the historic environment brings to Scotland. As published in Scotland's Historic Environment Audit 2016, it is estimated that the historic environment contributed in excess of £2.3 billion to Scotland's economy in 2015/16.

When we talk about Scotland's historic environment, we mean more than the properties in our care. The methodology developed as part of this project is intended to be equally applicable when assessing the risk to Scotland's wider historic environment, including the risk to Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, and Conservation Areas and to assets with no formal designation. The overall driver behind this is simple: Scotland's climate is and has been changing. The last century has been characterised by overall warming and altered precipitation patterns leading to wetter and warmer winters. and drier and warmer summers. Alongside this we are also experiencing the increased frequency of extreme and unpredictable weather events. Coupled with rising sea-level, the outlook for Scotland's historic environment is uncertain (see Figure 1 for a summary of the key changes measured in Scotland's climate since the 1960s). Statistics published by the Met Office in their State of the UK Climate 2016 report, tell us that eight of the ten warmest years in the UK have occurred since 2002 and seven of the ten wettest years recorded in the UK have been since 1998 (Kendon et al, 2017).



Figure 1: Changes in Scotland's climate since the 1960s (Sniffer 2014).

1.1 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The principle aims of this project are to:

- Identify the range of current climate threats to the HES Estate using a desktop spatial GIS mapping exercise using independent natural hazard datasets.
- 2. Compile a baseline national risk register for the properties forming the HES Estate, to be used within the HES Properties in Care Asset Management System (PICAMS) to inform ongoing conservation and maintenance.
- 3. Identify priority sites to allow more in-depth appraisal of risks and mitigating actions at a more local scale.

The above will assist with the development of: (i) a current climate risk register for the HES Estate, and (ii) a methodology for assessing the impacts of climate change on other heritage assets.

1.2 THE RISK ASSESSMENT AND PARTNERSHIP WORKING

This initial phase of the risk assessment project has been conducted in close partnership with the BGS and SEPA, who both supplied natural hazard datasets for use in this project. The partnership project work with BGS fell within the terms of an existing Memorandum of Agreement between HES and BGS. Under "Action on Climate Change", a joint statement on our shared responsibilities around climate change, SEPA was able to assist by providing us with key hazard datasets.

Ordnance Survey base mapping was provided under the One Scotland Mapping Agreement.

The project has involved a desk and GIS-based analysis of current natural hazard risk to the 336 PICs, from threats such as flooding, coastal erosion and slope instability. We define risk as exposure to a range of environmental threats / hazards that have the potential to cause damage to the asset and its cultural significance. Understanding the risks to our properties now provides a strong foundation for assessing how climate change will alter the risks to our PICs going into the future.

This desk-based approach provides a robust dataset from which we can then 'ground-truth' the results and match up modelled data with real life observations and site management practice. It forms the basis of ongoing facilitated workshops with conservation and maintenance colleagues and on-site discussions, focused on adapting our operations to the changing climate.

As with any data, there are constraints to how we can use these natural hazard datasets to assess the individual risk to each of our PICs. Using these datasets requires detailed knowledge and understanding not just of how they were created but of how the impacts might affect historic environment assets, from building fabric to belowground archaeological deposits. By working closely with the BGS and SEPA, we have developed a working methodology using the data, whilst understanding

its limitations. We have also appreciated the support of Adaptation Scotland through its Adaptation Learning Exchange Risk Task Group; this has enabled us to share experience with other public bodies undertaking similar studies, namely NHS Scotland, Scottish Water and Aberdeen City Council. Adaptation Scotland is a programme funded by Scottish Government and delivered by the sustainability charity Sniffer, which provides advice and support to help organisations. businesses and communities prepare for, and build resilience to climate change impacts.

1.3 WHY FOCUS ON NATURAL HAZARDS?

Many of our PICs are situated in landscapes that are vulnerable to natural hazards. They may also be in ruinous condition and may not have been wind and water-tight for hundreds of years. Although these properties are often by their very nature resilient to threats like flooding, climate change is altering the environmental parameters in which they function, meaning that some sites are exposed to new hazards or increased risk from existing hazards.

In screening for risk from various natural hazards, we aim to identify the sites most at risk from these threats, and therefore the sites that may be the most susceptible to climate change, in the coming years. Natural hazards such as flooding, coastal erosion and slope instability are indicators of vulnerability to the climate. Consequently, sites currently exposed to these hazards will be at increased risk as the climate changes. We decided that this screening approach was sufficient for this baseline, desk-based exercise that forms the current phase of the risk assessment process. and that it would be beneficial to focus further effort on the investigation of individual properties, highlighted as being at particular risk by this initial phase. At the property-level we will be able to include a wider range of climate impacts, more detailed information about the property and the knowledge and expertise of those who manage the site; this will form the basis of future phases of the project.

1.4 OUTPUTS AND USE OF THE CCRA

This completed initial phase of the project has resulted in the production of (i) a current climate risk register for the HES Estate, and (ii) a methodology for assessing the impacts of climate change on other heritage assets.

The results of this project and the subsequent ongoing detailed site specific work will feed directly into the ongoing monitoring and condition assessment programme for our PICs. The resultant data will be incorporated into the PICs Asset Management System (PICAMS), enabling us to fulfil the Asset Management Plan developed under the Scheme of Delegation. This report is therefore published as one of the group of reports that together will evidence our approach to the conservation and maintenance of the HES Estate. The project

and outputs also contribute to us achieving KPI 3, as set out in our Corporate Plan 2016-19, For All Our Futures, "Manage the impact of climate change by improving knowledge and understanding".

We also have a published commitment, under the SCCAP and the HES Climate Change Action Plan, to develop a methodology for assessing the impact of climate change on heritage assets. The methodology described here is equally applicable to other historic environment datasets and we therefore hope it will become a model for future climate change risk assessments in the wider historic environment.



2. METHODOLOGY DÒIGH-EÒLAS

2.1 OVERVIEW

The project has focused on the development of a GIS-based approach to combine asset management information with natural hazard datasets obtained from the BGS and SEPA. Our methodology was informed by Adaptation Scotland's publication, Five Steps to Managing Your Climate Risks: A Guide for Public Bodies. We used a commonly accepted formula for calculating risk, which is used in the guide:

Risk = Likelihood of an event X Consequences of an event (Impact)

As recommended by Adaptation Scotland, we used the existing HES risk assessment scoring guidance and matrix, in order that risks identified could easily be incorporated into the existing risk management protocols for the organisation. For each of our PICs, the geographical area for which HES has responsibility was evaluated against a range of hazard data within an ArcGIS project. Our own data on our PICs was in the form of spatial boundary data in shapefile format that showed the extent of the area under our direct ownership or quardianship. This area is often different from that covered by any legal designations, such as scheduling or listing. Some of our 336 PICs have more than one area of 'guardianship' or 'ownership', which is reflected in the spatial boundary data. Due to this we ran the analysis for 352 'sites' as opposed to 336 'properties', which is the official number of properties we look after. In most cases the area of ownership / guardianship extends much further than the upstanding visible remains; see, for example, Figure 2.

The spatial site boundary data was then overlain with the natural hazard datasets. Where a hazard intersected with an area of our guardianship or ownership, we could identify the likelihood of that hazard occurring at each property. This was determined by assessing (i) what the hazard was and (ii) what type of 'likelihood' score that particular dataset showed us.

We assessed impact by considering property type, staffing and visitor access and assigning this a score. We could then calculate a risk score for each hazard at every property by multiplying the likelihood and impact scores together.

Figure 2: Site map for Arbroath Abbey. The complex of Abbey buildings (centre top) accounts for a relatively small proportion of the total PIC area. The red polygon shows the extent of the area under our guardianship. The separate blue polygon shows the extent of the area under our ownership.



0 10 20 40 Meters

2.2 DATASETS SOURCES AND INFORMATION

Having identified and obtained relevant datasets, we worked with BGS to collate these GISready spatial datasets so that they could be utilised in the project. The large SEPA GIS datasets provide a level of information beyond that currently available through the publicly accessible SEPA Flood maps website.

Six datasets were identified as relevant for the project, those being; (1) Fluvial Flooding, (2) Pluvial Flooding, (3) Coastal Flooding, (4) Coastal Erosion, obtained from SEPA, (5) Groundwater Flooding Potential and (6) Slope Instability, developed by BGS. Basemapping was provided by the Ordnance Survey. Each dataset details the probability of the hazard it is mapping in the form of a calculated return period (this is the estimated time interval between events of a similar size or intensity), or qualitative, in the form of a risk description, such as 'the hazard is unlikely to occur in this area'.

Fluvial Flooding

This dataset shows the extent of river flooding for all catchments >3km², for return periods of 1 in 10 years, 1 in 100 years and 1 in 1,000 years. The development of the river flood map is based on a two-dimensional (2D) flood modelling method applied across Scotland to all catchments greater than 3km².

Pluvial Flooding

This dataset shows the flooding extent of pluvial surface water flooding for return periods of 1 in 10 years and 1 in 100 years. This dataset combined information on rainfall and sewer model outputs. It incorporated data from a national surface water study, a regional surface water study with increased resolution in selected areas, and a Scottish Water sewer flooding assessment.

Coastal Flooding

As informed by SEPA, these flood maps were based on a Coastal Flood Boundary dataset developed by the Environment Agency and Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. This provided us with coastal flooding extent of still water (i.e. without wave overtopping) for return periods of 1 in 10 years, 1 in 100 years, 1 in 1,000 years and 1 in 10,000 years.

Coastal Erosion

This dataset shows the natural susceptibility of the coastline to erosion, by considering the elevation of the land, rockhead elevation, distance from open coast and wave exposure. The data is supplied as a network of 50m grid tiles, meaning it is possible that smaller scale variations in risk at a smaller site scale may be missed.

More information on the methodologies behind the development of the SEPA datasets can be found here.

Groundwater Flooding

Groundwater flooding, for the purpose of this dataset, is defined by the BGS 'as the emergence of groundwater at the ground surface away from perennial river valleys or the rising of groundwater into man-made ground under conditions where the 'normal' range of groundwater levels and groundwater flows is exceeded'. This dataset describes the potential for groundwater flooding to occur, based on where geological conditions could enable the flooding to happen, and / or where groundwater may come close to the ground surface, i.e. where the water table is high. The dataset was developed using a GIS rulebased methodology based on permeable superficial deposit (PSD) flooding and clearwater flooding conceptual models. For more information see here.

Slope Instability

This dataset estimates the level of potential hazard by assessing particular slope characteristics (such as geology, gradient, sources of water, drainage, or the actions of people). The results were published as five GIS layers, A to E, with each classification representing increasing hazard. The level of potential hazard recorded at each of our PICs does not necessarily mean that a damaging event will happen, but is an indication of how many causative factors may be present. For more information see here.

Wherever possible, BGS supplies its data at no cost under the Open Government Licence. However there is some data that is only available under a commercial licence. Potential users should contact BGS directly for advice should they wish to obtain the datasets for their own purposes.

Generalised flood mapping data is available from SEPA's Flood maps website. Again, access to more detailed datasets will depend on the individual circumstances; SEPA should be contacted directly for advice. SEPA's datasets are indicative, and of a strategic nature. Whilst all reasonable effort has been made to ensure that they are accurate for their intended purpose, no warranty is given by SEPA in this regard. Within any modelling technique there is inherent uncertainty.

2.3 CALCULATING RISK SCORES

We have used the HES corporate risk matrix as a framework for scoring impact, likelihood and risk, as shown in Tables 1 and 2. This is to ensure that identified risks can be incorporated into operational risk registers and escalated as appropriate. Each of the PICs are assigned a risk rating, for each of the six hazards investigated, by multiplying the likelihood of an event occurring by the associated impact. The result is a 'risk rating' for each PIC.

The following section outlines a simplified methodology for assigning risk scores suitable for the purpose of this report which is to provide a project overview.

			l il	eliho	od	1
Mul	tiplier	1	2	3	4	5
	1	1	2	3	4	5
-	2	2	4	6	8	10
npa	3	3	6	9	12	15
t	4	4	8	12	16	
	5	5	10	15		

Table 1: The Risk Matrix. Multiplying the 'likelihood' by the 'impact' generates a risk score. The following description can be added to the 'likelihood' score: (1) do not believe will ever happen; (2) do not expect to happen; (3) may occur occasionally; (4) will probably occur; (5) likely to occur. See Table 6 for further information on 'impact' scores.

Risk Level	Score	Risk Level Description
Very High		Unacceptable level of risk exposure that requires immediate mitigating action. Action at SMT.
High	3	Unacceptable level of risk which requires controls to be put in place to reduce exposure. Action in Directorate / Consider SMT.
Medium	2	Acceptable level of risk subject to regular passive monitoring. Action in Directorate.
Low	1	Acceptable level of risk subject to regular passive monitoring. Action in Team.

Table 2: Further breakdown of 'risk ratings'. The level at which action should be discussed / taken is determined by how high the risk score is e.g. where a site records a 'very high' level of risk, action should be taken by the Senior Management Team (SMT).

2.3.1 GENERATING AND ASSIGNING LIKELIHOOD SCORES

The HES Risk Management Strategy suggests that the likelihood score is assigned on the estimated probability of a specific event occurring, ranked one to five (with five representing the greatest probability and one the lowest). We found that this was not entirely possible to do with the datasets obtained for this study. As outlined in section 2.2, depending on the dataset, this probability can be quantitative in the form of a calculated return period (this is the estimated time interval between events of a similar size or intensity), or qualitative in the form of a risk description, such as 'the hazard is unlikely to occur in this area'. Some of the likelihood scores were relatively straightforward to assign, i.e. where the data was intended to indicate risk. These datasets easily followed the HES Risk Management Strategy. However, some of the data was not intended to be used to indicate the potential impact of a hazard. This is particularly relevant to the BGS datasets slope instability and groundwater flooding and the SEPA coastal erosion dataset; this data was intended to be used to indicate susceptibility and whether or not a hazard is likely to be present. In these instances, a 'likelihood' score was still assigned on the basis that the results were to be used for screening purposes only and additional site by site analysis would be undertaken at a future date. The method we devised for assigning likelihood scores to each dataset is described below and summarised in Table 3 on the following page.



		Available datasets					
Likelihood	Probability	SEPA Fluvial Flooding	SEPA Pluvial Flooding	SEPA Coastal Flooding	SEPA Coastal Erosion	BGS Groundwater Flooding	BGS Landslides
5	1 in 10 chance	1 in 10 chance	1 in 10 chance	1 in 10 chance	165-175	С	E
4	1 in 100 chance	1 in 100 chance	1 in 100 chance	1 in 100 chance	150-160	В	D
3	1 in 1,000 chance	1 in 1,000 chance		1 in 1,000 chance	135-145	А	С
2	1 in 10,000 chance			1 in 10,000 chance	120-130		В
1	1 in 100,000 chance				105-115		А

Table 3: The relationship between the likelihood score and corresponding datasets used as part of this project.

Using ArcGIS' ArcMap software, a shapefile containing our PIC boundary spatial data was overlain with each of the six natural hazard datasets, in turn. A query run in ArcMap then assessed where the footprint of our PICs intersected with one or more of the six natural hazard datasets. The results of this exercise also told us what 'likelihood' of natural hazard was recorded, if at all.

Fluvial, Pluvial and Coastal Flooding

Three of the SEPA datasets contain probability data in the form of 'return periods'²: Fluvial Flooding, Pluvial Flooding, Coastal Flooding. For these datasets, likelihood is assigned using a 1 to 5 scale with 5 representing the greatest probability (or a 1 in 10 return period) and 1 the lowest probability (or a 1 in 100,000 return period; see Table 3). However, the same return periods are not included in every dataset. For example, the Pluvial Flooding dataset did not include information for floods with a 1 in 1,000 return period. This could, therefore, result in a site being assigned a zero likelihood score even though it may still be at risk. See Table 3 for the Fluvial, Pluvial and Coastal Flooding data available to us at the time of this study, and the corresponding likelihood score assigned.

<u>Д</u> 20

 $^{^{2}}$ A measure of the rarity of an event - the longer the return period, the rarer the event. It is the average length of time (usually in years) separating flood events of a similar magnitude. The return period is also the inverse of the probability that the event will be exceeded in any one year. For example, a 10-year flood has a 1/10 = 0.1 or 10% chance of being exceeded in any one year and a 50-year flood has a 1/50 = 0.2 or 2% chance of being exceeded in any one year. (SEPA, 2015).

Groundwater Flooding

The BGS Groundwater Flooding dataset is intended to be used to indicate susceptibility. It does not provide information on the likelihood of the occurrence of an event of a particular magnitude. However, a 'likelihood' score was still assigned on the basis that the results were to be used for screening purposes only and we needed to identify a means of flagging up sites that had potential for groundwater flooding to occur.

Three categories of potential for groundwater flooding to occur are identified in the dataset: A, B and C. See Table 4 for the definition of each category. Each category indicates limited potential or potential for groundwater flooding to occur. If there is potential for groundwater flooding to occur the depth of flooding is also indicated (i.e. either below ground level or at the surface). For the purpose of this study, we felt that if there is potential for groundwater flooding to occur at the surface we wanted a higher risk score to be generated, therefore we assigned this a 5 likelihood score; groundwater flooding below the surface was assigned a 4 likelihood score; and sites with limited potential for groundwater flooding to occur were assigned a 3 likelihood score. Sites that were found with no susceptibility to groundwater flooding were assigned a likelihood score of O. No likelihood scores of 1 or 2 were assigned.

Coastal Erosion

The SEPA Coastal Erosion dataset indicates areas that are likely to be more susceptible to coastal erosion. It does not indicate the likelihood of a hazard occurring. However, similar to the Groundwater Flooding dataset, a 'likelihood' score was still assigned on the basis that the results were to be used for screening purposes only and we needed to identify a means of flagging up sites that had potential for coastal erosion to occur.³

Five categories of susceptibility to coastal erosion are identified in the dataset. These categories are presented as a series of numbers ranging from 105 to 175; the higher the number the more susceptible the location is to coastal erosion. The numbers are generated using the SEPA Underlying Physical Susceptibility Model, which aggregates four different datasets to produce an overall score.⁴ Each number is assigned a colour ranging from green to red (traffic light system), green indicating least susceptible and red most susceptible. See Table 3 for how we decided to assign 'likelihood' scores against the range of susceptibility scores provided in the dataset.

Category	Definition
А	Limited potential for groundwater flooding to occur
В	Potential for groundwater flooding of property situated below ground level
С	Potential for groundwater flooding to occur at surface

Table 4: Potential for groundwater flooding categories and definitions as defined in the BGS SGF dataset.

³The Groundwater Flooding dataset is suitable for use for regional or national planning purposes where used alongside a range of other relevant information to inform land-use planning decisions. In the case of this study, the data is being used alongside other flood risk datasets and as part of an initial screening process to identify sites that may have potential for groundwater flooding to occur. ⁴SEPA Natural Susceptibility to Coastal Erosion: methodology and mapping summary.

Slope Instability

The BGS Slope Instability, or Landslide dataset (version 7) is intended to be used to identify and assess potential hazard in a given area. The severity of the hazard is indicated with an A-E classification - A representing the lowest hazard level and E the highest, (Table 5 shows the breakdown of this scale). The data does not indicate if a landslide is likely to occur, but rather how vulnerable an area might be to experiencing hazard events and whether the hazard is present or anticipated. However, a 'likelihood' score was still assigned on the basis that the results were to be used for screening purposes only, and we needed to identify a means of flagging up sites that had potential for a landslide to occur, or may already be affected. See Table 3 for how we decided to assign 'likelihood' scores.

Despite the inherent difficulties with assigning likelihood

scores, the available data give a reasonable indication of possible future impacts based on the current understanding of natural hazards. By using this data, even if not intended to be used to calculate risk, a baseline understanding of threats can be ascertained. Then, as additional data is available and further studies and individual site-by-site analyses are undertaken, data can be improved upon and threats modified to more accurately reflect the risk.

2.3.2 GENERATING AND ASSIGNING IMPACT SCORES

In order to apply consistent risk scores to all our PICs, an impact scoring system was created. For the purpose of this risk assessment, the scores are based entirely on the physical impact to the monument fabric, and its surrounding grounds. Details of the scores are outlined in Table 6. The system does not consider, for example, impact on health and safety (of staff/visitors), site access, business operations or organisational reputation etc. Once this methodology has been established and refined it is intended that we will apply it to wider aspects of our operations (which is beyond the scope of this initial phase). The impact score is ranked in a similar way to likelihood, with one being defined as the lowest impact and five the highest.

Due to the desk-based nature of the project, at this stage, impact scores were assigned based on the type of property and type of hazard in question. As set out in the Scheme of Delegation, Baseline Condition Survey, the HES PICs are broken down into six categories, which also form the breakdown for this risk assessment. Those categories are labeled A to F and detailed in the 'Monument Type' field of Table 6.

