Corporate and Business Plan Risks Update

Summary

1. This report presents a summary of our key corporate and Business Plan risks at the end of July 2026.

Recommendation:

a. You consider and note our key corporate and Business Plan risks as summarised in Annex 1 and detailed in Annexes 2, 3 and 4.

Background

2. Corporate risks are those which would affect more than one service area, or the whole organisation, and which have a financial or reputational scale which requires management at a strategic level. Business Plan risks are those which specifically threaten the delivery of our Business Plan.

3. Our external auditors have recommended that Governance Committee be updated on key corporate and Business Plan risks periodically, to inform thinking about the work of internal and external audit, and to ensure the committee is satisfied with our approach. We have been reporting to Governance Committee on key risks twice a year since April 2022, as part of our regular reporting. We last reported to the committee in April 2026, highlighting the key risks at the end of February 2026.

4. Corporate and Business Plan risks are also reported quarterly to Authority, where members critically review our management of them.

Policy context

Links to Business Plan

5. To ensure we deliver our Business Plan, any events which could be detrimental to plan delivery are identified as risks and are managed to reduce their likelihood and impact, where possible.

Links to Local Code of Corporate Governance

6. Our Local Code of Corporate Governance is structured around the key principles of the CIPFA / SOLACE publication 'Delivering Good Governance in Local Government'. One of the principles is 'Managing risks and performance through robust internal control and strong public financial management'. To support this, we are committed to operating a robust risk management process, with member oversight. This includes operating a risk management strategy at all levels in the Authority, so that informed decisions can be made on what level of risk to accept and what mitigating action needs to be in place to reduce or remove risk.

7. Our Risk Management Strategy was last approved in April 2026 by Governance Committee.

Options

8. Members are presented with the following options:
   a) consider and note our key corporate and Business Plan risks, as detailed in Annexes 2, 3 and 4; or
   b) suggest changes or additions to our key risks.

Proposals

9. Members are asked to consider and note our key corporate and Business Plan risks, suggest any changes to the current risks, and propose any new risks.

Demonstrating best value

10. Our Risk Management Strategy helps us to manage any potential events that may act as barriers to us achieving our objectives and delivering our corporate plans. It also allows us to ensure that public funds and our assets

are properly safeguarded. Having an effective approach to risk management helps to drive improvements in performance, efficiency and the quality of our services.

Finance considerations

11. There are no direct financial considerations from this report. We define the Authority's appetite for risk in our Risk Appetite Statement, which forms part of the Risk Management Strategy. This includes our appetite for risks relating to financial governance, delivery of services through our commercial strategy, and income from fees and charges.

Risk

12. Risk management is an important part of corporate governance and is subject to regular reviews from our internal audit programme.

Legal considerations

13. There are no legal implications as a direct result of this report. Within our Risk Appetite Statement, we define the Authority's appetite for risks related to legal and statutory duties.

Human resources

14. Risk management is critical to service delivery and organisational improvement; and is at the centre of good management.

15. Executive Board have a responsibility to promote risk management as a way of improving activity outcomes and to ensure that this is embedded within the culture and business planning processes of the Authority.

16. Heads of Service are responsible for ensuring that robust risk management is operated within their service, in line with our strategy.

Diversity implications

17. There are no specific diversity issues as a direct result of this report.

Sustainability

18. There are no significant environmental, economic or social effects as a direct result of this report.

Background papers	Risk Management Strategy
Author / Post	Catherine Slater, Performance Management Adviser
Responsible Director	Gavin Capstick, Chief Executive Officer
Date written	14 August 2026

Annex 1: Executive summary

1. **Number of risks:** At the end of July, there were nine corporate risks and six Business Plan risks being monitored within the Risk Register database.

2. **Risk level:** There were no risks at a critical or high level, and no risks with a current risk score of 10 or above.

3. **Risk status:** There were no risks with a red status. Four risks had an amber status, indicating issues with mitigation plans, but they should be recoverable.

4. **Risks above tolerance:** Five risks had a current risk score above tolerance.

5. **Direction of travel:** In Annex 2, we show the direction of travel of each risk since an update was last shared with Governance Committee. Three risks had an increased risk score and / or a worse status than in February. The risk score and / or status of two risks had improved.

6. **Contingency plans:** For our most significant risks, we identify contingency plans for if we are unable to manage them. These are risks which are at a critical or high level, which have a current risk score of 10 or above, or which have a current risk score where the potential impact on the Authority is high or very high. At the end of July, one risk met these criteria: CO35 Greenside Mine, which has a potentially very high impact on the Authority.

7. **Control mechanisms:** Changes to governance arrangements were approved by Authority in March 2026. As a result, the control mechanisms for some risks have been updated to reflect the new arrangements. At the end of each quarter, risk owners are asked to review the stated control mechanisms. This is to provide assurance to members about the controls in place. The control mechanisms for Business Plan and corporate risks were last reviewed by risk owners at the end of June, and all were confirmed to be in place and effective.

8. **Other changes** since the last risk report to Governance Committee:
    - The annual review and update of the Risk Management Strategy was approved by Governance Committee in April. There were no significant changes made to our Risk Appetite Statement or the wider strategy.

Following April's Governance Committee, the Risk Management Strategy was updated to reflect the changes in governance arrangements agreed at March's Authority.

- We closed corporate risk CO58 Brockhole, which was the risk that the initiatives to embed a new operating model at Brockhole fail, leaving the Authority with the cost of operating the site and no, or reduced, rental income. The lease of the site to a third party operator was signed on 1 April.
- We opened a new corporate risk CO60 Brockhole – rental partners. Details are shown in Annex 2, page 8.
- The target date to close risk CO41 Resource Availability has been changed from March 2031 to March 2029, which is the end of our three year indicative settlement and actuarial valuation period.

9. **Risk appetite:** We have a risk appetite map which shows the relationship between our risk appetite for different areas of work and the range of tolerable risk scores we would expect to see. If a risk sits on the risk appetite map above the risk appetite level for the area of work it most closely aligns to, it is unlikely to be acceptable, unless (i) the benefits and opportunities of taking the course of action outweigh the risk, and effective mitigation can be put in place; or (ii) it is a risk which we have not chosen to take, and where it is not possible to reduce the risk any further.

- The risk appetite map in Annex 3 shows the corporate and Business Plan risks where the risk appetite and tolerable risk scores are aligned.
- The risk appetite map in Annex 4 shows that the tolerable risk score for CO35 Greenside Mine sits above our risk appetite. This risk relates to legal and statutory duties, for which we have a low risk appetite. However, the tolerable risk score is medium. As previously reported, this is a risk which we have not chosen to take and, as it relates to public safety, we cannot reduce the potential impact any further. Our aim is to keep the likelihood of the risk materialising very low. The risks are being well managed, and the current risk score is within tolerance.

Annex 2: Key risks to delivery of the Business Plan (BP) and key corporate risks (CO) at the end of July 2026

Cyber Risk and Data Security (CO40)

Risk	There is a risk that a cyber-attack disabling Authority systems or infrastructure, or a data breach, could result