Scale	Definition
А	Slope instability problems are not thought to occur, but consideration to potential problems of adjacent areas impacting on the site should always be considered
В	Slope instability problems are not likely to occur, but consideration to potential problems of adjacent areas impacting on the site should always be considered
С	Slope instability problems may be present or anticipated—site investigation should consider specifically the slope stability of the site
D	Slope instability problems are probably present or have occurred in the past—land use should consider specifically the stability of the site
E	Slope instability problems almost certainly present and may be active—significant constraint on land use

Table 5: Scale of hazard as defined in the BGS GeoSure Landslides dataset.

 $\Lambda \Gamma$

IMPACT LEVEL ONE

Monument Type	Roofed Monuments (A&B) (Occupied and Unoccupied)	Unroofed Monuments (C&D) (High and Low Masonry)	Standing Stones, Carved Stones & Field Monuments (E&F)		
Impact Description	Historic fabric is stable	Historic fabric is stable	No alteration		
General Site Description	Negligible impact to property/site; No ground disturbance; Site remains in optimal condition.				

IMPACT LEVEL TWO

Monument Type	Roofed Monuments (A&B) (Occupied and Unoccupied)	Unroofed Monuments (C&D) (High and Low Masonry)	Standing Stones, Carved Stones & Field Monuments (E&F)	
Impact Description	Minor decay to exposed features	Minor decay to exposed features	Gradual attrition of material fabric	
General Site Description	Minor damage to site, Recoverable and no loss of historic fabric; Localised ground disturbance; Site remains in satisfactory condition.			

IMPACT LEVEL THREE

Monument Type	Roofed Monuments (A&B)	Unroofed Monuments (C&D)	Standing Stones, Carved Stones		
	(Occupied and Unoccupied)	(High and Low Masonry)	& Field Monuments (E&F)		
Impact Description Damage to structural elements (masonry, roof, etc.)		Damage to structural elements (masonry, roof, etc.)	Continued attrition; Surface modification/loss.		
General Site	Minor damage to (or loss) of historic fabric; Short to long term consequences; Ground disturbance;				
Description	Potential for exposure of archaeological deposits; Significant localised problems.				

IMPACT LEVEL FOUR

Monument Type	Roofed Monuments (A&B) (Occupied and Unoccupied)	Unroofed Monuments (C&D) (High and Low Masonry)	Standing Stones, Carved Stones & Field Monuments (E&F)	
Impact Description	Cracks in masonry with signs of movement; Potential for collapse	Cracks in masonry with signs of movement; Potential for collapse	Rapid attrition of material; Monument unstable; Loss of surface features	
General Site Description	Damage to site with significant loss of historic fabric; Long-term consequences; Significant ground disturbance; Damage/loss of archaeological deposits; Site in unsatisfactory condition with major localised problems.			

IMPACT LEVEL FIVE

Monument Type	Roofed Monuments (A&B) (Occupied and Unoccupied)	Unroofed Monuments (C&D) (High and Low Masonry)	Standing Stones, Carved Stones & Field Monuments (E&F)	
Impact Description	Partial to total collapse	Partial to total collapse	Major deterioration of fabric	
General Site Description	Irrecoverable loss of historic fabric; Major long-term consequences; Site in unsatisfactory condition.			

Table 6: A new scale of impact developed for the purpose of this project.

For example, if a landslide were to occur, or a section of coast eroded, these would be irreversible events. As such, they both inflict the maximum impact on any given property. A flood, however, would have a different impact depending on what the type of property was. For example, a flood at a roofed monument that is occupied would arguably have a greater impact than a flood at a field monument. This is due to the fact that a roofed monument is more likely to house special collections, have decorative interiors and have a decreased ability to 'dry out' after flood waters have receded. An unroofed monument, as another example, whilst in many cases having largely intact foundations / walls, is less likely to contain such vulnerable collections, therefore the impact of a flood is likely to be lower here as well. Table 7 details the assigned relationship between the six different hazards investigated, and their impact on the six categories of property.

	Property Category					
HAZARD	Α	В	с	D	E	F
Landslide	5	5	5	5	5	5
Coastal Erosion	5	5	5	5	5	5
Pluvial Flooding	4	4	3	3	2	2
Fluvial Flooding	4	4	3	3	2	2
Coastal Flooding	4	4	3	3	2	2
Groundwater Flooding	4	4	3	3	2	2
	Impact Score (2 to 5)					

Table 7: The relationship between the different 'types' of monument we care for, and the fixed impact score for the different hazards.



2.3.3 INHERENT AND RESIDUAL RISK SCORES

(i) Inherent Risk

This is the first of two risk scores generated for each PIC. It is generated by multiplying the 'likelihood' of an event occurring by the 'impact'. It provides us with a means of assessing inherent risk at PICs. This reflects the primary vulnerability of a site to the natural hazards considered, before taking into account the mitigating factors and controls associated with site management.

(ii) Mitigants and Controls

To reflect our site operations and maintenance regime (presence of site staff, conservation teams, etc.), the impact score is modified to reflect this which, as a result, changes the risk score. This gives us the change from Inherent Risk to Residual Risk.

To modify the impact score, it is reduced depending on the level of staffing in place at any given site, and its visitor access (some of our properties are open all year, some seasonal and some permanently closed). This is a notional adjustment related primarily to the on-site presence of staff to reflect an expected reduction in risk. For example, at a site that is staffed all year round, it could be anticipated that staff will be alerted to an imminent flood, therefore there is greater potential for proactive action in response to this hazard. The amount deducted from the impact score is shown in Table 8.

(iii) Residual Risk

This is the second risk score generated for each PIC and details the risk present after taking into consideration the mitigants and controls. Again, it is generated by multiplying the likelihood of an event occurring by the impact. However, this time the final score is adjusted based on the mitigants and controls in place.

Property Opening times (plus staffing)	Impact Modifier (Change in Impact Score)
Closed	No Change
Seasonal	-0.25
Seasonal (Staffed)	-0.5
All Year	-0.75
All Year (Staffed)	-1

Table 8: The amount deducted from the inherent impact score to give us the residual impact score.

3. RESULTS TORAIDHEAN

For this initial phase of the project we have assessed the risk from six natural hazards at 352 'sites'. The results of this initial deskbased assessment has allowed us to identify, to the best of our knowledge, what sites we believe to be the most at risk from the natural hazards assessed, and ultimately climate change. These results will now inform the next phase of our risk assessment. which will include more detailed desk based assessments of risk at the high-priority sites, as well as site visits and gathering in staff observations from the ground. Using this data to inform our next steps will allow us to allocate time and resources in a more

efficient and pragmatic way. Initial results from the desk-top natural risk assessment show that of the 352 'sites', 89% are exposed to at least one hazard in a way that is considered unacceptable i.e. damaging to the site or monument fabric (Inherent Risk: very high or high – see Figure 3). Taking into account the mitigants and controls in place, the number of sites classified as 'at risk' is reduced to 53% (see Figure 3, residual risk). 28 sites are classified as very high and 160 sites as high risk.

The high and very high risk categories indicate unacceptable risk that requires actions in order to control or reduce exposure to hazards. We define risk as exposure to a range of environmental threats / hazards. which have the potential to cause damage to the asset and its cultural significance. These sites on the Residual list will now undergo a priority assessment to identify mitigation requirements. In some cases work has recently been carried out or is currently underway to reduce the residual risk, as part of our continual annual maintenance and repair works, e.g. rock containment at Edinburgh Castle; coastal protection works at Blackness Castle.



Figure 3: Initial results of the Risk Assessment. The 'inherent risk' score does not take into account any mitigants and controls already in place at our PICs. An assessment of staff and visitor presence at our PICs alters the risk score to produce the 'residual risk'. See section 2.3 for more information.

<u>کر</u> 26

3.1 DATA LIMITATIONS

As with any modelled data, there are inherent uncertainties that can influence the results. The SEPA datasets, which were created to support flood risk management planning at a community level, are not intended for property level assessment. As such, the results are indicative of the risk that may be experienced at our sites. Likewise, the BGS slope instability dataset has specific limitations in that it is concerned only with potential ground stability related to natural geological conditions. It does not cover man-made hazards, such as contaminated land or mining.

We have been able to address these limitations to the best of our ability by working closely with SEPA and BGS. This close working partnership has allowed us to acknowledge, and understand, the limitations of these datasets but still use them in an effective and sensible manner.

In general, the nature of the data and the fact that we are assessing only presence or absence of a hazard within the property boundary, means that there are cases where a site records high levels of risk, but in fact that hazard may only be a feature at a small, localised area of the site. Case Study Two, Blackness Castle, is a good example of this and is included at the end of the report. The opposite is also true here; there are examples of sites where the entire site boundary falls within the footprint of one or more of the hazards investigated. Within the remit of this initial phase of the risk assessment project, risk scores are not altered to reflect what percentage of the site is at risk from one or more of the hazards studied.



3.2 FLUVIAL FLOODING

The Fluvial Flooding SEPA dataset shows the extent of river flooding for all catchments >3km², for return periods of 1 in 10 years, 1 in 100 years and 1 in 1,000 years. Of our 336 PICs, 45% are located within 100 metres of a river or a stream course. When we consider other areas liable to flood, such as culverts, standing bodies of water, marsh land and agricultural drainage systems, the number of properties within 100 metres of these increases to 86%.

The proximity of many of our sites to these areas liable to fluvial flooding is not surprising. When many of our properties were constructed and used, being close to a water source was essential for provision of water for the domestic, agricultural and transport needs of our ancestors. The legacy of this is that many of our properties are now susceptible to the impacts of fluvial flooding. However many



Inverlochy Castle, built around 1280 on the banks of the River Lochy, which once fed a large moat that surrounded the castle.

show an inbuilt resilience to this - See our Case Study on Threave Castle for example, at the end of the report.

Initial results from the risk assessment (Inherent Risk) show that out of 352 'sites' analysed, approximately 17% are exposed to fluvial flooding in a way that is deemed unacceptable (i.e. Very High and High risk). The remaining 83% are not thought to be at immediate risk, however as the continued impacts of climate change are realised, it is expected that this figure will change, with an increase in the number of 'at risk' sites. Taking into account the mitigants and controls in place, the number of sites classified as 'at risk' is reduced to approximately 16% – seven sites recording a 'Very High' risk and 48 recording a 'High' risk, this is the Residual Risk score.





3.3 PLUVIAL FLOODING

The Pluvial Flooding SEPA dataset shows the flooding extent of pluvial surface water flooding for return periods of 1 in 10 years and 1 in 100 years. Pluvial flooding affects a relatively small proportion of our sites, with routine maintenance and drainage schemes already providing effective dispersal of rainwater. The rural setting of many of our properties and the resulting irregular topography is also a key factor in the dispersal of rainwater into natural flow pathways. Where pluvial flooding has been recorded at our sites, it is usually in small, localised areas. These will now require further investigation to identify if they present an immediate risk. Depending on the nature of the site, risk of pluvial flooding may already be effectively managed by routine maintenance e.g. regular clearance of cast iron rainwater goods and ground drainage systems. Initial results from the risk assessment (Inherent Risk) show that out of 352 'sites' analysed, approximately 5% are exposed to Pluvial Flooding in a way that is deemed unacceptable. The remaining 95% are not thought to be at immediate risk.

Taking into account the mitigants and controls in place, the number of sites classified as 'at risk' is reduced to approximately 4% – two sites recording a 'Very High' risk and 12 recording a 'High' risk, this is the Residual Risk score.





Brough of Birsa



3.4 COASTAL FLOODING AND COASTAL EROSION

Of our 336 PICs, 8% are within 10 metres of the coastline, and 14% within 50 metres. Although a relatively small proportion of our overall Estate, this still represents a number of significant sites that may be at risk of coastal flooding and / or erosion. It is worth noting that given the national scale of the coastal erosion dataset, there are instances where it has not identified sites where there is known coastal erosion. Part of the solution to this omission is our involvement in the ongoing National Coastal Change Assessment for Scotland (NCCA), which has established historical coastal change in order to estimate past erosion and accretion rates. This has provided a basis for a fifty year projection of coastal change. A key output

from this project has been the Dynamic Coast website – an interactive tool to inform strategic planning at local authority level. Tools like this will help us make more informed decisions, with respect to adapting to future coastal change.

The coastal setting of many of our sites is a legacy of the needs of the people that constructed and used them. Similar to the benefits of being close to a river. there were significant advantages for the defence and domestic needs of the people using these sites by being close to the sea. Our Fort George Case Study, included at the end of the report, is a good example of picking a strategically advantageous stretch of coastline for constructing a military base. Fort George is also a good example of a site now under

pressure, from coastal erosion in particular, in the face of rising sea-levels and a possible increase in the number of, and intensity of, winter storms.

Our coastal sites present one of our greatest challenges moving forward, as the unrelenting increase in sea-levels in particular, continue to cause issues arising from coastal flooding and erosion. Many of our sites have had seadefences in place for many years now, including (but not limited to) Skara Brae, Blackness Castle, Castle Sween and Fort George. In many cases, these defences are doing the job they were intended to, however, they require ongoing monitoring and maintenance and will come under increasing pressures as climate change intensifies.

3.4.1 COASTAL FLOODING

The Coastal Flooding SEPA dataset shows the Coastal Flooding extent of still water (i.e. without wave overtopping) for return periods of 1 in 10 years, 1 in 100 years, 1 in 1,000 years and 1 in 10,000 years. Initial results from the risk assessment (Inherent Risk) show that out of 352 'sites' analysed, approximately 10% are exposed to Coastal Flooding in a way that is deemed unacceptable. The remaining 90% are not thought to be at immediate risk. Taking into account the mitigants and controls in place, the number of sites classified as 'at risk' is reduced to approximately 9% seven sites recording a 'Very High' risk and 24 recording a 'High' risk, this is the Residual Risk score.



Figure 6: Breakdown of risk, due to Coastal Flooding, at the 352 'sites' assessed.

3.4.2 COASTAL EROSION

The Coastal Erosion SEPA dataset shows the natural susceptibility of the coastline to erosion, by considering the elevation of the land, rockhead elevation (the depth to the bedrock geology), distance from open coast and wave exposure. Initial results from the risk assessment (Inherent Risk) show that out of 352 'sites' analysed, approximately 10% are exposed to Coastal Erosion in a way that is deemed unacceptable. The remaining 90% are not thought to be at immediate risk. Taking into account the mitigants and controls in place, the number of sites classified as 'at risk' is reduced to approximately 7% - 10 sites recording a 'Very High' risk and 14 recording a 'High' risk, this is the Residual Risk score.



Figure 7: Breakdown of risk, due to Coastal Erosion, at the 352 'sites' assessed.

3.5 GROUNDWATER FLOODING

This BGS dataset, based on geological and hydrogeological information, identifies areas where geological conditions could enable groundwater flooding to occur and where groundwater may come close to the ground surface. Groundwater flooding has the potential to alter the historic fabric and appearance of our properties, by changing ground conditions and altering the type of vegetation that can grow on the surface. It has the potential to cause flooding in sites that go below ground level, which is a concern at many of our properties that contain cellars / vaults, as well as those with surviving archaeological deposits. Certain stone types, like sandstone, which is used prolifically throughout our Estate, are susceptible to enhanced rates of decay as they can absorb groundwater into their porous structure, as observed at Lincluden Collegiate Church (see image above). Section 4.2 has additional information on these impacts.



Lincluden Collegiate Church

Initial results from the risk assessment (Inherent Risk) show that out of 352 'sites' analysed, approximately 59% are exposed to Groundwater Flooding in a way that is deemed unacceptable. The remaining 41% are not thought to be at immediate risk. Taking into account the mitigants and controls in place, the number of sites classified as 'at risk' is reduced to approximately 41% -14 sites recording a 'Very High' risk and 131 recording a 'High' risk, this is the Residual Risk

score. Recent research by BGS (2015) indicates that the actual impact of groundwater flooding is often mitigated by artificial or natural drainage systems, as well as building design. As a result, the true percentage of properties 'at risk' is likely to be lower than this screening exercise suggests. Future phases of the risk assessment project, which include ground-truthing the results of this report, will help us refine our understanding of risk across the Estate.







Dunadd Fort

3.6 SLOPE INSTABILITY

This BGS dataset identifies where slope instability occurs when particular slope characteristics (such as geology, gradient, sources of water, drainage, or the actions of people) could combine to make the slope unstable. As with the other hazards investigated in this assessment, many of the sites at risk of slope instability are so because of the fundamental characteristics of the site, which are the very reason they were occupied historically. Some of our most recognisable landmarks are those perched atop rocky outcrops, such as Stirling and Edinburgh Castles, which both make use of the natural defence capabilities provided by the steep-sided volcanic crags. There is a symbolic element as well in being located on high, visible and defensible points of land. This is clear at sites like Dunadd Fort, which rises from Moine Mhor (the 'great moss'), an expanse of peat bog that carpets the southern end of Kilmartin Glen in the west of Scotland. Excavations in the 1980s found the mound was used

as a fort more than 2,000 years ago. But the site is internationally renowned as a royal power centre of the Gaelic kings of Dál Riata, from about AD 500 to AD 800.

Initial results from the risk assessment (Inherent Risk) show that out of 352 'sites' analysed, approximately 95% are exposed to Slope Instability in a way that is deemed unacceptable. The remaining 5% are not thought to be at immediate risk. While this statistic may appear alarming, it is a result of the way in which the impact score for slope instability is obtained. This type of hazard is irreversible, and automatically scores the highest level of impact, which is why such a high percentage of our sites are initially recorded as being at 'High' or 'Very High' risk. Taking into account the mitigants and controls in place, the number of sites classified as 'at risk' is reduced to approximately 19% seven sites recording a 'Very High' risk and 60 recording a 'High' risk, this is the Residual Risk score.



3.7 SITES AT RISK

Based on the initial results of this desk-based analysis of current natural hazard risk across the HES Estate, the following 28 sites all record 'Very High' levels of risk in one, or more, of the six hazards investigated. A further 160 sites record 'High' levels of risk (see the Risk Register Appendix for the complete results of the risk assessment). Of the 28 sites, seven record a 'Very High' risk for fluvial flooding, seven for coastal flooding, two for pluvial flooding, 14 for groundwater flooding, 10 for coastal erosion, and seven for slope instability.

Property Name	Туре	Hazards
Biggar Gasworks	А	FF, GF
Bonawe Iron Furnace	В	FF, GF, PF, CF
Brough of Birsay	D	CE
Cambuskenneth Abbey	В	FF, GF, CF
Castle Sween	С	CE
Dundonald Castle	С	LA
Eileach-an-Naoimh	С	CE
Elcho Castle	А	GF
Fort George	А	CE
Hackness Battery & Martello Tower	А	CF
Inchcolm Abbey	В	CE, LA, GF, CF
Inchcolm Island	В	CE, LA, GF, CF
Innerpeffray Chapel	В	GF
Kisimul Castle	А	CF
Mavisbank Policies	F	LA
Ness of Burgi	D	CE
Newark Castle	А	CE, GF, CF
Quoyness Chambered Cairn	В	CE
Seton Collegiate Church	В	GF, FF
Spynie Palace	С	LA
St. Blane's Church	С	LA
St. Serf's Church, Dunning	В	GF
Stanley Mills	А	LA, FF, GF
Tealing Dovecot	В	GF, FF, PF
Torphichen Preceptory	В	GF
Tullibardine Chapel	В	GF
Whithorn Priory Crosses (& Museum)	A	FF
Wideford Hill Chambered Cairn	E	LA

Table 9: Top 28 'at risk' sites. 'Type' refers to the six monument categories (see section 2.3). Hazards key: **FF** – fluvial flooding; **PF** – pluvial flooding; **GF** – groundwater flooding; **CF** – coastal flooding; **CE** – coastal erosion and **LA** – slope instability.

4. FUTURE RISK RIOSG TEACHDAIL

The results of our risk assessment, to date, are based on the current risk to our PICs, not future risk influenced by a changing climate. However, all of the risks are likely to increase as a result of climate change due to their inherent links to precipitation and sea level rise. The results gathered as part of this assessment therefore form the baseline data from which we can consider how climate change will impact our PICs in the future.

4.1 CLIMATE CHANGE IN SCOTLAND

We know that the climate is changing, and we know that this is already having a notable impact on the historic environment. To begin to understand how changing climatic conditions will impact the historic environment in the future we first of all need to know what 'change' is going to happen.

In the United Kingdom the primary source of future climate

projections data is the United **Kingdom Climate Projections** 2009 (UKCP09) climate modelling tool. This data provides probabilistic projections for a range of atmospheric variables including temperature and precipitation. The data can be viewed over varying temporal time scales and under three proposed future emissions scenarios (low, medium and high). The data is given at a resolution of 25km as well as for whole regions. The projected climate change data included in Figure 10 is based on a high emissions scenario (worst case outcome) and with a 50% probability (central estimate), meaning that under different circumstances there are higher and lower figures obtainable. It shows the anticipated changes in Scotland's climate by the 2050s (UKCP09, 2017).

Within the Scotland-wide projections for future climate change lie strong regional variations in anticipated climate change. When looking specifically at changes in precipitation, the North West coast of Scotland and the Northern Isles are expected to see a lower reduction in summer rainfall, in comparison to the rest of the country. In contrast to this, these same areas are expected to see a larger increase in rain falling during the winter months, (see Figure 11 for further information). When looking at the anticipated changes in temperature, in both the summer and winter analysis, Southern Scotland will, broadly speaking, see higher increases in temperature in comparison to Northern Scotland, as shown in the UKCP09 maps in Figure 11.

These regional differences will play an important role in future consideration of climate change risk across our Estate of Properties in Care, and the wider historic environment.



Figure 10: Projected changes in the climate of Scotland by the 2050s, under a high emissions scenario (UKCP09, 2017).



A Climate Change Risk Assessment
4.2 IMPACTS ON THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Rising Sea Levels

Sea-levels around Scotland have historically been variable. Our coastline today bears the evidence of rising and falling sea-levels, with many of our PICs showing evidence of these changes. Old Caerlaverock Castle in Dumfries and Galloway is a good example of this. The original castle, constructed in the early 13th Century had its own harbour and stood at the head of a small tidal inlet, (see Figure 12 for an artist's impression of this). An apparent drop in sea level since this time has left what remains of the

harbour inland by approximately 200m from the present day shoreline. This is a familiar story around Scotland, where a complex glacial and geological history, as well as local human influences, has resulted in apparent falls and rises in sea-level.

After the retreat of the last Scottish ice sheet around 20,000 year ago, the land surface of Scotland began to 'rebound', as a result of the immense weight of the ice sheets being removed. This effectively 'cancelled out' rising sea-levels. The rates at which sea levels are rising now, as a result of anthropogenic climate change, has overtaken this process (Rennie and Hansom, 2011), As reported in The Committee on Climate Change UK Climate Change Risk Assessment 2017. since 1900, sea-levels around the UK have risen by 15 to 20 centimetres, with climate change projections indicating that by 2100 there could be a further rise of between 50 and 100 cm. This has clear, severe implications for our sites located on the coast. 8% of our sites are located within just 10 meters of the shoreline. and 14% within 50 metres. Many of these sites have been classified as being at 'Very High' risk of coastal erosion and flooding in this risk assessment.



Figure 12: An artist's illustration of the early 13th Century Caerlaverock Castle, situated at the head of a small tidal inlet, complete with its own harbour.





Increasing frequency and intensity of rainfall

As discussed in Section 4.1, Scotland is expected to see continually wetter winters and drier summers, with more frequent intense spells of rain. This changing frequency, and intensity, of rainfall will have direct impacts on all aspects of the historic environment.

Water is the most destructive agent of decay. On a large scale, heavy and intense rainfall can directly lead to flooding in a short time frame, which has the potential to cause catastrophic damage to all elements of the historic environment within reach of these potential flood zones. As reported by The Committee on Climate Change (2017) in the UK Climate Change Risk Assessment 2017, increased occurrence rates of flooding and the associated risk is seen as the greatest direct climate change related threat in the United Kingdom. Out of the 336 PICs of HES. 45% are within 100 metres of a stream or river course. When we consider other areas liable to flood, such as agricultural drains, marsh land and standing bodies of water such as ponds and lochs, the number of sites within 100 metres of these areas increases to 86%. However, it should be noted that not all these sites have been identified as being at direct risk from flooding in this risk assessment.

Ness of Burgi, an Iron Age ruin in Shetland. Situated on a narrow promontory, the site is dominated by a so-called 'blockhouse fort' - a rare type of monument of which there are only three confirmed examples, all in Shetland. This site is flagged as being at 'Very High' risk of coastal erosion.

Within our portfolio of PICs, 55 are identified as being at 'High' or 'Very High' risk of fluvial flooding. Within these identified properties, there are many that provide examples of resilience to this flooding threat. The very existence of some of these sites is testament to their ability to cope with hazards such as flooding. This theme is explored further in the Kilchurn Castle Case Study at the end of the report. Water is also a key controlling factor in other natural hazards aside from flooding. Landslips and other slope instability issues, for example, are to an extent controlled by the presence of water. See, for example the relationship between rainfall and the occurrence of landslides, as demonstrated in Figure 13. This example, recorded by the BGS, details how in 2012 above average levels of rainfall correlated with an increase in the number of landslides recorded.



Figure 13: Relationship between rainfall and the occurrence rates of landslides, 2012 (BGS, 2016).

Repeated extreme wetting and drying can also lead to ground instability issues, through the destabilisation of soils. This could have a range of negative effects, including the movement of building foundations and the disturbance of known and unknown buried archaeological remains. This is more prevalent in certain types of soils, such as those that are clay rich.

On a smaller scale, but over a longer period of time, water is a major controlling factor in chemical, biological and physical decay processes that are particularly prolific in the deterioration of stone work. In short, if stone is exposed to increased amounts of moisture, then the speed at which it naturally deteriorates will accelerate. Saturation of stone work, and the repeated process of drying out can also facilitate the diffusion of salts into the porous structure of masonry. When the stone dries out these salts can crystallise, and exert an internal pressure that causes the stone to decay. The source of these salts could be natural. for example an airborne aerosol in a marine environment, or from human sources, for example the use of de-icing salts on paths (Smith et al, 2011). This process is similar in freeze-thaw weathering, whereby water freezing and expanding within the porous network of stone. or in fissures and cracks, overtime causes the stone to decay. However, with winter temperatures continuing to rise we expect to see freezethaw weathering becoming less prevalent, although it is possible that previous damage as a result

of freeze-thaw decay will have left stonework vulnerable to other methods of decay that our changing climate will favour.

A fluctuating water table or wetting and / or drying of archaeological deposits under the topsoil can lead to chemical changes, compaction, settlement or erosion that may have adverse effects on the long-term survival of these remains, including palaeoenvironmental material (Daly 2013; High et al 2016; Historic England 2016; Martens et al, 2016).

Increasing temperatures

Increasing annual temperatures in Scotland will have a variety of direct impacts on the historic environment. This includes the potential to change the appearance of our historic landscapes and gardens, the creation of new and more favourable habitats for damaging pest species and increasing the likelihood of wildfires in our landscapes.

Rising temperatures across Scotland will enable the spread of pests into areas where they previously would not have been able to survive. This is a particular cause for concern at our properties that still contain elements of their original historic interiors, with vulnerable components such as textiles and wood at risk from pests including the Clothes Moth and Carpet Beetle. The warming of Scotland's climate will result in more favourable conditions that will potentially allow pests to have increasingly longer periods of indoor activity, as well as the ability to disperse into new areas more effectively (Brimblecombe and Lankester, 2013).

Although winter rainfall levels are projected to increase markedly, summer levels are expected to drop considerably, with a projected decrease of 13% across Scotland by the 2050s. As a result, warmer and drier summers with longer dry spells will increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring in our natural landscapes. Landscapes that are prone to fire, including woodland and moorland will, in many cases, have known and unknown archaeological deposits below the surface. A fire has the potential to remove ground cover, and leave the archaeological deposits at increased risk of erosion. Damage as a result of heat could also modify archaeological deposits and alter material crucial in dating of the deposits. The occurrence of wildfires also has the potential to alter the visual appearance of these landscapes.



A small fire-damaged patch of grassland at Machrie Moor Standing Stones, Isle of Arran, May 2016. This rich archaeological landscape includes stone circles, standing stones, burial cairns and cists, as well as hut circles and an extensive field system, all dating to between 3500 and 1500 BC.

1/



The walled garden at Edzell Castle - original constructed in 1604. The garden today is based on a newer design, constructed in the 1930s, and forms part of the Scheduled Area of the monument.

Changes in Vegetation Patterns Increasing annual temperatures and seasonal variations in the amount of rainfall across Scotland will, combined, create conditions that are favourable to increasing levels of biogenic growth. This could take the form of a longer growing season, vegetation growth on historic buildings and changing distributions of plant species.

The growing season in Scotland has been extended by approximately 30 days since the early 1960s (Sniffer 2014). The impact of this on the historic environment is wide ranging, depending on what aspect is being considered. For example, many of our unroofed monuments have open wallheads that are vulnerable to water penetration. They also provide ideal locations for encouraging plant growth. Plants and small tree roots have the ability to break down mortar and force open cracks in masonry, allowing for more effective water penetration. This can lead to serious issues with unstable masonry and the accelerated decay of vulnerable stonework. Where stonework becomes saturated. it is increasingly susceptible to becoming discoloured as well as facilitating algal growth on the surface. Combined, this increase in biological colonisation of our vulnerable monuments could lead to enhanced rates of biodeterioration, through both chemical and physical processes.

In our managed historic gardens and landscapes, changing weather patterns will have the combined effect of changing the distribution of plant species. This will result in species that once thrived in particular areas no longer being able to do so. However, some exotic plants deliberately planted in the past in gardens may thrive in future climates. Likewise, other species will move into new regions. This will change the character of historic landscapes and it also has the potential to introduce aggressive species that could cause damage to other plant types, as well as to the fabric of historic buildings and collections.



5. NEXT STEPS ATH-CHEUMAN

Now that a baseline assessment of risk from natural hazards for our Estate has been undertaken. attention will be focused on the properties that have been identified as 'at risk'. By conducting site visits, speaking to staff and others who manage and use these sites, and by carrying out more in-depth environmental studies of these properties, we will be able to generate a more refined assessment of risk tailored to individual sites. The next stage will also include more advanced assessments of projected climate change data for sites. Enhanced information from sites, including site specific

management practice, is likely to add an additional 'risk modifier' to the assessment that will further increase our understanding of climate change risk at our PICs.

Further work will also focus on re-running the initial environmental screening risk assessment, with an extended geographical buffer zone beyond the perimeter of our sites. This will highlight additional factors such as risks to key infrastructure and services such as access routes and utilities, which, if disrupted, could have a significant impact on site management (e.g. access for emergency services, provision of power etc.). Consideration of the areas beyond our immediate boundaries will also benefit future planning for sites in terms of visitor access and awareness of changes to the surrounding landscapes, which can influence the cultural significance of the heritage asset. We will continue to work closely with our Partners to review our methodology for calculating risk scores as our understanding of the current data expands and new data becomes available. This will allow us to refine our results and enhance our overall understanding of climate change risk across our Estate.



6. CONCLUSION CO-DHÙNADH

This assessment has brought together, for the first time, datasets pertaining to the risk posed to Historic Environment Scotland's Properties in Care from various natural hazards. To date, it represents the most in depth study of risk from natural hazards to the 336 Properties in Care of the Scottish Ministers. It is a baseline assessment and provides the foundations for future studies. It also informs us, to the best of our current understanding, on what sites will be most susceptible to the impacts of climate change. The results of this initial risk assessment can now be incorporated into our

existing maintenance works programmes, as well as acting as an additional consideration when prioritising the allocation of funds for future works.

The development of a new methodology for calculating the risk to culturally and historically significant monuments forms a key output of the project and can be adopted by others looking to conduct their own assessments in the broader historic environment.

It is important to note that although many properties record low levels of risk in many of the natural hazards assessed, climate change is altering the severity and occurrence rates of these hazards beyond conditions we recognise today. As such, we cannot rule out sites, which are not identified in this risk assessment, as being at risk and experiencing one or more of the hazards highlighted in this report.

This study represents a first step in assessing environmental and climate change risks to our Properties in Care. Further work will refine this, through more detailed site specific analysis, and consideration of additional datasets including the integration of climate change projections.



7. REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING TEISTEANASAN IS LEUGHADH A BHARRACHD

BGS (2010). Susceptibility to groundwater flooding explanatory notes for users. *British Geological Survey Data Products Explanatory Notes for Users* [Online] Available at: http://www.bgs.ac.uk/products/hydrogeology/ groundwaterFlooding.html [Accessed 25 August 2017].

BGS (2015). Estimating numbers of properties susceptible to groundwater flooding in England [online] Available at: http://nora.nerc. ac.uk/510064 [Accessed 01 September 2017]

BGS (2016). Rainfall and Landslide Data for the UK. [Online] Available at http://www. bgs.ac.uk/research/engineeringGeology/ shallowGeohazardsAndRisks/landslides/ landslidesAndRainfall.html [Accessed 09 March 2016].

Brimblecombe, P., & Lankester, P. (2013). Long-term changes in climate and insect damage in historic houses. *Studies in Conservation*, 58(1), 13-22.

Committee on Climate Change (2017). UK Climate Change Risk Assessment 2017: Synthesis report [Online] Available at: https://www.theccc.org.uk/uk-climate-change-riskassessment-2017/synthesis-report/ [Accessed 22 Mar. 2017].

Daly, C (2013). Climate Change and the Conservation of Archaeological Sites: A Review of Impacts Theory. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 13(4), 293-310.

High, K, Milner, N, Panter, I, & Penkman, K E H (2015), Apatite for destruction: investigating bone degradation due to high acidity at Star Carr. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 59, 159-168

Historic England (2016). Preserving archaeological remains: Decision-taking for sites under development. Swindon. Historic England.

Historic Environment Scotland, (2016). Short Guide 11: Climate Change Adaptation for Traditional Buildings.

Kendon, M., McCarthy, M., Jevrejeva, S. and Legg, T. (2017): State of the UK Climate 2016, Met Office, Exeter, UK.

Lee, K.A., and D. Diaz Doce. (2014). User Guide for the British Geological Survey GeoSure dataset. *British Geological Survey Internal Report*, OR/14/012. Martens, V V, Bergersen, O, Vorenhout, M, Sandvik, P U & Holleson, J (2016). Research and Monitoring on Conservation State and Preservation Conditions in Unsaturated Archaeological Deposits of a Medieval Farm Mound in Troms and a Late Stone Age Midden in Finnmark, Northern Norway. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 18(1-3), 8-29.

Peltier, L. C. (1950). The geographic cycle in periglacial regions as it is related to climatic geomorphology. *Annals of the association of American Geographers*, 40(3), 214-236.

Rennie, A. F., & Hansom, J. D. (2011). Sea level trend reversal: Land uplift outpaced by sea level rise on Scotland's coast. *Geomorphology*, 125(1), 193-202.

SEPA. (2014). Coastal Flooding. Scottish Environment *Protection Agency Methodology and Mapping Summary.*

SEPA. (2014). Natural Susceptibility to Coastal Erosion. *Scottish Environment Protection Agency Methodology and Mapping Summary.*

SEPA. (2014). River Flooding. Scottish Environment Protection Agency Methodology and Mapping Summary.

SEPA. (2014). Surface Water Flooding. Scottish Environment Protection Agency Methodology and Mapping Summary.

SEPA. (2015). Strategic Flood Risk Assessment: SEPA technical guidance to support development planning. *Scottish Environment Protection Agency Land Use Planning Guidance Report*, LUPS-GU23.

Smith, B. J., McCabe, S., McAllister, D., Adamson, C., Viles, H. A., & Curran, J. M. (2011). A commentary on climate change, stone decay dynamics and the 'greening 'of natural stone buildings: new perspectives on 'deep wetting'. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 63(7-8), 1691-1700.

Sniffer (2014). Scotland's Climate Trends Handbook, Sniffer Project CC13, http://www.environment.scotland.gov.uk/ climate_trends_handbook/ [Accessed 20 January 2017].

UKCP09, (2015). Maps & key findings - Crown copyright. [Online] Available at http://ukclimateprojections. metoffice.gov.uk/21708 [Accessed 13 January 2017].



CASE STUDY

THREAVE CASTLE Designed with Flooding in Mind

HISTORY

Built in 1369. Threave Castle was a tower house almost 30m tall one of the first of its type built in Scotland - surrounded by a large complex of other buildings. The tower house was five storeys high, had storage and service space on its lower floors, housed a private suite of rooms above, out of reach of potential floodwaters (and attackers), had walls 3m thick, with only small windows facing the island and had formidable battlements - an overhanging timber hoarding let the garrison keep attackers at bay. The other buildings can no longer be seen above ground, but substantial remains were found during archaeological excavations in the 1970s. They included an outer hall, additional living quarters for the

household staff and a harbour. Located on a small island in the River Dee flood plain in Dumfries and Galloway, The River Dee acted as a means of defence, covering all approaches, as well as providing the main transportation route to and from the island. Today, the castle structure still stands tall, despite centuries exposed to varying natural hazards, including flooding, which as recently as 2016 severely affected the area. The same floods rendered the island's ticket office unusable, necessitating the closure of the site, with new ticket facilities now located in temporary accommodation. The castle itself, although saturated by flood waters, remained largely unaffected.

RISK ASSESSMENT

Threave Castle is at high risk from fluvial, groundwater and pluvial flooding (amber). The site has a history of flooding, but 2016's flood was one of the worst recorded in living memory, with the River Dee recording its highest ever level. The site river levels can also be influenced by a hydroelectric dam further upstream so the environmental conditions are influenced by additional factors and are different to those when the site was built.

	Site Info	ormation			Hazard Ratings							
Unroofed Monument (High Masonry)	Staffed	Seasonal Access	Houses Collections	Fluvial Flooding	Ground- Water Flooding	Coastal Flooding	Pluvial Flooding	Coastal Erosion	Slope Instability			

Table 10: Threave Castle residual risk score.

HAZARD MAPS

Included below is the fluvial flooding hazard map (right) and OS Map (left) for Threave. The blue polygon (on both maps) is the area under our direct care. This is a rare example whereby the entire site is shown to be 'at risk' from the hazard in question.



Figure 14: Site map and boundary (left) and fluvial flooding map (right). All images © NERC.

 $\Delta \Gamma$

PRESENT CLIMATE TRENDS

Weather station data from the Met Office includes data from their Threave Gardens weather station, which is approximately 1.5 miles from Threave Castle. This data comprises of monthly rainfall totals, dating back to 1961. Using this data we can build up an accurate picture of changing weather patterns in and around Threave. As seen in Figure 15, annual rainfall totals have been increasing steadily since the early 1960s, with approximately an additional 200mm of rain falling annually in recent years in comparison to the 1960s. Seven of the wettest ten years recorded since 1961 have occurred since 2000, with 2015 being the wettest year ever recorded.



Figure 15: Rainfall totals recorded at Threave Gardens, 1961 to 2015.

FUTURE CLIMATE TRENDS

As climate change intensifies, properties like Threave Castle will be exposed to changing weather patterns. Like the rest of Scotland, Threave will see increasingly warmer and wetter winters and warmer and drier summers. The UKCP09 climate change Projections tool quantifies what this change may be. The high emissions scenario for Threave is detailed here in Table 11.

Time Scale	Avg Max Temp (°C)	Avg Min Temp (°C)	Rainfall (%)
Annual	+ 2.6°C	+ 2.5°C	-1%
Summer	+3.4°C	+2.7°C	-13%
Winter	+2.3°C	+2.6°C	+16%

Table 11: By the 2050s, winters at Threave could be 16% wetter than currently, with summers being approximately 13% drier. Data from UKCP09.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

The way in which the changing climate will influence the occurrence rates, and severity of natural hazards, is only one aspect of the overall impact of climate change on our PICs.

With a more in-depth assessment of climate change risk at our PICs, we will also need to consider the impacts to the fabric of the building itself, i.e. how vulnerable is the stone masonry to increased levels of rainfall; can the monument adequately shed increased amounts of rainfall and can it effectively dry out in between wet spells? Using a system of general climate descriptions and weathering observations, first produced by Peltier (1950), and by adding in the Met Office data for Threave Gardens, we can provide a basic description of the changing stone decay types. This provides a starting point for assessing how the monuments themselves will respond to climate change. Figure 16 shows how, using this system, there has been a gradual shift from moderate chemical and frost action weathering towards strong chemical weathering since the early 1960s.

This consideration of altering stone decay types and process may form an additional risk multiplier in future phases of our CCRA.



Figure 16: A descriptive measure of the relationship between annual rainfall and temperature and stone decay types (Figure adapted from Peltier, 1950).

48



CASE STUDY

BLACKNESS CASTLE Adaptation in Action

HISTORY

Blackness Castle stands by the Firth of Forth, at the port that served the royal burgh of Linlithgow in medieval times. Though built in the 15th century as a lordly residence for the Crichtons, one of Scotland's more powerful families, it soon took on other roles. Blackness went on to become a royal castle in 1453, then a garrison fortress, a state prison and an ammunition depot in the later 19th century. The castle was decommissioned after WWI and has subsequently become a popular visitor attraction.

Situated on the exposed banks of the Firth of Forth. like many of our Properties in Care, Blackness Castle is exposed to many natural hazards, including coastal flooding and coastal erosion. Blackness Castle is a good example of a site where interventions have already been carried out to mitigate against the risk of a particular hazard(s). The castle itself is somewhat protected by its own impressive curtain wall, however the south-east corner of the site is at 'High' risk of coastal erosion and coastal flooding. To mitigate against these hazards a small retaining wall was constructed to protect the site, (see Figure 18).



RISK ASSESSMENT

This study shows that Blackness Castle is at high risk from fluvial, groundwater, pluvial and coastal flooding, as well as coastal erosion (amber). The site is at medium risk (yellow) from slope instability.

	Site Info	ormation			Hazard Ratings							
Roofed Monument (Occupied)	Staffed	Seasonal Access	Houses Collections	Fluvial Flooding	Ground- Water Flooding	Coastal Flooding	Pluvial Flooding	Coastal Erosion	Slope Instability			

Table 12: Blackness Castle residual risk scores.

HAZARD MAPS

Included here (Figure 17) are a selection of the hazard maps generated for Blackness Castle. The castle itself occupies a relatively small proportion of the area we manage. The castle is also protected by a large curtain wall which surrounds the castle buildings. However, within the site boundary there are areas very susceptible to natural hazard risk – primarily the lower right corner of the site, where a small stream enters the Firth of Forth.



Figure 17: Top row - left; site plan, right; fluvial flooding. Bottom row - left; coastal erosion, right; coastal flooding. All images © NERC.



Figure 18: A newly constructed shore front wall at Blackness Castle. This helps protect the grounds behind from damaging wave action and coastal flooding.

PRESENT CLIMATE TRENDS

Weather station data from the Met Office was obtained which included data for a selection of sites through the Central Belt of Scotland. Comprised of monthly rainfall totals dating back to 1961. Using this data it is possible to build up an accurate picture of changing weather patterns in the Scottish Central Belt, where Blackness Castle is located. As seen on the graph (Figure 19), annual rainfall totals have been increasing steadily since the early 1960s, with approximately an additional 200mm rain falling annually.



Figure 19: Annual rainfall totals recorded in the Central Belt of Scotland, 1961 to 2015.

FUTURE CLIMATE TRENDS

As is the general trend across Scotland, changes in climate will result in warmer and wetter winters for Blackness Castle, as well as hotter and drier summers. The UKCP09 climate change projections tool allows us to investigate what this change may be. Under a high emissions scenario, by the 2050s, winters at Blackness could be 10% wetter than they are currently, with summers being approximately 13% drier, as detailed in Table 13.

Time Scale	Avg Max Temp (°C)	Avg Min Temp (°C)	Rainfall (%)
Annual	+ 2.6°C	+ 2.2°C	0
Summer	+3.6°C	+2.9°C	-13%
Winter	+2.3°C	+2.2°C	+10%

Table 13: Projected changes to the climate at Blackness. Data taken from UKCP09.





FORT GEORGE Adaptation in Action

HISTORY

Fort George is the finest example of 18th century military engineering in the British Isles. Strategically located on a promontory jutting into the Moray Firth, the army base was designed to evade capture. Fort George was built on a monumental scale, making use of sophisticated defence standards of the period, with heavy guns covering every angle. It was built in the wake of the Battle of Culloden (1746) as an impregnable base for King George II's army. It took 21 years to complete, by which time the Jacobite threat had been largely extinguished.

The fort became a recruiting base and training camp for the rapidly expanding British Army, and is currently the home of the Black Watch 3rd Battalion, The Royal Regiment of Scotland.

Due to the site's low-lying (O to 5m above sea level) coastal exposure, there are concerns regarding erosion of the coastal defences. Due to this, rock armour has been installed on the exposed, north-facing side, in a project carried out in partnership with the Army (see Figure 21).

RISK ASSESSMENT

Currently, Fort George is at very high risk from coastal erosion (red), at high risk from groundwater flooding and coastal flooding (amber), and at medium risk of slope instability (yellow).

	Site Info	ormation			Hazard Ratings							
Roofed Monument (Occupied)	Staffed	All Year Access	Houses Collections	Fluvial Flooding	Ground- Water Flooding	Coastal Flooding	Pluvial Flooding	Coastal Erosion	Slope Instability			

Table 14: Fort George residual risk scores.

HAZARD MAPS

Included here are a selection of the hazard maps for Fort George. Its low-lying form leaves it very susceptible to issues arising from coastal erosion and flooding. The problems experienced currently will be exacerbated by the anticipated changes in our climate - primarily sea-level rise - which will cause further coastal erosion and undermining of the sea-defences and potential damage to the fortification itself. Sea levels could rise by as much as 0.5m, in the region by 2070 (UCKP09), which has clear implications for the site.



Figure 20: Top row - left; groundwater flooding, right; coastal erosion. Bottom row; coastal flooding. All images © NERC.

54



Figure 21: An area of protective 'rock armour' has been built in front of the walls to reduce the destructive force of the waves.

PRESENT CLIMATE TRENDS

Since the early 1960s, there has been a measurable change in the climate of Northern Scotland, a summary of which is included here in Table 15.

Climate Variable	Observed Change
Average Temperature (°C) 1961 - 2011	Increase of 1.2°C
Air Frost (days) 1961 - 2011	Decrease of 21.7 days
Average Precipitation (%) 1961 - 2011	Increase of 25.8%
Days of Rain >1mm 1961 - 2011	Increase of 8.1 days
Days of Heavy Rain >10mm 1961 - 2011	Increase of 7.1 days

Table 15: Changes in the climate of Northern Scotland, since the early 1960s (Scotland's Climate Trends Handbook).

FUTURE CLIMATE TRENDS

Looking at future change in the climate around Fort George, the UKCP09 projections tool indicates that winters could be up to 15% wetter and summers 13% drier than currently, as detailed in Table 16. These changes in precipitation levels, as well as projected increases in average temperatures across all seasons, reflect the expected national changes across Scotland.

Time Scale	Avg Max Temp (°C)	Avg Min Temp (°C)	Rainfall (%)
Annual	+2.3°C	+1.9°C	0%
Summer	+3.2°C	+2.7°C	-13%
Winter	+2.2°C	+1.9°C	+15%

Table 16: Climate Change projections for Fort George (UKCP09).

OBSERVING CHANGE AT FORT GEORGE

As with many of our PICs, it is possible to observe the direct impacts resulting from environmental changes. At Fort George, there is evidence that the vulnerable low lying vegetation that surrounds the fort is eroding at an alarming rate, with over a meter of vegetation and ground lost during a single winter period. Images taken in 2013 (Figures 22 and 23), help visualise what this looks like on the ground.



Figure 22: Part of Fort George sea wall showing 'clean' lower part where turf and soil layer has been completely eroded, leaving the masonry vulnerable to the sea.



Figure 23: Damage to vegetation layer at Fort George as a result of winter storms (photo taken Feb 2013). In recent years it is not unusual for a metre of turf to be lost each year.

CASE STUDY

KILCHURN CASTLE Evidence of Historic Environmental Change

HISTORY

Kilchurn Castle was initially constructed under the orders of Sir Colin Campbell, 1st Lord of Glenorchy, in the mid-15th century, and comprised a five-storey tower house and small courtyard, enclosed by a curtain wall. Various phases of subsequent expansion carried out by subsequent Lords let Kilchurn retain its importance as a powerhouse of the Glenorchy Campbell's for the next 150 years. The 6th Lord of Glenorchy relocated the Campbells to Perthshire before his death in 1583.

In 1689 Sir John Campbell of Glenorchy, 1st Earl of Breadalbane, began converting the castle into a garrison stronghold. This included the construction of a new barracks on the north side of the castle's courtyard, capable of housing up to 200 men. The barracks block remains relatively complete today, and is the oldest surviving barracks on the British mainland. The garrison stronghold saw little use, other than as an outpost for government soldiers during the Jacobite risings of struck by lightning during a particularly violent storm at some point in the 1760s, causing damage that was never repaired, and the castle was eventually abandoned later that century.

When Kilchurn Castle was initially constructed, the rocky knoll on which it is perched was cut off from the mainland by Loch Awe – it was an island. A series of maps created by Timothy Pont between 1583 and 1614 show Kilchurn (or Castel Cheulchurn, as it is noted on the map, see Figure 24) as an island. The castle was occupied in turbulent times, and its defensive location on an island allowed the Glenorchy Campbells to retain a powerful presence in the region.

A drainage project on Loch Awe in 1817 cleared the main outflow of the loch, lowering the water level and connecting the isolated rocky knoll to the mainland. Today, the low-lying ground around the castle is predominantly marshy, reflecting its previous history.



Figure 24: Timothy Pont map of Loch Awe showing Kilchurn Castle (Castel Cheulchurn) located on a small island (middle right at the head of Loch Awe). Reproduced with the permission of the National Library of Scotland.

RISK ASSESSMENT

Kilchurn Castle is at high risk from fluvial flooding, groundwater flooding and slope instability issues (amber), and thought to be at little to no risk from pluvial flooding and coastal erosion and flooding.

	Site Info	ormation				Hazard	Ratings		
Unroofed Monument (High Masonry)	Staffed	Seasonal Access	Houses Collections	Fluvial Flooding	Ground- Water Flooding	Coastal Flooding	Pluvial Flooding	Coastal Erosion	Slope Instability

Table 17: Kilchurn Castle residual risk scores.



HAZARD MAPS

Included below (Figure 25) is the fluvial flooding risk map. Despite projected flooding to the formerly submerged areas, during all flood extents (1:10. 1:100 and 1:1,000) the castle ruins are predicted to remain out of reach of floodwaters, probably resulting from the initial construction of the structure on what was an island.



Figure 25: Kilchurn Castle fluvial flooding risk map. Image © NERC.

HISTORIC CHANGE: A FUTURE ANALOGUE

Kilchurn Castle is one example, of many historic sites, where evidence exists for historic changes in environmental conditions occurring within the lifetime of the monument. Such case studies are allowing us to develop a better understanding of changing environmental conditions at PICs, many of which exhibit a built-in resilience to the natural hazards assessed as part of this CCRA. The fact that Kilchurn Castle was once located on an island, means it currently has capacity to withstand hazards such as flooding. Despite this, it does not mean that Kilchurn Castle is fully protected from the impacts of climate change. For example, the lack of a roof and the presence of exposed masonry is likely to make the structure susceptible to damage from increased rainfall.

^{0 15 30 60} Meters

APPENDIX A

THE CLIMATE CHANGE RISK REGISTER AIPEANDAIG A (CLÀR-RIOSG NA CLÌOMAID)



CLIMATE CHANGE RISK REGISTER USERS GUIDE

PROPERTY NAME

The official name of the property in question.

CATEGORY

The 'type' of property in question.

- A Roofed monument (occupied)
- B Roofed monument (unoccupied)
- C Unroofed monument (low masonry)
- D Unroofed monument (high masonry)
- E Standing stones and carved stones
- F Field monuments

COLLECTION

States whether the property contains any collections: Y - Yes N - No

HAZARD

Identifies the type of hazard being recorded on that particular row.

FF - Fluvial Flooding

- PF Pluvial Flooding
- CF Coastal Flooding
- GF Groundwater Flooding
- CE Coastal Erosion
- LA Slope Instability

INHERENT RISK

This is the first of two risk scores generated for each PIC. It is the unaltered risk score that does not take into account any mitigants and controls that may be in existence already at one of our PICs.

RESIDUAL RISK

This is the second risk score generated for each PIC and details the risk posed after taking into consideration our site operations (mitigants and controls).

LIKELIHOOD

The estimated probability of a specific event occurring, ranked one to five (with five representing the greatest probability and one the lowest).

IMPACT

This score is based on a subjective assessment of what the impacts of a hazard occurring, at any given site, could be. Ranked in a similar way to likelihood, with one being defined as the lowest impact and five the highest (see section 2.3.2 for for the Impact score breakdown).

RISK RATING

The likelihood score multiplied by the Impact score, gives us the risk rating for the property in question.

MITIGANTS AND CONTROLS

An assessment of whether the site is staffed and when the site is opened. This determines the change from inherent risk to residual risk.

Staffed:

- Y Yes
- N No

Access: A - All year S - Seasonal C - Closed

Sites with duplicate risk scores are those sites with multiple areas of guardian or ownership, see section 2.1 for more information.



CURRENT CLIMATE RISK REGISTER				Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti	Mitigants & Controls (Existing)		Residual Risk		
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	
Aberdour Castle	А	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15	
Aberdour Castle	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15	
Aberdour Castle	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8	
Aberdour Castle	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0	
Aberdour Castle	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0	
Aberdour Castle	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0	
Aberlemno Churchyard Cross Slab	E	Ν	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5	
Aberlemno Churchyard Cross Slab	E	Ν	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5	
Aberlemno Churchyard Cross Slab	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0	
Aberlemno Churchyard Cross Slab	E	Ν	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0	
Aberlemno Churchyard Cross Slab	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0	
Aberlemno Churchyard Cross Slab	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0	
Aberlemno Sculptured Stones	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5	
Aberlemno Sculptured Stones	E	N	GF	3	2	6	N	А	3	1.25	3.75	
Aberlemno Sculptured Stones	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0	
Aberlemno Sculptured Stones	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0	
Aberlemno Sculptured Stones	E	Ν	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0	
Aberlemno Sculptured Stones	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0	
Aberlemno Stones - plan locations	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5	
Aberlemno Stones - plan locations	E	Ν	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5	
Aberlemno Stones - plan locations	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0	
Aberlemno Stones - plan locations	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0	
Aberlemno Stones - plan locations	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0	
Aberlemno Stones - plan locations	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0	
Abernethy Round Tower	В	N	GF	4	4	16	Y	А	4	3	12	
Abernethy Round Tower	В	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8	
Abernethy Round Tower	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0	
Abernethy Round Tower	В	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0	
Abernethy Round Tower	В	N	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0	
Abernethy Round Tower	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0	

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Achnabreck Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	LA	1	5	5	N	А	1	4.25	4.25
Achnabreck Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Achnabreck Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Achnabreck Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Achnabreck Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	GF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Achnabreck Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Affleck Castle	А	N	GF	3	4	12	N	С	3	5	15
Affleck Castle	А	N	LA	2	5	10	N	С	2	5	10
Affleck Castle	А	N	FF	0	4	0	N	С	0	5	0
Affleck Castle	А	N	PF	0	4	0	N	С	0	5	0
Affleck Castle	А	N	CE	0	5	0	N	С	0	5	0
Affleck Castle	А	N	CF	0	4	0	N	С	0	5	0
Antonine Wall - Bantaskin	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Antonine Wall - Bantaskin	F	Y	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
Antonine Wall - Bantaskin	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Bantaskin	F	Y	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Bantaskin	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall - Bantaskin	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Bar Hill	F	Y	LA	3	5	15	Ν	A	3	4.25	12.75
Antonine Wall - Bar Hill	F	Y	PF	4	2	8	Ν	A	4	1.25	5
Antonine Wall - Bar Hill	F	Y	GF	3	2	6	Ν	A	3	1.25	3.75
Antonine Wall – Bar Hill	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall - Bar Hill	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Bar Hill	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Bearsden Bath-house	D	Y	GF	4	3	12	N	А	4	2.25	9
Antonine Wall - Bearsden Bath-house	D	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Antonine Wall - Bearsden Bath-house	D	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall - Bearsden Bath-house	D	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Antonine Wall - Bearsden Bath-house	D	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Antonine Wall – Bearsden Bath-house	D	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	CURRENT CLIMATE RISK REGISTER			Inhe	rent Ris	k	Mitigants & Controls (Existing)		Residual Risk		
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Antonine Wall - Castlecary Fort	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Antonine Wall - Castlecary Fort	F	Y	GF	5	2	10	Ν	A	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall – Castlecary Fort	F	Y	PF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall - Castlecary Fort	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall - Castlecary Fort	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Castlecary Fort	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Croy Hill	F	Y	LA	3	5	15	Ν	А	3	4.25	12.75
Antonine Wall - Croy Hill	F	Y	GF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall - Croy Hill	F	Y	PF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall - Croy Hill	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Croy Hill	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Croy Hill	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall – Dullatur	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Antonine Wall - Dullatur	F	Y	GF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall - Dullatur	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall - Dullatur	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall – Dullatur	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Dullatur	F	Y	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Garnhall	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Antonine Wall - Garnhall	F	Y	GF	3	2	6	Ν	А	3	1.25	3.75
Antonine Wall - Garnhall	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Garnhall	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Garnhall	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall - Garnhall	F	Y	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Kirkintilloch	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Antonine Wall - Kirkintilloch	F	Y	GF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall - Kirkintilloch	F	Y	PF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall - Kirkintilloch	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Kirkintilloch	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Kirkintilloch	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE	RISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Antonine Wall - Rough Castle	F	Y	LA	3	5	15	N	A	3	4.25	12.75
Antonine Wall - Rough Castle	F	Y	PF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall - Rough Castle	F	Y	GF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall - Rough Castle	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall - Rough Castle	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Rough Castle	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Seabegs Wood	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Antonine Wall - Seabegs Wood	F	Y	GF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall - Seabegs Wood	F	Y	PF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
Antonine Wall - Seabegs Wood	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall - Seabegs Wood	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Seabegs Wood	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall – Tollpark	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Antonine Wall – Tollpark	F	Y	GF	3	2	6	N	А	3	1.25	3.75
Antonine Wall – Tollpark	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall – Tollpark	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall – Tollpark	F	Y	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall – Tollpark	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge	F	Y	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge	F	Y	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE RISK REGISTER			Inherent Risk			Mitigants & Controls (Existing)		Residual Risk			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge West	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge West	F	Y	GF	5	2	10	Ν	A	5	1.25	6.25
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge West	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge West	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge West	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Antonine Wall - Watling Lodge West	F	Y	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	Y	А	4	2	8
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	Y	A	3	2	6
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Arbroath Abbey	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Arbroath Abbey Abbot's House	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Arbroath Abbey Abbot's House	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	Y	A	3	2	6
Arbroath Abbey Abbot's House	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Arbroath Abbey Abbot's House	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Arbroath Abbey Abbot's House	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Arbroath Abbey Abbot's House	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Ardchattan Priory	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Ardchattan Priory	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Ardchattan Priory	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Ardchattan Priory	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Ardchattan Priory	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Ardchattan Priory	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Ardclach Bell Tower	В	N	GF	3	4	12	Y	А	3	3	9
Ardclach Bell Tower	В	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Ardclach Bell Tower	В	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Ardclach Bell Tower	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Ardclach Bell Tower	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Ardclach Bell Tower	В	Ν	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0

CURRENT CLIMATE RISK REGISTER			Inhe	erent Ris	k	Mitigants & Controls (Existing)		Residual Risk			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Ardestie Souterrain	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	S	2	4.75	9.5
Ardestie Souterrain	F	N	GF	3	2	6	N	S	3	1.75	5.25
Ardestie Souterrain	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	S	0	1.75	0
Ardestie Souterrain	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Ardestie Souterrain	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	S	0	1.75	0
Ardestie Souterrain	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	S	0	4.75	0
Ardunie Roman Signal Station	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Ardunie Roman Signal Station	F	N	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
Ardunie Roman Signal Station	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Ardunie Roman Signal Station	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Ardunie Roman Signal Station	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Ardunie Roman Signal Station	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Argyll's Lodging	А	Y	LA	1	5	5	Y	А	1	4	4
Argyll's Lodging	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Argyll's Lodging	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Argyll's Lodging	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Argyll's Lodging	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Argyll's Lodging	А	Y	GF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Arnol Blackhouse No. 39	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	A	3	4	12
Arnol Blackhouse No. 39	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Arnol Blackhouse No. 39	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Arnol Blackhouse No. 39	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Arnol Blackhouse No. 39	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Arnol Blackhouse No. 39	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Arnol Blackhouse No. 42	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Arnol Blackhouse No. 42	В	Y	GF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Arnol Blackhouse No. 42	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Arnol Blackhouse No. 42	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Arnol Blackhouse No. 42	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Arnol Blackhouse No. 42	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Auchagallon Stone Circle	Е	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Auchagallon Stone Circle	Е	N	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
Auchagallon Stone Circle	Е	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Auchagallon Stone Circle	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Auchagallon Stone Circle	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Auchagallon Stone Circle	Е	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE RISK REGISTER			Inhe	erent Ris	k	Mitigants & Controls (Existing)		Residual Risk			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Auchindown Castle	С	N	LA	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Auchindown Castle	С	N	GF	3	3	9	Ν	А	3	2.25	6.75
Auchindown Castle	С	Ν	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Auchindown Castle	С	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Auchindown Castle	С	N	CF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Auchindown Castle	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Ballygowan Cup & Ring Mark Rock	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Ballygowan Cup & Ring Mark Rock	E	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Ballygowan Cup & Ring Mark Rock	E	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Ballygowan Cup & Ring Mark Rock	E	N	GF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Ballygowan Cup & Ring Mark Rock	E	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Ballygowan Cup & Ring Mark Rock	E	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Baluachraig Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	LA	3	5	15	Ν	А	3	4.25	12.75
Baluachraig Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	GF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Baluachraig Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Baluachraig Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Baluachraig Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Baluachraig Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Balvaird Castle	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Ν	А	5	3.25	16.25
Balvaird Castle	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Balvaird Castle	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Balvaird Castle	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Balvaird Castle	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Balvaird Castle	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Balvenie Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	S	2	4.75	9.5
Balvenie Castle	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	N	S	3	2.75	8.25
Balvenie Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Ν	S	0	2.75	0
Balvenie Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Ν	S	0	2.75	0
Balvenie Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	S	0	4.75	0
Balvenie Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Ν	S	0	2.75	0
Barochan Cross	E	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Barochan Cross	E	N	GF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Barochan Cross	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Barochan Cross	E	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Barochan Cross	E	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Barochan Cross	Е	Ν	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	Inherent Risk			Mitigants &		Residual Risk					
							Control	s (Existing)			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk	Staffed	Access -	Likelihood	Impact	Risk
						Rating	(1/N)	Seasonal (S)			Rating
								Closed (C)			
Barsalloch Fort	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Barsalloch Fort	F	N	CE	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Barsalloch Fort	F	N	GF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Barsalloch Fort	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Barsalloch Fort	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Barsalloch Fort	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Beauly Priory	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	N	А	5	3.25	16.25
Beauly Priory	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Ν	А	5	3.25	16.25
Beauly Priory	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Beauly Priory	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Beauly Priory	В	Y	CE	1	5	5	Ν	А	1	4.25	4.25
Beauly Priory	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Beauly Priory	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Beauly Priory	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Beauly Priory	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Beauly Priory	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Beauly Priory	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Beauly Priory	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Big Balcraig and Clachan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	С	2	5	10
Big Balcraig and Clachan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	С	0	5	0
Big Balcraig and Clachan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	Ν	FF	0	2	0	Ν	С	0	2	0
Big Balcraig and Clachan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	Ν	CF	0	2	0	Ν	С	0	2	0
Big Balcraig and Clachan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	С	0	2	0
Big Balcraig and Clachan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	GF	0	2	0	Ν	С	0	2	0
Biggar Gasworks	А	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Biggar Gasworks	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Biggar Gasworks	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Biggar Gasworks	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Biggar Gasworks	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Biggar Gasworks	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Bishop's House, Elgin	В	N	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Bishop's House, Elgin	В	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Bishop's House, Elgin	В	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Bishop's House, Elgin	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Bishop's House, Elgin	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Bishop's House, Elgin	В	N	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0

CURRENT CLIMATE RISK REGISTER				Inhe	rent Risl	k	Mitigants & Controls (Existing)		Residual Risk		
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Bishop's Palace, Kirkwall	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	Y	S	4	2.5	10
Bishop's Palace, Kirkwall	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Bishop's Palace, Kirkwall	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Bishop's Palace, Kirkwall	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Bishop's Palace, Kirkwall	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Bishop's Palace, Kirkwall	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Blackfriars Chapel, St Andrews	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Blackfriars Chapel, St Andrews	С	N	GF	3	3	9	N	A	3	2.25	6.75
Blackfriars Chapel, St Andrews	С	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Blackfriars Chapel, St Andrews	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Blackfriars Chapel, St Andrews	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Blackfriars Chapel, St Andrews	С	N	CF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Blackhammer Chambered Cairn	D	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Blackhammer Chambered Cairn	D	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Blackhammer Chambered Cairn	D	N	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Blackhammer Chambered Cairn	D	N	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Blackhammer Chambered Cairn	D	N	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Blackhammer Chambered Cairn	D	N	GF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Blackhill Roman Camp, Ardoch	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Blackhill Roman Camp, Ardoch	F	Ν	GF	4	2	8	Ν	A	4	1.25	5
Blackhill Roman Camp, Ardoch	F	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Blackhill Roman Camp, Ardoch	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Blackhill Roman Camp, Ardoch	F	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Blackhill Roman Camp, Ardoch	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Blackness Castle	A	Y	CE	4	5	20	Y	A	4	4	16
Blackness Castle	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Blackness Castle	А	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Blackness Castle	А	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Blackness Castle	А	Y	PF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Blackness Castle	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8

CURRENT CLIMATE RISK REGISTER			Inhe	erent Ris	k	Mitigants & Controls (Existing)		Residual Risk			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Bonawe Iron Furnace	В	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Bonawe Iron Furnace	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Bonawe Iron Furnace	В	Y	PF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Bonawe Iron Furnace	В	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Bonawe Iron Furnace	В	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	S	3	4.5	13.5
Bonawe Iron Furnace	В	Y	CE	1	5	5	Y	S	1	4.5	4.5
Bothwell Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Bothwell Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Bothwell Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Bothwell Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Bothwell Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Bothwell Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Brandsbutt Stone	Е	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Brandsbutt Stone	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Brandsbutt Stone	Е	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Brandsbutt Stone	Е	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Brandsbutt Stone	Е	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Brandsbutt Stone	Е	N	GF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Brechin Round Tower	В		GF	3	4	12	N	А	3	3.25	9.75
Brechin Round Tower	В		LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Brechin Round Tower	В		CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Brechin Round Tower	В		PF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Brechin Round Tower	В		FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Brechin Round Tower	В		CF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Bridge of Oich	D	N	GF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Bridge of Oich	D	N	FF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Bridge of Oich	D	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Bridge of Oich	D	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Bridge of Oich	D	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Bridge of Oich	D	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	CF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	Y	S	3	2.5	7.5
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Broch of Gurness	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0

CURRENT CLIMATE RISK REGISTER			Inhe	rent Risl	k	Mitigants & Controls (Existing)		Residual Risk			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Brough of Birsay	D	Y	CE	4	5	20	Y	S	4	4.5	18
Brough of Birsay	D	Y	CF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Brough of Birsay	D	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Brough of Birsay	D	Y	GF	3	3	9	Y	S	3	2.5	7.5
Brough of Birsay	D	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Brough of Birsay	D	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Broughty Castle	А	Y	CE	4	5	20	Y	А	4	4	16
Broughty Castle	А	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Broughty Castle	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Broughty Castle	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Broughty Castle	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Broughty Castle	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Burghead Well	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Burghead Well	F	N	CE	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Burghead Well	F	N	GF	3	2	6	Y	А	3	1	3
Burghead Well	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Burghead Well	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Burghead Well	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Burleigh Castle	С	N	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Burleigh Castle	С	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Burleigh Castle	С	N	FF	3	3	9	Y	S	3	2.5	7.5
Burleigh Castle	С	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Burleigh Castle	С	N	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Burleigh Castle	С	N	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Cadzow Castle	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Cadzow Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Cadzow Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Cadzow Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Cadzow Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Cadzow Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Caerlaverock Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Caerlaverock Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Caerlaverock Castle	С	Y	CF	2	3	6	Y	А	2	2	4
Caerlaverock Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Caerlaverock Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Caerlaverock Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Cairn Holy 1	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	0	4.25	0
Cairn Holy 1	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Cairn Holy 1	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cairn Holy 1	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cairn Holy 1	E	N	GF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cairn Holy 1	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0

72 A Climate Change Risk Assessment
CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Cairn Holy 2	Е	Ν	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Cairn Holy 2	Е	N	GF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Cairn Holy 2	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Cairn Holy 2	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cairn Holy 2	Е	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cairn Holy 2	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Cairn of Memsie	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Cairn of Memsie	F	N	GF	4	2	8	N	А	4	1.25	5
Cairn of Memsie	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Cairn of Memsie	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cairn of Memsie	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cairn of Memsie	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	Α	0	1.25	0
Cairn O'Get	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Cairn O'Get	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Cairn O'Get	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Cairn O'Get	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Cairn O'Get	F	N	GF	0	2	0	N	Α	0	1.25	0
Cairn O'Get	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	Α	0	1.25	0
Cairnbaan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Cairnbaan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Cairnbaan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	GF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cairnbaan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cairnbaan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cairnbaan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Cairnpapple Hill	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Cairnpapple Hill	F	Ν	GF	3	2	6	Y	S	3	1.5	4.5
Cairnpapple Hill	F	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Cairnpapple Hill	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Y	S	0	1.5	0
Cairnpapple Hill	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Y	S	0	1.5	0
Cairnpapple Hill	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Y	S	0	1.5	0
Calanais Standing Stones	E	N	LA	1	5	5	Y	А	1	4	4
Calanais Standing Stones	E	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Calanais Standing Stones	E	N	CF	0	2	0	Y	A	0	1	0
Calanais Standing Stones	E	N	GF	0	2	0	Y	A	0	1	0
Calanais Standing Stones	E	N	FF	0	2	0	Y	A	0	1	0
Calanais Standing Stones	E	N	PF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REGI	STER		Inhe	rent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Risl	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Cambuskenneth Abbey	В	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Cambuskenneth Abbey	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Cambuskenneth Abbey	В	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Cambuskenneth Abbey	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Cambuskenneth Abbey	В	Y	CE	1	5	5	Y	S	1	4.5	4.5
Cambuskenneth Abbey	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Cardoness Castle	С	Y	PF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Cardoness Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Cardoness Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Cardoness Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Cardoness Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Cardoness Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Carlungie Souterrain	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	S	2	4.75	9.5
Carlungie Souterrain	F	N	GF	4	2	8	N	S	4	1.75	7
Carlungie Souterrain	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	S	0	4.75	0
Carlungie Souterrain	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Carlungie Souterrain	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Carlungie Souterrain	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Carn Ban Long Cairn	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	С	2	5	10
Carn Ban Long Cairn	F	N	GF	4	2	8	N	С	4	2	8
Carn Ban Long Cairn	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	С	0	5	0
Carn Ban Long Cairn	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	С	0	2	0
Carn Ban Long Cairn	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	С	0	2	0
Carn Ban Long Cairn	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	С	0	2	0
Carn Liath	С	N	GF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Carn Liath	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Carn Liath	С	N	CE	1	5	5	N	А	1	4.25	4.25
Carn Liath	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Carn Liath	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Carn Liath	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Carnasserie Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Carnasserie Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Carnasserie Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Carnasserie Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Carnasserie Castle	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Carnasserie Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Carsluith Castle	С	N	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Carsluith Castle	С	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Carsluith Castle	С	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Carsluith Castle	С	N	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Carsluith Castle	С	N	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Carsluith Castle	С	N	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R		ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti	gants &	Resi	dual Ris	k
							Control	s (Existing)			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Castle Campbell	В	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Castle Campbell	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Castle Campbell	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Castle Campbell	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Castle Campbell	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Castle Campbell	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Castle of Old Wick	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	N	A	3	4.25	12.75
Castle of Old Wick	С	Y	CF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Castle of Old Wick	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	N	А	3	2.25	6.75
Castle of Old Wick	С	Y	CE	1	5	5	N	А	1	4.25	4.25
Castle of Old Wick	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Castle of Old Wick	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Castle of Park	В	N	GF	3	4	12	N	С	3	4	12
Castle of Park	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	С	2	5	10
Castle of Park	В	N	CE	0	5	0	N	С	0	5	0
Castle of Park	В	N	CF	0	4	0	N	С	0	4	0
Castle of Park	В	N	PF	0	4	0	N	С	0	4	0
Castle of Park	В	N	FF	0	4	0	N	С	0	4	0
Castle Semple Collegiate Church	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Castle Semple Collegiate Church	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Castle Semple Collegiate Church	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Castle Semple Collegiate Church	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Castle Semple Collegiate Church	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Castle Semple Collegiate Church	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Castle Sween	С	Y	CE	4	5	20	Ν	A	4	4.25	17
Castle Sween	С	Y	CF	5	3	15	Ν	А	5	2.25	11.25
Castle Sween	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Ν	A	5	2.25	11.25
Castle Sween	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Castle Sween	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Castle Sween	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Castlelaw Fort	F	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Castlelaw Fort	F	N	GF	3	2	6	Y	A	3	1	3
Castlelaw Fort	F	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Castlelaw Fort	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Y	A	0	1	0
Castlelaw Fort	F	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Y	A	0	1	0
Castlelaw Fort	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Y	A	0	1	0

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REG	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Caterthuns, Brown	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	S	2	4.75	9.5
Caterthuns, Brown	F	N	GF	3	2	6	Ν	S	3	1.75	5.25
Caterthuns, Brown	F	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	S	0	4.75	0
Caterthuns, Brown	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Caterthuns, Brown	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Caterthuns, Brown	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Caterthuns, White	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	S	2	4.75	9.5
Caterthuns, White	F	Ν	GF	3	2	6	Ν	S	3	1.75	5.25
Caterthuns, White	F	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	S	0	4.75	0
Caterthuns, White	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Caterthuns, White	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Caterthuns, White	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Chapel Finian	D	N	GF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Chapel Finian	D	N	LA	2	5	0	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Chapel Finian	D	N	CE	1	5	5	N	А	1	4.25	4.25
Chapel Finian	D	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Chapel Finian	D	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Chapel Finian	D	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Chesters Hill Fort	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Chesters Hill Fort	F	N	GF	3	2	6	N	А	3	1.25	3.75
Chesters Hill Fort	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Chesters Hill Fort	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Chesters Hill Fort	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Chesters Hill Fort	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Clackmannan Tower	В	Y	GF	3	4	12	N	А	3	3.25	9.75
Clackmannan Tower	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Clackmannan Tower	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Clackmannan Tower	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Clackmannan Tower	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Clackmannan Tower	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Clava Cairns	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Clava Cairns	F	N	GF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Clava Cairns	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Clava Cairns	F	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Clava Cairns	F	Ν	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Clava Cairns	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Claypotts Castle	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Claypotts Castle	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Claypotts Castle	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Claypotts Castle	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Claypotts Castle	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Clavpotts Castle	В	Y	CE	0	4	0	Y	Α	0	.3	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R		STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti	gants &	Resi	dual Ris	k
						1	Control	s (Existing)			1
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Click Mill, Dounby	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	N	А	5	3.25	16.25
Click Mill, Dounby	В	Y	FF	5	4	20	N	А	5	3.25	16.25
Click Mill, Dounby	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Click Mill, Dounby	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Click Mill, Dounby	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Click Mill, Dounby	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Clickimin Broch	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
Clickimin Broch	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Clickimin Broch	С	Y	CE	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Clickimin Broch	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Clickimin Broch	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Clickimin Broch	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Cnoc Freiceadain Long Cairn	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Cnoc Freiceadain Long Cairn	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Cnoc Freiceadain Long Cairn	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cnoc Freiceadain Long Cairn	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Cnoc Freiceadain Long Cairn	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Cnoc Freiceadain Long Cairn	F	N	GF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Cobbie Row's Castle	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Cobbie Row's Castle	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Cobbie Row's Castle	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Cobbie Row's Castle	С	N	FF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Cobbie Row's Castle	С	N	GF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Cobbie Row's Castle	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Corgarff Castle	A	Y	GF	3	4	12	Y	S	3	3.5	10.5
Corgarff Castle	A	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Corgarff Castle	A	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Corgarff Castle	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Corgarff Castle	A	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Corgarff Castle	A	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Corrimony Chambered Cairn	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Corrimony Chambered Cairn	F	Ν	GF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Corrimony Chambered Cairn	F	N	FF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Corrimony Chambered Cairn	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Corrimony Chambered Cairn	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Corrimony Chambered Cairn	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	RISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Corstorphine Dovecot	В	N	GF	5	4	20	N	A	5	3.25	16.25
Corstorphine Dovecot	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Corstorphine Dovecot	В	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Corstorphine Dovecot	В	Ν	CF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Corstorphine Dovecot	В	Ν	FF	0	4	0	Ν	A	0	3.25	0
Corstorphine Dovecot	В	Ν	PF	0	4	0	Ν	A	0	3.25	0
Coulter Motte	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Coulter Motte	F	N	GF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Coulter Motte	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Coulter Motte	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Coulter Motte	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Coulter Motte	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Craigmillar Castle	С	Y	PF	4	3	12	Y	А	4	2	8
Craigmillar Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Craigmillar Castle	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	Y	А	3	2	6
Craigmillar Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Craigmillar Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Craigmillar Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Craignethan Castle	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	S	3	4.5	13.5
Craignethan Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Craignethan Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Craignethan Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Craignethan Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Craignethan Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Crichton Castle	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	Y	S	4	2.5	10
Crichton Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Crichton Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Crichton Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Crichton Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Crichton Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Crookston Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Crookston Castle	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	Y	А	3	2	6
Crookston Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Crookston Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Crookston Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Crookston Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	N	A	4	2.25	9
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	N	A	4	2.25	9
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Crosskirk, Peebles	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Crossraguel Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Cullerie Stone Circle	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Cullerie Stone Circle	E	N	GF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Cullerie Stone Circle	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Cullerie Stone Circle	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Cullerie Stone Circle	Е	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Cullerie Stone Circle	Е	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Culross Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	S	2	4.75	9.5
Culross Abbey	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	N	S	3	2.75	8.25
Culross Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	S	0	4.75	0
Culross Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	S	0	2.75	0
Culross Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	S	0	2.75	0
Culross Abbey	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	S	0	2.75	0
Culsh Earth House	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Culsh Earth House	F	N	GF	3	2	6	N	А	3	1.25	3.75
Culsh Earth House	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Culsh Earth House	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Culsh Earth House	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Culsh Earth House	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Risl	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Cuween Hill Chambered Cairn	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Cuween Hill Chambered Cairn	В	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Cuween Hill Chambered Cairn	В	N	FF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Cuween Hill Chambered Cairn	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Cuween Hill Chambered Cairn	В	N	CF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Cuween Hill Chambered Cairn	В	N	GF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Dallas Dhu Distillery	А	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Dallas Dhu Distillery	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Dallas Dhu Distillery	А	Y	PF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Dallas Dhu Distillery	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Dallas Dhu Distillery	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Dallas Dhu Distillery	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Deer Abbey	D	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Deer Abbey	D	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Deer Abbey	D	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Deer Abbey	D	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Deer Abbey	D	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Deer Abbey	D	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Dere Street Roman Road (North)	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Dere Street Roman Road (North)	F	N	GF	3	2	6	Ν	А	3	1.25	3.75
Dere Street Roman Road (North)	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Dere Street Roman Road (North)	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Dere Street Roman Road (North)	F	Ν	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Dere Street Roman Road (North)	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Dere Street Roman Road (South)	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Dere Street Roman Road (South)	F	Ν	GF	3	2	6	N	А	3	1.25	3.75
Dere Street Roman Road (South)	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Dere Street Roman Road (South)	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Dere Street Roman Road (South)	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Dere Street Roman Road (South)	F	Ν	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Deskford Church	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Deskford Church	С	N	GF	3	3	9	N	A	3	2.25	6.75
Deskford Church	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Deskford Church	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Deskford Church	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Deskford Church	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Dirleton Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Dirleton Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Dirleton Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Dirleton Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dirleton Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dirleton Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dogton Stone	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Dogton Stone	E	N	GF	3	2	6	N	A	3	1.25	3.75
Dogton Stone	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Dogton Stone	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Dogton Stone	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Dogton Stone	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Doon Hill	F	Ν	LA	1	5	5	Ν	А	1	4.25	4.25
Doon Hill	F	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Doon Hill	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Doon Hill	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Doon Hill	F	N	GF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Doon Hill	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Doune Castle & Roman Camp	В	Y	LA	4	5	20	Y	А	4	4	16
Doune Castle & Roman Camp	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Doune Castle & Roman Camp	В	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Doune Castle & Roman Camp	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Doune Castle & Roman Camp	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Doune Castle & Roman Camp	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Druchtag Motte	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Druchtag Motte	F	N	GF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Druchtag Motte	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Druchtag Motte	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Druchtag Motte	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Druchtag Motte	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Drumcoltran Tower	В	N	GF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Drumcoltran Tower	В	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Drumcoltran Tower	В	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Drumcoltran Tower	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Drumcoltran Tower	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Drumcoltran Tower	В	N	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Drumtroddan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Drumtroddan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	GF	3	2	6	Ν	А	3	1.25	3.75
Drumtroddan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Drumtroddan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Drumtroddan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Drumtroddan Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Drumtroddan Standing Stones	E	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Drumtroddan Standing Stones	E	N	GF	3	2	6	N	А	3	1.25	3.75
Drumtroddan Standing Stones	E	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Drumtroddan Standing Stones	E	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Drumtroddan Standing Stones	E	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Drumtroddan Standing Stones	E	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Dryburgh Abbey	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Dryburgh Abbey	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Dryburgh Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Dryburgh Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Dryburgh Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Dryburgh Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Duff House	А	Y	LA	4	5	20	Y	А	4	4	16
Duff House	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Duff House	А	Y	CF	4	4	16	Y	А	4	3	12
Duff House	А	Y	FF	4	4	16	Y	A	4	3	12
Duff House	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Duff House	A	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Duffus Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Duffus Castle	С	Y	CF	4	3	12	Y	А	4	2	8
Duffus Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Duffus Castle	С	Y	CE	1	5	5	Y	А	1	4	4
Duffus Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Duffus Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Dumbarton Castle	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Dumbarton Castle	А	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Dumbarton Castle	А	Y	PF	4	4	16	Y	A	4	3	12
Dumbarton Castle	А	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	A	3	4	12
Dumbarton Castle	А	Y	CE	3	5	15	Y	A	3	4	12
Dumbarton Castle	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Dun Beag	С	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Dun Beag	С	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Dun Beag	С	N	GF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Dun Beag	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Dun Beag	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Dun Beag	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Dun Carloway	С	N	LA	1	5	5	Y	A	1	4	4
Dun Carloway	С	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Dun Carloway	С	Ν	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dun Carloway	С	Ν	GF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dun Carloway	С	Ν	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Dun Carloway	С	Ν	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dun Dornaigil	С	N	GF	5	3	15	Ν	A	5	2.25	11.25
Dun Dornaigil	С	Ν	FF	5	3	15	Ν	А	5	2.25	11.25
Dun Dornaigil	С	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Dun Dornaigil	С	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Dun Dornaigil	С	Ν	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Dun Dornaigil	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Dun Telve	С	N	LA	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Dun Telve	С	Ν	GF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Dun Telve	С	N	FF	3	3	9	Ν	А	3	2.25	6.75
Dun Telve	С	Ν	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Dun Telve	С	Ν	PF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Dun Telve	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Dun Troddan	С	N	GF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
Dun Troddan	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Dun Troddan	С	Ν	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Dun Troddan	С	Ν	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Dun Troddan	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Dun Troddan	С	Ν	CF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Dunadd Hill Fort	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Dunadd Hill Fort	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Dunadd Hill Fort	F	Y	GF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Dunadd Hill Fort	F	Y	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Dunadd Hill Fort	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Dunadd Hill Fort	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Dunblane Cathedral	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Dunblane Cathedral	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Dunblane Cathedral	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Dunblane Cathedral	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Dunblane Cathedral	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Dunblane Cathedral	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Dunchraigaig Cairn	F	N	GF	4	2	8	N	А	4	1.25	5
Dunchraigaig Cairn	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Duncrhaigaig Cairn	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Duncrhaigaig Cairn	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Duncrhaigaig Cairn	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Duncrhaigaig Cairn	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Dundonald Castle	С	N	LA	4	5	20	Y	S	4	4.5	18
Dundonald Castle	С	N	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Dundonald Castle	С	N	FF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Dundonald Castle	С	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Dundonald Castle	С	N	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Dundonald Castle	С	N	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Dundrennan Abbey	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Dundrennan Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Dundrennan Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Dundrennan Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Dundrennan Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Dundrennan Abbey	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Dunfallandy Stone	E	N	LA	3	5	15	N	A	3	4.25	12.75
Dunfallandy Stone	E	N	GF	4	2	8	N	Α	4	1.25	5
Dunfallandy Stone	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	Α	0	4.25	0
Dunfallandy Stone	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Dunfallandy Stone	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Dunfallandy Stone	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Dunfermline Abbey Palace and Nave	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Dunfermline Abbey Palace and Nave	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Dunfermline Abbey Palace and Nave	A	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Dunfermline Abbey Palace and Nave	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Dunfermline Abbey Palace and Nave	A	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Dunfermline Abbey Palace and Nave	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	RISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Dunfermline Abbey, Nether Yett	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	N	A	4	2.25	9
Dunfermline Abbey, Nether Yett	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Dunfermline Abbey, Nether Yett	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Dunfermline Abbey, Nether Yett	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Dunfermline Abbey, Nether Yett	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Dunfermline Abbey, Nether Yett	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Dunglass Collegiate Church	В	Y	GF	3	4	12	Y	А	3	3	9
Dunglass Collegiate Church	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Dunglass Collegiate Church	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Dunglass Collegiate Church	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Dunglass Collegiate Church	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Dunglass Collegiate Church	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Dunkeld Cathedral	С	Y	LA	4	5	20	Y	А	4	4	16
Dunkeld Cathedral	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Dunkeld Cathedral	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Dunkeld Cathedral	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Dunkeld Cathedral	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dunkeld Cathedral	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dunstaffnage Castle & Chapel	В	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Dunstaffnage Castle & Chapel	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Dunstaffnage Castle & Chapel	В	Y	CE	1	5	5	Y	А	1	4	4
Dunstaffnage Castle & Chapel	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Dunstaffnage Castle & Chapel	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Dunstaffnage Castle & Chapel	В	Y	GF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	RISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Dunstaffnage Castle Chapel	В	Y	LA	1	5	5	Y	A	1	4	4
Dunstaffnage Castle Chapel	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Dunstaffnage Castle Chapel	В	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dunstaffnage Castle Chapel	В	Y	GF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dunstaffnage Castle Chapel	В	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dunstaffnage Castle Chapel	В	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Dupplin Cross	E	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Dupplin Cross	E	Ν	GF	5	2	10	Y	S	5	1.5	7.5
Dupplin Cross	Е	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Dupplin Cross	Е	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Y	S	0	1.5	0
Dupplin Cross	Е	N	CF	0	2	0	Y	S	0	1.5	0
Dupplin Cross	E	N	FF	0	2	0	Y	S	0	1.5	0
Dwarfie Stane	E	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Dwarfie Stane	E	N	GF	3	2	6	N	А	3	1.25	3.75
Dwarfie Stane	Е	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Dwarfie Stane	E	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Dwarfie Stane	Е	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Dwarfie Stane	Е	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Dyce Symbol Stones	Е	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Dyce Symbol Stones	Е	Y	GF	3	2	6	Ν	A	3	1.25	3.75
Dyce Symbol Stones	Е	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Dyce Symbol Stones	Е	Y	FF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Dyce Symbol Stones	E	Y	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Dyce Symbol Stones	E	Y	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Eagle Rock	E	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Eagle Rock	E	N	CF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Eagle Rock	E	N	GF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Eagle Rock	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Eagle Rock	Е	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Eagle Rock	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Earl's Bu, Orphir	С	N	GF	5	3	15	Ν	A	5	2.25	11.25
Earl's Bu, Orphir	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Earl's Bu, Orphir	С	N	CE	1	5	5	N	А	1	4.25	4.25
Earl's Bu, Orphir	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Earl's Bu, Orphir	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Earl's Bu, Orphir	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Earl's Palace, Birsay	С		GF	4	3	12	Ν	A	4	2.25	9
Earl's Palace, Birsay	С		LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Earl's Palace, Birsay	С		CE	1	5	5	N	A	1	4.25	4.25
Earl's Palace, Birsay	С		FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Earl's Palace, Birsay	С		PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Earl's Palace, Birsay	С		CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Earl's Palace, Kirkwall	С		GF	4	3	12	Y	S	4	2.5	10
Earl's Palace, Kirkwall	С		LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Earl's Palace, Kirkwall	С		CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Earl's Palace, Kirkwall	С		FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Earl's Palace, Kirkwall	С		CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Earl's Palace, Kirkwall	С		PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Eassie Cross Slab	Е	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Eassie Cross Slab	Е	N	GF	5	2	10	Ν	A	5	1.25	6.25
Eassie Cross Slab	Е	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Eassie Cross Slab	Е	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Eassie Cross Slab	Е	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Eassie Cross Slab	Е	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Easter Aquhorthies Stone Circle	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Easter Aquhorthies Stone Circle	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Easter Aquhorthies Stone Circle	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Easter Aquhorthies Stone Circle	E	N	GF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Easter Aquhorthies Stone Circle	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Easter Aquhorthies Stone Circle	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Edinburgh Castle	А	Y	LA	4	5	20	Y	A	4	4	16
Edinburgh Castle	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Edinburgh Castle	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Edinburgh Castle	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Edinburgh Castle	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Edinburgh Castle	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Edin's Hall Broch	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Edin's Hall Broch	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Edin's Hall Broch	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Edin's Hall Broch	F	N	GF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Edin's Hall Broch	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Edin's Hall Broch	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	Α	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Edrom Norman Arch	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Edrom Norman Arch	E	N	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
Edrom Norman Arch	Е	Ν	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Edrom Norman Arch	Е	Ν	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Edrom Norman Arch	Е	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Edrom Norman Arch	Е	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Edzell Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Edzell Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Edzell Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Edzell Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Edzell Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Edzell Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Eileach-an-Naoimh	С	Y	CE	4	5	20	N	А	4	4.25	17
Eileach-an-Naoimh	С	Y	CF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Eileach-an-Naoimh	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Eileach-an-Naoimh	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Eileach-an-Naoimh	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Eileach-an-Naoimh	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Eilean Mor	С	N	CE	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Eilean Mor	С	N	LA	1	5	5	N	А	1	4.25	4.25
Eilean Mor	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Eilean Mor	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Eilean Mor	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Eilean Mor	С	N	GF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Elcho Castle	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Elcho Castle	А	Y	CF	3	4	12	Y	S	3	3.5	10.5
Elcho Castle	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Elcho Castle	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Elcho Castle	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Elcho Castle	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Elgin Cathedral	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Elgin Cathedral	В	Y	FF	4	4	16	Y	А	4	3	12
Elgin Cathedral	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Elgin Cathedral	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Elgin Cathedral	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Elgin Cathedral	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0

88 A Climate Change Risk Assessment

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Elgin Pans Port & Precinct Wall	В	N	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Elgin Pans Port & Precinct Wall	В	N	FF	4	4	16	Y	А	4	3	12
Elgin Pans Port & Precinct Wall	В	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Elgin Pans Port & Precinct Wall	В	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Elgin Pans Port & Precinct Wall	В	N	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Elgin Pans Port & Precinct Wall	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Eynhallow Church	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Eynhallow Church	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Eynhallow Church	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Eynhallow Church	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Eynhallow Church	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Eynhallow Church	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Fort Charlotte	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	4
Fort Charlotte	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	4
Fort Charlotte	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	3
Fort Charlotte	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	3
Fort Charlotte	А	Y	GF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	3
Fort Charlotte	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	3
Fort George	А	Y	CE	5	5	25	Y	А	5	4	20
Fort George	А	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Fort George	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Fort George	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Fort George	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Fort George	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Fortrose Cathedral	В	Y	GF	4	4	16	N	A	4	3.25	13
Fortrose Cathedral	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Fortrose Cathedral	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Fortrose Cathedral	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Fortrose Cathedral	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Fortrose Cathedral	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Ν	A	0	3.25	0
Foulden Tithe Barn	В	Y	GF	4	4	16	N	А	4	3.25	13
Foulden Tithe Barn	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Foulden Tithe Barn	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Foulden Tithe Barn	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Foulden Tithe Barn	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Foulden Tithe Barn	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti	gants &	Resi	dual Risl	k
							Control	s (Existing)			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Fowlis Wester Cross Slab	Е	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Fowlis Wester Cross Slab	E	N	GF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Fowlis Wester Cross Slab	Е	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Fowlis Wester Cross Slab	Е	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Fowlis Wester Cross Slab	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Fowlis Wester Cross Slab	Е	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Glasgow Cathedral	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Glasgow Cathedral	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Glasgow Cathedral	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Glasgow Cathedral	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Glasgow Cathedral	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Glasgow Cathedral	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Glenbuchat Castle	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Glenbuchat Castle	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	N	А	3	2.25	6.75
Glenbuchat Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Glenbuchat Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Glenbuchat Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Glenbuchat Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Glenluce Abbey	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Glenluce Abbey	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Glenluce Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Glenluce Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Glenluce Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Glenluce Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Grain Earth House	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Grain Earth House	F	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Grain Earth House	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Grain Earth House	F	N	GF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Grain Earth House	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Grain Earth House	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Greenknowne Tower	С	N	GF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Greenknowne Tower	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Greenknowne Tower	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Greenknowne Tower	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Greenknowne Tower	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Greenknowne Tower	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Grey Cairns of Camster	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Grey Cairns of Camster	В	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Grey Cairns of Camster	В	N	CF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Grey Cairns of Camster	В	N	GF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Grey Cairns of Camster	В	N	PF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Grey Cairns of Camster	В	N	FF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	RISK REGI	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Hackness Battery & Martello Tower	A	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Hackness Battery & Martello Tower	A	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Hackness Battery & Martello Tower	A	Y	CE	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Hackness Battery & Martello Tower	A	Y	GF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Hackness Battery & Martello Tower	A	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Hackness Battery & Martello Tower	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Hailes Castle	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	А	3	4	12
Hailes Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Hailes Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Hailes Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Hailes Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Hailes Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Hermitage Castle & Chapel	D	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Hermitage Castle & Chapel	D	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Hermitage Castle & Chapel	D	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Hermitage Castle & Chapel	D	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Hermitage Castle & Chapel	D	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Hermitage Castle & Chapel	D	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Hill O'Many Stanes	F	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Hill O'Many Stanes	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Hill O'Many Stanes	F	N	GF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Hill O'Many Stanes	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Hill O'Many Stanes	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Hill O'Many Stanes	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Hilton of Cadboll	F	N	LA	3	5	15	N	A	3	4.25	12.75
Hilton of Cadboll	F	N	CE	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Hilton of Cadboll	F	N	GF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Hilton of Cadboll	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Hilton of Cadboll	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Hilton of Cadboll	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Holm of Papa Westray Chambered Cairn	В	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Holm of Papa Westray Chambered Cairn	В	N	CE	1	5	5	N	A	1	4.25	4.25
Holm of Papa Westray Chambered Cairn	В	N	CF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Holm of Papa Westray Chambered Cairn	В	N	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Holm of Papa Westray Chambered Cairn	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Holm of Papa Westray Chambered Cairn	В	N	GF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Holyrood Park	В	Y	LA	4	5	20	Y	А	4	4	16
Holyrood Park	В	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Holyrood Park	В	Y	PF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Holyrood Park	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Holyrood Park	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Holyrood Park	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Huntingtower Castle	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Huntingtower Castle	А	Y	FF	3	4	12	Y	А	3	3	9
Huntingtower Castle	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Huntingtower Castle	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Huntingtower Castle	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Huntingtower Castle	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Huntly Castle	С	Y	LA	4	5	20	Y	А	4	4	16
Huntly Castle	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	А	3	4	12
Huntly Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Huntly Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Huntly Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Huntly Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Huntly Castle	С	Y	PF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Huntly Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Huntly Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Huntly Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Huntly Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Huntly Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Inchcolm Abbey	В	Y	CE	5	5	25	Y	S	5	4.5	22.5
Inchcolm Abbey	В	Y	LA	4	5	20	Y	S	4	4.5	18
Inchcolm Abbey	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Inchcolm Abbey	В	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Inchcolm Abbey	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Inchcolm Abbey	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Inchcolm Island	В	Ν	CE	5	5	25	Y	S	5	4.5	22.5
Inchcolm Island	В	Ν	LA	4	5	20	Y	S	4	4.5	18
Inchcolm Island	В	N	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Inchcolm Island	В	N	CF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Inchcolm Island	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Inchcolm Island	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Inchkenneth Chapel	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
Inchkenneth Chapel	С	Y	CF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
Inchkenneth Chapel	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Inchkenneth Chapel	С	Y	CE	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Inchkenneth Chapel	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Inchkenneth Chapel	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Inchmahome Priory	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Inchmahome Priory	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Inchmahome Priory	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Inchmahome Priory	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Inchmahome Priory	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Inchmahome Priory	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Innerpeffray Chapel	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Innerpeffray Chapel	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Innerpeffray Chapel	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Innerpeffray Chapel	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Innerpeffray Chapel	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Innerpeffray Chapel	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Inverlochy Castle	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	Ν	А	3	4.25	12.75
Inverlochy Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Ν	А	5	2.25	11.25
Inverlochy Castle	С	Y	PF	5	3	15	Ν	A	5	2.25	11.25
Inverlochy Castle	С	Y	CF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
Inverlochy Castle	С	Y	CE	1	5	5	N	А	1	4.25	4.25
Inverlochy Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Iona Abbey	А	Y	GF	4	4	16	Y	A	4	3	12
Iona Abbey	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Iona Abbey	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Iona Abbey	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Iona Abbey	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Iona Abbey	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Iona Nunnery	С	Ν	GF	5	3	15	Ν	A	5	2.25	11.25
Iona Nunnery	С	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Iona Nunnery	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Iona Nunnery	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Iona Nunnery	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
lona Nunnery	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Jarlshof	D	Y	CE	4	5	20	Y	А	4	4	16
Jarlshof	D	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	А	3	4	12
Jarlshof	D	Y	GF	4	3	12	Y	А	4	2	8
Jarlshof	D	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Jarlshof	D	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Jarlshof	D	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Jedburgh Abbey	С	Y	PF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Jedburgh Abbey	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Jedburgh Abbey	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Jedburgh Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Jedburgh Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Jedburgh Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Keills Chapel & Cross	В	Y	GF	4	4	16	N	А	4	3.25	13
Keills Chapel & Cross	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Keills Chapel & Cross	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Keills Chapel & Cross	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Keills Chapel & Cross	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	N	Α	0	3.25	0
Keills Chapel & Cross	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	N	Α	0	3.25	0
Kelso Abbey	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	N	Α	4	2.25	9
Kelso Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Kelso Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Kelso Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Kelso Abbey	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Kelso Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Kilberry Sculptured Stones	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Ν	A	5	3.25	16.25
Kilberry Sculptured Stones	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Kilberry Sculptured Stones	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Kilberry Sculptured Stones	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Ν	A	0	3.25	0
Kilberry Sculptured Stones	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Ν	A	0	3.25	0
Kilberry Sculptured Stones	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Kilchurn Castle	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	S	3	4.5	13.5
Kilchurn Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Kilchurn Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Kilchurn Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Kilchurn Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Kilchurn Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Kildalton Cross	Е	Y	LA	1	5	5	N	A	1	4.25	4.25
Kildalton Cross	Е	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Kildalton Cross	E	Y	GF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Kildalton Cross	E	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Kildalton Cross	E	Y	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Kildalton Cross	E	Y	CF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Kildrummy Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Kildrummy Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Kildrummy Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Kildrummy Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Kildrummy Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Kildrummy Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Kilmartin Crosses	В	N	GF	3	4	12	N	A	3	3.25	9.75
Kilmartin Crosses	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Kilmartin Crosses	В	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Kilmartin Crosses	В	N	CF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Kilmartin Crosses	В	N	PF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Kilmartin Crosses	В	N	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Kilmartin Glebe Cairn	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Kilmartin Glebe Cairn	F	N	GF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Kilmartin Glebe Cairn	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Kilmartin Glebe Cairn	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Kilmartin Glebe Cairn	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Kilmartin Glebe Cairn	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Kilmartin Sculptured Stones	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Kilmartin Sculptured Stones	E	N	GF	3	2	6	N	A	3	1.25	3.75
Kilmartin Sculptured Stones	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Kilmartin Sculptured Stones	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Kilmartin Sculptured Stones	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Kilmartin Sculptured Stones	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Kilmichael Glassary Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	LA	1	5	5	N	A	1	4.25	4.25
Kilmichael Glassary Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Kilmichael Glassary Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	GF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Kilmichael Glassary Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Kilmichael Glassary Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Kilmichael Glassary Cup & Ring Mark Rocks	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Kilmodan Sculptured Stones	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Ν	A	5	3.25	16.25
Kilmodan Sculptured Stones	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Kilmodan Sculptured Stones	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Kilmodan Sculptured Stones	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Kilmodan Sculptured Stones	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Kilmodan Sculptured Stones	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Kilmory Knap Chapel	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Ν	А	5	3.25	16.25
Kilmory Knap Chapel	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Kilmory Knap Chapel	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Kilmory Knap Chapel	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Kilmory Knap Chapel	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Kilmory Knap Chapel	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Kilpatrick Dun	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Kilpatrick Dun	F	N	GF	4	2	8	N	А	4	1.25	5
Kilpatrick Dun	F		CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Kilpatrick Dun	F	Ν	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Kilpatrick Dun	F	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Kilpatrick Dun	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Kilwinning Abbey	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	N	А	4	2.25	9
Kilwinning Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Kilwinning Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Kilwinning Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Kilwinning Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Kilwinning Abbey	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
King's Knot	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
King's Knot	F	Y	GF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
King's Knot	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
King's Knot	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
King's Knot	F	Y	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
King's Knot	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Kinkell Church	В	Y	GF	5	3	15	Ν	А	5	2.25	11.25
Kinkell Church	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Kinkell Church	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Kinkell Church	В	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Kinkell Church	В	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Kinkell Church	В	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Kinnaird Head Castle Lighthouse	А	Y	CE	4	5	20	Y	А	4	4	16
Kinnaird Head Castle Lighthouse	А	Y	GF	4	4	16	Y	А	4	3	12
Kinnaird Head Castle Lighthouse	A	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Kinnaird Head Castle Lighthouse	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Kinnaird Head Castle Lighthouse	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Kinnaird Head Castle Lighthouse	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Kinnaird Head Wine Tower	А	Y	CE	4	5	20	Y	А	4	4	16
Kinnaird Head Wine Tower	A	Y	GF	4	4	16	Y	А	4	3	12
Kinnaird Head Wine Tower	A	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Kinnaird Head Wine Tower	A	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Kinnaird Head Wine Tower	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Kinnaird Head Wine Tower	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Kinneil House	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	N	A	5	3.25	16.25
Kinneil House	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Kinneil House	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Kinneil House	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Kinneil House	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Kinneil House	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Kinneil Old Church Cross	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Kinneil Old Church Cross	Е	N	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
Kinneil Old Church Cross	Е	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Kinneil Old Church Cross	Е	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Kinneil Old Church Cross	Е	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Kinneil Old Church Cross	Е	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Kirkconnel Stones	Е	N	GF	5	2	10	N	С	5	2	10
Kirkconnel Stones	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	С	2	5	10
Kirkconnel Stones	E	N	FF	4	2	8	N	С	4	2	8
Kirkconnel Stones	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	С	0	5	0
Kirkconnel Stones	Е	N	CF	0	2	0	N	С	0	2	0
Kirkconnel Stones	Е	N	PF	0	2	0	N	с	0	2	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Kirkhill Roman Signal station	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	С	2	5	10
Kirkhill Roman Signal station	F	N	GF	3	2	6	Ν	С	3	2	6
Kirkhill Roman Signal station	F	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	С	0	5	0
Kirkhill Roman Signal station	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	С	0	2	0
Kirkhill Roman Signal station	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	С	0	2	0
Kirkhill Roman Signal station	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	С	0	2	0
Kirkmadrine Stones	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Kirkmadrine Stones	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Kirkmadrine Stones	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Kirkmadrine Stones	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Kirkmadrine Stones	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Kirkmadrine Stones	В	Y	GF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Kisimul Castle	А	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Kisimul Castle	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Kisimul Castle	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Kisimul Castle	А	Y	GF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Kisimul Castle	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Kisimul Castle	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Knap of Howar	D	N	LA	3	5	15	Ν	А	3	4.25	12.75
Knap of Howar	D	N	CF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Knap of Howar	D	N	CE	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Knap of Howar	D	N	GF	3	3	9	Ν	А	3	2.25	6.75
Knap of Howar	D	N	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Knap of Howar	D	N	PF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
Knock Castle	С	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	С	2	5	10
Knock Castle	С	N	GF	3	3	9	Ν	С	3	3	9
Knock Castle	С	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	С	0	5	0
Knock Castle	С	N	CF	0	3	0	Ν	С	0	3	0
Knock Castle	С	N	PF	0	3	0	Ν	С	0	3	0
Knock Castle	С	N	FF	0	3	0	Ν	С	0	3	0
Knocknagael Boar Stone	E	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Knocknagael Boar Stone	E	N	GF	5	2	10	Ν	A	5	1.25	6.25
Knocknagael Boar Stone	E	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Knocknagael Boar Stone	E	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Knocknagael Boar Stone	E	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Knocknagael Boar Stone	Е	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Knowe of Unstan Chambered Cairn	В	N	GF	4	4	16	N	A	4	3.25	13
Knowe of Unstan Chambered Cairn	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Knowe of Unstan Chambered Cairn	В	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Knowe of Unstan Chambered Cairn	В	N	FF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Knowe of Unstan Chambered Cairn	В	N	PF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Knowe of Unstan Chambered Cairn	В	N	CF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Knowe of Yarso Chambered Cairn	D	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Knowe of Yarso Chambered Cairn	D	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Knowe of Yarso Chambered Cairn	D	N	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Knowe of Yarso Chambered Cairn	D	N	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Knowe of Yarso Chambered Cairn	D	N	GF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Knowe of Yarso Chambered Cairn	D	N	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Laggangarn Standing Stones	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Laggangarn Standing Stones	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Laggangarn Standing Stones	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Laggangarn Standing Stones	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Laggangarn Standing Stones	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Laggangarn Standing Stones	E	N	GF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Lauderdale Aisle	А	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	4
Lauderdale Aisle	А	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	4
Lauderdale Aisle	А	N	GF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	3
Lauderdale Aisle	А	N	FF	3	4	12	Y	A	3	3	3
Lauderdale Aisle	А	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	3
Lauderdale Aisle	А	Ν	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	3

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	GF	4	5	20	Y	А	4	4	16
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	LA	2	3	6	Y	A	2	2	4
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Lincluden Collegiate Church	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Lindsay Burial Aisle	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Lindsay Burial Aisle	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Lindsay Burial Aisle	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Lindsay Burial Aisle	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Lindsay Burial Aisle	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Lindsay Burial Aisle	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Links of Notland	F	Y	LA	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Links of Notland	F	Y	CE	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Links of Notland	F	Y	GF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Links of Notland	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Links of Notland	F	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Links of Notland	F	Y	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Linlithgow Palace, Peel & Park	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	A	3	4	12
Linlithgow Palace, Peel & Park	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Linlithgow Palace, Peel & Park	С	Y	PF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Linlithgow Palace, Peel & Park	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Linlithgow Palace, Peel & Park	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Linlithgow Palace, Peel & Park	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti	gants &	Resi	dual Ris	k
							Control	s (Existing)			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Loanhead of Daviot Stone Circle	E	N	LA	1	5	5	N	А	1	4.25	4.25
Loanhead of Daviot Stone Circle	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Loanhead of Daviot Stone Circle	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Loanhead of Daviot Stone Circle	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Loanhead of Daviot Stone Circle	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Loanhead of Daviot Stone Circle	E	N	GF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Loch Doon Castle	С	N	LA	1	5	5	N	A	1	4.25	4.25
Loch Doon Castle	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Loch Doon Castle	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Loch Doon Castle	С	N	GF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Loch Doon Castle	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Loch Doon Castle	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Lochleven Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Lochleven Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Lochleven Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Lochleven Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Lochleven Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Lochleven Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Lochmaben Castle	С	N	FF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
Lochmaben Castle	С	N	GF	4	3	12	N	A	4	2.25	9
Lochmaben Castle	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Lochmaben Castle	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Lochmaben Castle	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Lochmaben Castle	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Lochranza Castle	С	Y	CE	3	5	15	Y	S	3	4.5	13.5
Lochranza Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Lochranza Castle	С	Y	CF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Lochranza Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Lochranza Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Lochranza Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Machrie Moor Stone Circles	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Machrie Moor Stone Circles	E	N	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
Machrie Moor Stone Circles	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Machrie Moor Stone Circles	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Machrie Moor Stone Circles	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Machrie Moor Stone Circles	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	STER		Inhe	rent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
MacLean's Cross, Iona	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
MacLean's Cross, Iona	E	N	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
MacLean's Cross, Iona	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
MacLean's Cross, Iona	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
MacLean's Cross, Iona	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
MacLean's Cross, Iona	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Maclellan's Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Maclellan's Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Maclellan's Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Maclellan's Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Maclellan's Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Maclellan's Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Maes Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Maes Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Maes Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Maes Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Maes Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Maes Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Maiden Stone	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Maiden Stone	Е	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Maiden Stone	Е	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Maiden Stone	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Maiden Stone	Е	Ν	GF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Maiden Stone	E	Ν	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Maison Dieu Chapel, Brechin	С		LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Maison Dieu Chapel, Brechin	С		GF	3	3	9	N	А	3	2.25	6.75
Maison Dieu Chapel, Brechin	С		CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Maison Dieu Chapel, Brechin	С		PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Maison Dieu Chapel, Brechin	С		CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Maison Dieu Chapel, Brechin	С		FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Mars Wark	С	N	LA	1	5	5	N	А	1	4.25	4.25
Mars Wark	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Mars Wark	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Mars Wark	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Mars Wark	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Mars Wark	С	N	GF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0

102 A Climate Change Risk Assessment

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti	gants &	Resi	dual Ris	k
Droporty	Catagony	Collections	Hazard	Likeliheed	Impact	Dick	Control	s (Existing)	Likeliheed	Impact	Dick
Name	Category	Collections	nazaru	Likelinood	Impact	Rating	(Y/N)	All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelinood	Impact	Rating
Mavisbank Policies	F	N	LA	5	5	25	N	С	5	5	25
Mavisbank Policies	F	N	FF	5	2	10	N	С	5	2	10
Mavisbank Policies	F	N	PF	5	2	10	N	С	5	2	10
Mavisbank Policies	F	N	GF	5	2	10	N	С	5	2	10
Mavisbank Policies	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	С	0	5	0
Mavisbank Policies	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	С	0	2	0
Maybole Collegiate Church	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	N	S	5	2.75	13.75
Maybole Collegiate Church	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	S	2	4.75	9.5
Maybole Collegiate Church	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	S	0	4.75	0
Maybole Collegiate Church	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	S	0	2.75	0
Maybole Collegiate Church	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	S	0	2.75	0
Maybole Collegiate Church	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	S	0	2.75	0
Meigle Stones (& Museum)	А	Y	GF	4	4	16	Y	S	4	3.5	14
Meigle Stones (& Museum)	A	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Meigle Stones (& Museum)	A	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Meigle Stones (& Museum)	A	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Meigle Stones (& Museum)	A	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Meigle Stones (& Museum)	A	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Melrose Abbey and Precinct	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Melrose Abbey and Precinct	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Melrose Abbey and Precinct	С	Y	PF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Melrose Abbey and Precinct	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Melrose Abbey and Precinct	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Melrose Abbey and Precinct	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Merkland Cross	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Merkland Cross	E	N	GF	4	2	8	N	А	4	1.25	5
Merkland Cross	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Merkland Cross	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Merkland Cross	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Merkland Cross	E	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R		STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Mid Howe Broch	С	Y	CF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
Mid Howe Broch	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Mid Howe Broch	С	Y	CE	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Mid Howe Broch	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Mid Howe Broch	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Mid Howe Broch	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Mid Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Mid Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	CE	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Mid Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	CF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Mid Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Mid Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Mid Howe Chambered Cairn	В	N	GF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Monreith Cross	Е	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Monreith Cross	E	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Monreith Cross	Е	N	FF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Monreith Cross	Е	N	GF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Monreith Cross	E	N	CF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Monreith Cross	Е	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Y	А	0	1	0
Morton Castle	С	N	GF	5	3	15	Ν	А	5	2.25	11.25
Morton Castle	С	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Morton Castle	С	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Morton Castle	С	Ν	CF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Morton Castle	С	Ν	PF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Morton Castle	С	Ν	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Moss Farm Road Stone Circle	E	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Moss Farm Road Stone Circle	E	N	GF	4	2	8	Ν	А	4	1.25	5
Moss Farm Road Stone Circle	E	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Moss Farm Road Stone Circle	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Moss Farm Road Stone Circle	E	Ν	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Moss Farm Road Stone Circle	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Mousa Broch	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Mousa Broch	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Mousa Broch	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Mousa Broch	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Mousa Broch	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Mousa Broch	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Muir O'Fauld Roman Signal Station	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Muir O'Fauld Roman Signal Station	F	N	GF	3	2	6	N	A	3	1.25	3.75
Muir O'Fauld Roman Signal Station	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Muir O'Fauld Roman Signal Station	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Muir O'Fauld Roman Signal Station	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Muir O'Fauld Roman Signal Station	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Muness Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Muness Castle	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	Y	A	3	2	6
Muness Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Muness Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Muness Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Muness Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Muthill Old Church & Tower	С	N	GF	4	3	12	N	A	4	2.25	9
Muthill Old Church & Tower	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Muthill Old Church & Tower	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Muthill Old Church & Tower	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Muthill Old Church & Tower	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Muthill Old Church & Tower	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Ness of Burgi	D	Y	CE	4	5	20	Ν	А	4	4.25	17
Ness of Burgi	D	Y	CF	5	3	15	Ν	А	5	2.25	11.25
Ness of Burgi	D	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Ness of Burgi	D	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Ness of Burgi	D	Y	PF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Ness of Burgi	D	Y	GF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Nether Largie Mid Cairn	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Nether Largie Mid Cairn	F	N	GF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Nether Largie Mid Cairn	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Nether Largie Mid Cairn	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Nether Largie Mid Cairn	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Nether Largie Mid Cairn	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	RISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Risl	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Nether Largie North Cairn	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Nether Largie North Cairn	F	N	GF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Nether Largie North Cairn	F	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Nether Largie North Cairn	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Nether Largie North Cairn	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Nether Largie North Cairn	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Nether Largie South Cairn	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Nether Largie South Cairn	F	Ν	GF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Nether Largie South Cairn	F	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Nether Largie South Cairn	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Nether Largie South Cairn	F	Ν	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Nether Largie South Cairn	F	Ν	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
New Abbey Corn Mill	А	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
New Abbey Corn Mill	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
New Abbey Corn Mill	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
New Abbey Corn Mill	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
New Abbey Corn Mill	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
New Abbey Corn Mill	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Newark Castle	А	Y	CE	4	5	20	Y	S	4	4.5	18
Newark Castle	А	Y	CE	4	5	20	Y	S	4	4.5	18
Newark Castle	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Newark Castle	А	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Newark Castle	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Newark Castle	А	Y	CF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Newark Castle	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Newark Castle	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Newark Castle	A	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Newark Castle	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Newark Castle	A	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Newark Castle	A	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Notland Castle	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Notland Castle	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Notland Castle	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Notland Castle	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Notland Castle	В	Y	GF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Notland Castle	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	RISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Old Brig O'Dee	С	N	LA	3	5	15	N	A	3	4.25	12.75
Old Brig O'Dee	С	N	FF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
Old Brig O'Dee	С	N	GF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
Old Brig O'Dee	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Old Brig O'Dee	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Old Brig O'Dee	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Orchardton Tower	С	Y	LA	1	5	5	Y	A	1	4	4
Orchardton Tower	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Orchardton Tower	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Orchardton Tower	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Orchardton Tower	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Orchardton Tower	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Ormiston Cross	E	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
Ormiston Cross	E	N	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
Ormiston Cross	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Ormiston Cross	E	Ν	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Ormiston Cross	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Ormiston Cross	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Peel Ring of Lumphanan	F	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Peel Ring of Lumphanan	F	Y	FF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Peel Ring of Lumphanan	F	Y	GF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Peel Ring of Lumphanan	F	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Peel Ring of Lumphanan	F	Y	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Peel Ring of Lumphanan	F	Y	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Picardy Symbol Stone	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Picardy Symbol Stone	E	N	GF	3	2	6	N	A	3	1.25	3.75
Picardy Symbol Stone	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Picardy Symbol Stone	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Picardy Symbol Stone	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Picardy Symbol Stone	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Pierowall Church	С	N	LA	3	5	15	N	A	3	4.25	12.75
Pierowall Church	С	N	GF	4	3	12	N	А	4	2.25	9
Pierowall Church	С	N	CF	4	3	12	N	А	4	2.25	9
Pierowall Church	С	N	CE	1	5	5	N	A	1	4.25	4.25
Pierowall Church	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Pierowall Church	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Preston Market Cross	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Preston Market Cross	E	N	GF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Preston Market Cross	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Preston Market Cross	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Preston Market Cross	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Preston Market Cross	Е	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Quoyness Chambered Cairn	В	N	CE	4	5	20	Ν	A	4	4.25	17
Quoyness Chambered Cairn	В	N	CF	5	4	20	Ν	A	5	3.25	16.25
Quoyness Chambered Cairn	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Quoyness Chambered Cairn	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Quoyness Chambered Cairn	В	N	GF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Quoyness Chambered Cairn	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Ν	А	0	3.25	0
Ravenscraig Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Ν	A	5	2.25	11.25
Ravenscraig Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Ravenscraig Castle	С	Y	CE	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Ravenscraig Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Ravenscraig Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Ravenscraig Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Rennibister Earth House	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Rennibister Earth House	F	N	GF	4	2	8	Ν	А	4	1.25	5
Rennibister Earth House	F	N	CE	1	5	5	Ν	А	1	4.25	4.25
Rennibister Earth House	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Rennibister Earth House	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Rennibister Earth House	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Restenneth Priory	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Ν	А	5	2.25	11.25
Restenneth Priory	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Restenneth Priory	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Restenneth Priory	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Restenneth Priory	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Restenneth Priory	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
Ri-Cruin Cairn	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Ri-Cruin Cairn	F	N	GF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Ri-Cruin Cairn	F	Ν	FF	4	2	8	Ν	А	4	1.25	5
Ri-Cruin Cairn	F	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Ri-Cruin Cairn	F	Ν	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Ri-Cruin Cairn	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Ring of Brodgar	Е	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Ring of Brodgar	Е	Y	GF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Ring of Brodgar	Е	Y	FF	5	2	10	Ν	A	5	1.25	6.25
Ring of Brodgar	E	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Ring of Brodgar	Е	Y	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Ring of Brodgar	Е	Y	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
CURRENT CLIMATE R	RISK REGI	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
-------------------	-----------	-------------	--------	------------	-----------	----------------	------------------	--	------------	----------	----------------
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Rispain Camp	F	Ν	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Rispain Camp	F	Ν	GF	4	2	8	Ν	A	4	1.25	5
Rispain Camp	F	Ν	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Rispain Camp	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Rispain Camp	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Rispain Camp	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Rothesay Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Rothesay Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Rothesay Castle	С	Y	CF	3	3	9	Y	A	3	2	6
Rothesay Castle	С	Y	CE	1	5	5	Y	A	1	4	4
Rothesay Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Rothesay Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Rowallan Castle	В	N	PF	5	4	20	N	A	5	3.25	16.25
Rowallan Castle	В	N	FF	5	4	20	N	A	5	3.25	16.25
Rowallan Castle	В	N	GF	5	4	20	N	A	5	3.25	16.25
Rowallan Castle	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Rowallan Castle	В	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Rowallan Castle	В	N	CF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Ruthven Barracks	С	N	LA	3	5	15	Y	A	3	4	12
Ruthven Barracks	С	N	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Ruthven Barracks	С	N	FF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Ruthven Barracks	С	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Ruthven Barracks	С	N	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Ruthven Barracks	С	N	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Ruthwell Cross	Е	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Ruthwell Cross	Е	Y	GF	5	2	10	N	А	5	1.25	6.25
Ruthwell Cross	Е	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Ruthwell Cross	Е	Y	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Ruthwell Cross	Е	Y	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Ruthwell Cross	E	Y	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Scalloway Castle	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Scalloway Castle	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Scalloway Castle	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Scalloway Castle	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Scalloway Castle	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Scalloway Castle	С	N	GF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Scotstarvit Tower	В	N	LA	1	5	5	Y	А	1	4	4
Scotstarvit Tower	В	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Scotstarvit Tower	В	N	GF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Scotstarvit Tower	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Scotstarvit Tower	В	N	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Scotstarvit Tower	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Y	Α	0	3	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REGI	STER		Inhe	rent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Risl	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Seton Collegiate Church	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Seton Collegiate Church	В	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Seton Collegiate Church	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Seton Collegiate Church	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Seton Collegiate Church	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Seton Collegiate Church	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Skara Brae	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Skara Brae	В	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	А	3	4	12
Skara Brae	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Skara Brae	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Skara Brae	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Skara Brae	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Skelmorlie Aisle	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
Skelmorlie Aisle	В	Y	CE	3	5	15	Y	А	3	4	12
Skelmorlie Aisle	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Skelmorlie Aisle	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Skelmorlie Aisle	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Skelmorlie Aisle	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Skipness Castle	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	N	А	5	3.25	16.25
Skipness Castle	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Skipness Castle	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Skipness Castle	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Skipness Castle	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Skipness Castle	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Skipness Chapel	С	Y	CE	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Skipness Chapel	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Skipness Chapel	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Skipness Chapel	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Skipness Chapel	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Skipness Chapel	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Smailholm Tower	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Smailholm Tower	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Smailholm Tower	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Smailholm Tower	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Smailholm Tower	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Smailholm Tower	А	Y	GF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Spynie Palace	С	Y	LA	4	5	20	Y	S	4	4.5	18
Spynie Palace	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Spynie Palace	С	Y	CF	4	3	12	Y	S	4	2.5	10
Spynie Palace	С	Y	FF	3	3	9	Y	S	3	2.5	7.5
Spynie Palace	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Spynie Palace	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0

110 A Climate Change Risk Assessment

CURRENT CLIMATE R		STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
St Andrews Castle	С	Y	CE	4	5	20	Y	A	4	4	16
St Andrews Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
St Andrews Castle	С	Y	CF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
St Andrews Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
St Andrews Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
St Andrews Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
St Andrews Cathedral	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	Y	A	4	2	8
St Andrews Cathedral	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
St Andrews Cathedral	С	Y	CE	1	5	5	Y	A	1	4	4
St Andrews Cathedral	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
St Andrews Cathedral	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
St Andrews Cathedral	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
St Blane's Church	С	Y	LA	4	5	20	N	A	4	4.25	17
St Blane's Church	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
St Blane's Church	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
St Blane's Church	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
St Blane's Church	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
St Blane's Church	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
St Bride's Church	В	Y	GF	4	4	16	Y	A	4	3	12
St Bride's Church	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
St Bride's Church	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
St Bride's Church	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
St Bride's Church	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
St Bride's Church	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
St Bridget's Kirk	С		GF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
St Bridget's Kirk	С		LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
St Bridget's Kirk	С		CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
St Bridget's Kirk	С		FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
St Bridget's Kirk	С		PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
St Bridget's Kirk	С		CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
St Clement's Church, Rodel	В	Y	LA	1	5	5	Y	A	1	4	4
St Clement's Church, Rodel	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
St Clement's Church, Rodel	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
St Clement's Church, Rodel	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
St Clement's Church, Rodel	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
St Clement's Church, Rodel	В	Y	GF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REGI	STER		Inhe	rent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Risl	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
St Machar's Cathedral Transepts	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
St Machar's Cathedral Transepts	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	Ν	A	3	2.25	6.75
St Machar's Cathedral Transepts	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
St Machar's Cathedral Transepts	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
St Machar's Cathedral Transepts	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
St Machar's Cathedral Transepts	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
St Magnus Church, Egilsay	С		LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
St Magnus Church, Egilsay	С		CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
St Magnus Church, Egilsay	С		PF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
St Magnus Church, Egilsay	С		FF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
St Magnus Church, Egilsay	С		GF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
St Magnus Church, Egilsay	С		CF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
St Martin's Kirk, Haddington	С	Ν	GF	5	3	15	Ν	А	5	2.25	11.25
St Martin's Kirk, Haddington	С	Ν	FF	5	3	15	Ν	А	5	2.25	11.25
St Martin's Kirk, Haddington	С	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
St Martin's Kirk, Haddington	С	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
St Martin's Kirk, Haddington	С	Ν	PF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
St Martin's Kirk, Haddington	С	Ν	CF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
St Mary's Chapel, Crosskirk	С	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
St Mary's Chapel, Crosskirk	С	Ν	GF	3	3	9	Y	A	3	2	6
St Mary's Chapel, Crosskirk	С	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
St Mary's Chapel, Crosskirk	С	Ν	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
St Mary's Chapel, Crosskirk	С	Ν	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
St Mary's Chapel, Crosskirk	С	Ν	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REG	STER		Inhe	rent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
St Mary's Chapel, Rothesay	В	Y	GF	3	4	12	Y	А	3	3	9
St Mary's Chapel, Rothesay	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
St Mary's Chapel, Rothesay	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
St Mary's Chapel, Rothesay	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
St Mary's Chapel, Rothesay	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
St Mary's Chapel, Rothesay	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
St Mary's Chapel, Wyre	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
St Mary's Chapel, Wyre	С	Ν	GF	3	3	9	N	А	3	2.25	6.75
St Mary's Chapel, Wyre	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
St Mary's Chapel, Wyre	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
St Mary's Chapel, Wyre	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
St Mary's Chapel, Wyre	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
St Mary's Church Grandtully	В	N	GF	3	4	12	N	А	3	3.25	9.75
St Mary's Church Grandtully	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
St Mary's Church Grandtully	В	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
St Mary's Church Grandtully	В	N	CF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
St Mary's Church Grandtully	В	N	PF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
St Mary's Church Grandtully	В	N	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
St Mary's Kirk, Auchindoir	С	N	GF	4	3	12	N	A	4	2.25	9
St Mary's Kirk, Auchindoir	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
St Mary's Kirk, Auchindoir	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
St Mary's Kirk, Auchindoir	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
St Mary's Kirk, Auchindoir	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
St Mary's Kirk, Auchindoir	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE	RISK REGI	STER		Inhe	rent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Risl	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
St Mary's Kirkheugh, St Andrews	D	N	GF	4	3	12	Ν	А	4	2.25	9
St Mary's Kirkheugh, St Andrews	D	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	A	2	4.25	8.5
St Mary's Kirkheugh, St Andrews	D	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
St Mary's Kirkheugh, St Andrews	D	N	PF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
St Mary's Kirkheugh, St Andrews	D	N	CF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
St Mary's Kirkheugh, St Andrews	D	N	FF	0	3	0	Ν	A	0	2.25	0
St Nicholas Church, Orphir			GF	5	0	0			5	0	0
St Nicholas Church, Orphir			LA	2	0	0			2	0	0
St Nicholas Church, Orphir			PF	0	0	0			0	0	0
St Nicholas Church, Orphir			FF	0	0	0			0	0	0
St Nicholas Church, Orphir			CF	0	0	0			0	0	0
St Nicholas Church, Orphir			CE	1	0	0			1	0	0
St Ninian's Cave	F	Ν	LA	3	5	15	Ν	А	3	4.25	12.75
St Ninian's Cave	F	Ν	GF	3	2	6	Ν	А	3	1.25	3.75
St Ninian's Cave	F	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
St Ninian's Cave	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
St Ninian's Cave	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
St Ninian's Cave	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
St Ninian's Chapel, Isle of Whithorn	С	N	CE	3	5	15	Ν	A	3	4.25	12.75
St Ninian's Chapel, Isle of Whithorn	С	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
St Ninian's Chapel, Isle of Whithorn	С	N	CF	3	3	9	Ν	А	3	2.25	6.75
St Ninian's Chapel, Isle of Whithorn	С	N	PF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
St Ninian's Chapel, Isle of Whithorn	С	N	GF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
St Ninian's Chapel, Isle of Whithorn	С	N	FF	0	3	0	Ν	А	0	2.25	0
St Orland's Stone	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
St Orland's Stone	E	N	GF	4	2	8	Ν	А	4	1.25	5
St Orland's Stone	Е	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
St Orland's Stone	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
St Orland's Stone	Е	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
St Orland's Stone	Е	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	RISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
St Peter's Church, Duffus	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	Y	A	4	2	8
St Peter's Church, Duffus	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
St Peter's Church, Duffus	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
St Peter's Church, Duffus	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
St Peter's Church, Duffus	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
St Peter's Church, Duffus	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
St Rules Tower, St Andrews	В	N	GF	3	4	12	Y	A	3	3	9
St Rules Tower, St Andrews	В	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
St Rules Tower, St Andrews	В	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
St Rules Tower, St Andrews	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
St Rules Tower, St Andrews	В	N	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
St Rules Tower, St Andrews	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
St Serf's Church, Dunning	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
St Serf's Church, Dunning	В	Y	FF	4	4	16	Y	S	4	3.5	14
St Serf's Church, Dunning	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
St Serf's Church, Dunning	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
St Serf's Church, Dunning	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
St Serf's Church, Dunning	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
St Serf's Priory, Loch Leven	С	N	FF	5	3	15	N	С	5	3	15
St Serf's Priory, Loch Leven	С	N	GF	5	3	15	N	С	5	3	15
St Serf's Priory, Loch Leven	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	С	2	5	10
St Serf's Priory, Loch Leven	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	С	0	5	0
St Serf's Priory, Loch Leven	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	С	0	3	0
St Serf's Priory, Loch Leven	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	С	0	3	0
St Triduana's Aisle	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
St Triduana's Aisle	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
St Triduana's Aisle	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
St Triduana's Aisle	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
St Triduana's Aisle	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
St Triduana's Aisle	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REGI	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Risl	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access – All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
St Vigeans Stones (& Museum)	A	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	А	5	3	15
St Vigeans Stones & Museum)	A	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
St Vigeans Stones (& Museum)	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
St Vigeans Stones (& Museum)	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
St Vigeans Stones (& Museum)	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
St Vigeans Stones (& Museum)	A	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Stanley Mills	А	Y	LA	4	5	20	Y	S	4	4.5	18
Stanley Mills	А	Y	FF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Stanley Mills	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Stanley Mills	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Stanley Mills	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Stanley Mills	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Stanydale Temple	F	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Stanydale Temple	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Stanydale Temple	F	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Stanydale Temple	F	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Stanydale Temple	F	N	GF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Stanydale Temple	F	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Steinacleit Cairn and Stone Circle	E	N	LA	1	5	5	Ν	А	1	4.25	4.25
Steinacleit Cairn and Stone Circle	E	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Steinacleit Cairn and Stone Circle	E	N	CF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Steinacleit Cairn and Stone Circle	E	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Steinacleit Cairn and Stone Circle	E	N	GF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Steinacleit Cairn and Stone Circle	E	N	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Stirling Castle	А	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	А	3	4	12
Stirling Castle	А	Y	GF	3	4	12	Y	А	3	3	9
Stirling Castle	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Stirling Castle	A	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Stirling Castle	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Stirling Castle	A	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Stirling Old Bridge	С	N	LA	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Stirling Old Bridge	С	N	FF	5	3	15	Ν	А	5	2.25	11.25
Stirling Old Bridge	С	N	CF	5	3	15	N	A	5	2.25	11.25
Stirling Old Bridge	С	N	GF	4	3	12	N	А	4	2.25	9
Stirling Old Bridge	С	N	CE	1	5	5	N	A	1	4.25	4.25
Stirling Old Bridge	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	ISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	rent Ris	k	Miti	gants &	Resi	dual Ris	k
							Control	s (Existing)			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Stone positions - Dunfallandy, St Orlands	E	N	LA	3	5	15	N	A	3	4.25	12.75
Stone positions - Dunfallandy, St Orlands	E	N	GF	4	2	8	N	А	4	1.25	5
Stone positions - Dunfallandy, St Orlands	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Stone positions - Dunfallandy, St Orlands	E	Ν	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Stone positions - Dunfallandy, St Orlands	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Stone positions - Dunfallandy, St Orlands	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Stones of Stenness	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Stones of Stenness	E	N	GF	4	2	8	N	A	4	1.25	5
Stones of Stenness	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Stones of Stenness	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Stones of Stenness	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Stones of Stenness	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Sueno's Stone	Е	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Sueno's Stone	Е	N	GF	4	2	8	N	А	4	1.25	5
Sueno's Stone	Е	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	A	0	4.25	0
Sueno's Stone	Е	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Sueno's Stone	Е	Ν	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Sueno's Stone	Е	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Sunnybrae Cottage	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Ν	A	5	3.25	16.25
Sunnybrae Cottage	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Ν	А	2	4.25	8.5
Sunnybrae Cottage	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Sunnybrae Cottage	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	N	A	0	3.25	0
Sunnybrae Cottage	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Ν	A	0	3.25	0
Sunnybrae Cottage	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Ν	A	0	3.25	0
Sweetheart Abbey	С	Y	GF	4	3	12	Y	A	4	2	8
Sweetheart Abbey	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Sweetheart Abbey	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Sweetheart Abbey	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Sweetheart Abbey	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Sweetheart Abbey	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Sweetheart Abbey Precinct Walls	С	N	FF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Sweetheart Abbey Precinct Walls	С	N	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Sweetheart Abbey Precinct Walls	С	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Sweetheart Abbey Precinct Walls	С	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Sweetheart Abbey Precinct Walls	С	N	CF	0	3	0	Y	A	0	2	0
Sweetheart Abbey Precinct Walls	С	N	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0

CURRENT CLIMATE R	RISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	А	3	4	12
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	LA	3	5	15	Y	А	3	4	12
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	A	5	2	10
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	CF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	GF	3	3	9	Y	А	3	2	6
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	CE	1	5	5	Y	А	1	4	4
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	Α	0	2	0
Tantallon Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	Α	0	2	0
Tarves Tomb	D	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	Α	2	4.25	8.5
Tarves Tomb	D	Y	GF	3	3	9	N	А	3	2.25	6.75
Tarves Tomb	D	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	Α	0	4.25	0
Tarves Tomb	D	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	Α	0	2.25	0
Tarves Tomb	D	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Tarves Tomb	D	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Taversoe Tuick Chambered Cairn	D	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Taversoe Tuick Chambered Cairn	D	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Taversoe Tuick Chambered Cairn	D	N	GF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Taversoe Tuick Chambered Cairn	D	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Taversoe Tuick Chambered Cairn	D	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Taversoe Tuick Chambered Cairn	D	N	CF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Tealing Dovecot	В	N	GF	5	4	20	N	S	5	3.75	18.75
Tealing Dovecot	В	N	FF	5	4	20	N	S	5	3.75	18.75
Tealing Dovecot	В	N	PF	5	4	20	N	S	5	3.75	18.75
Tealing Dovecot	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	S	2	4.75	9.5
Tealing Dovecot	В	N	CE	0	5	0	N	S	0	4.75	0
Tealing Dovecot	В	N	CF	0	4	0	N	S	0	3.75	0
Tealing Souterrain	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	S	2	4.75	9.5
Tealing Souterrain	F	N	GF	5	2	10	N	S	5	1.75	8.75
Tealing Souterrain	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	S	0	4.75	0
Tealing Souterrain	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Tealing Souterrain	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0
Tealing Souterrain	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	S	0	1.75	0

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REG	ISTER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti	gants &	Resi	dual Ris	k
							Control	s (Existing)			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Temple Wood Stone Circle	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Temple Wood Stone Circle	E	N	GF	5	2	10	N	A	5	1.25	6.25
Temple Wood Stone Circle	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Temple Wood Stone Circle	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Temple Wood Stone Circle	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Temple Wood Stone Circle	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Threave Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Threave Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Threave Castle	С	Y	PF	4	3	12	Y	S	4	2.5	10
Threave Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Threave Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Threave Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Tolquhon Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Tolquhon Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Tolquhon Castle	С	Y	FF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Tolquhon Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Tolquhon Castle	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Tolquhon Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Tomnavervie Stone Circle	E	Y	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Tomnavervie Stone Circle	E	Y	GF	3	3	9	N	A	3	2.25	6.75
Tomnavervie Stone Circle	E	Y	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Tomnavervie Stone Circle	E	Y	FF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Tomnavervie Stone Circle	E	Y	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Tomnavervie Stone Circle	E	Y	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Torhouse Stone Circle	E	N	LA	2	5	10	N	A	2	4.25	8.5
Torhouse Stone Circle	E	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Torhouse Stone Circle	E	N	FF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Torhouse Stone Circle	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Torhouse Stone Circle	E	N	GF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Torhouse Stone Circle	E	N	PF	0	2	0	N	A	0	1.25	0
Tormiston Mill	А	N	GF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Tormiston Mill	А	N	FF	5	4	20	Y	A	5	3	15
Tormiston Mill	А	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	A	2	4	8
Tormiston Mill	А	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	A	0	4	0
Tormiston Mill	А	N	CF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0
Tormiston Mill	А	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	A	0	3	0

CURRENT CLIMATE F	RISK REG	STER		Inhe	erent Ris	k	Miti Control	gants & s (Existing)	Resi	dual Ris	k
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Torphichen Preceptory	В	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Torphichen Preceptory	В	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Torphichen Preceptory	В	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Torphichen Preceptory	В	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Torphichen Preceptory	В	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Torphichen Preceptory	В	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Torr A'Chaisteil Fort	F	N	LA	3	5	15	Ν	A	3	4.25	12.75
Torr A'Chaisteil Fort	F	Ν	GF	5	2	10	Ν	А	5	1.25	6.25
Torr A'Chaisteil Fort	F	Ν	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Torr A'Chaisteil Fort	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Torr A'Chaisteil Fort	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Torr A'Chaisteil Fort	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Torrylin Cairn	F	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Torrylin Cairn	F	N	GF	4	2	8	N	А	4	1.25	5
Torrylin Cairn	F	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Torrylin Cairn	F	N	FF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Torrylin Cairn	F	N	CF	0	2	0	N	А	0	1.25	0
Torrylin Cairn	F	N	PF	0	2	0	N	Α	0	1.25	0
Trinity House	А	Y	GF	5	4	20	Y	Α	5	3	15
Trinity House	А	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	Α	2	4	8
Trinity House	А	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	Α	0	4	0
Trinity House	А	Y	PF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Trinity House	А	Y	CF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Trinity House	А	Y	FF	0	4	0	Y	А	0	3	0
Tullibardine Chapel	В	N	GF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Tullibardine Chapel	В	N	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Tullibardine Chapel	В	N	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Tullibardine Chapel	В	N	FF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Tullibardine Chapel	В	N	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Tullibardine Chapel	В	N	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	GF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	А	5	2	10
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	А	2	4	8
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	А	0	4	0
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	А	0	2	0
Urquhart Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	Α	0	2	0
Urguhart Castle	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	Α	0	2	0

120 A Climate Change Risk Assessment

CURRENT CLIMATE RISK REGISTER				Inherent Risk			Mitigants & Controls (Existing)		Residual Risk		
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Wanlockhead Beam Engine	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Wanlockhead Beam Engine	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	A	0	4.25	0
Wanlockhead Beam Engine	С	N	GF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Wanlockhead Beam Engine	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Wanlockhead Beam Engine	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Wanlockhead Beam Engine	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
West Port, St Andrews	С	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
West Port, St Andrews	С	N	GF	3	3	9	N	А	3	2.25	6.75
West Port, St Andrews	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
West Port, St Andrews	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
West Port, St Andrews	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
West Port, St Andrews	С	N	CF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Westquarter Dovecot	В	N	GF	4	4	16	N	А	4	3.25	13
Westquarter Dovecot	В	N	LA	2	5	10	N	А	2	4.25	8.5
Westquarter Dovecot	В	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Westquarter Dovecot	В	N	PF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Westquarter Dovecot	В	N	FF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Westquarter Dovecot	В	N	CF	0	4	0	N	А	0	3.25	0
Westside Church, Tuquoy	С	N	LA	3	5	15	N	А	3	4.25	12.75
Westside Church, Tuquoy	С	N	CF	5	3	15	N	А	5	2.25	11.25
Westside Church, Tuquoy	С	N	GF	4	3	12	N	A	4	2.25	9
Westside Church, Tuquoy	С	N	CE	0	5	0	N	А	0	4.25	0
Westside Church, Tuquoy	С	N	PF	0	3	0	N	A	0	2.25	0
Westside Church, Tuquoy	С	N	FF	0	3	0	N	А	0	2.25	0
Whithorn Priory	С	Y	FF	5	3	15	Y	S	5	2.5	12.5
Whithorn Priory	С	Y	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Whithorn Priory	С	Y	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Whithorn Priory	С	Y	GF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Whithorn Priory	С	Y	CF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0
Whithorn Priory	С	Y	PF	0	3	0	Y	S	0	2.5	0

CURRENT CLIMATE RISK REGISTER			Inherent Risk			Mitigants & Controls (Existing)		Residual Risk			
Property Name	Category	Collections	Hazard	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Staffed (Y/N)	Access - All year (A) Seasonal (S) Closed (C)	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
Whithorn Priory Crosses (& Museum)	A	N	FF	5	4	20	Y	S	5	3.5	17.5
Whithorn Priory Crosses (& Museum)	A	Ν	LA	2	5	10	Y	S	2	4.5	9
Whithorn Priory Crosses (& Museum)	А	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Y	S	0	4.5	0
Whithorn Priory Crosses (& Museum)	А	Ν	GF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Whithorn Priory Crosses (& Museum)	А	Ν	PF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Whithorn Priory Crosses (& Museum)	A	N	CF	0	4	0	Y	S	0	3.5	0
Wideford Hill Chambered Cairn	E	Ν	LA	4	5	20	Ν	А	4	4.25	17
Wideford Hill Chambered Cairn	E	Ν	CE	0	5	0	Ν	А	0	4.25	0
Wideford Hill Chambered Cairn	E	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Wideford Hill Chambered Cairn	E	Ν	FF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Wideford Hill Chambered Cairn	E	Ν	CF	0	2	0	Ν	А	0	1.25	0
Wideford Hill Chambered Cairn	E	Ν	GF	0	2	0	Ν	A	0	1.25	0
Wren's Egg	E	N	LA	2	5	10	Ν	С	2	5	10
Wren's Egg	E	N	GF	5	2	10	N	С	5	2	10
Wren's Egg	Е	N	CE	0	5	0	Ν	С	0	5	0
Wren's Egg	Е	Ν	PF	0	2	0	Ν	С	0	2	0
Wren's Egg	E	N	FF	0	2	0	Ν	С	0	2	0
Wren's Egg	E	N	CF	0	2	0	N	С	0	2	0





| ÀRAINNEACHD | EACHDRAIDHEIL | ALBA

Historic Environment Scotland Longmore House, Salisbury Place Edinburgh EH9 1SH T. 0131 668 8600

Scottish Charity No. SCO45925 VAT Number: GB 221 8680 15 ©Historic Environment Scotland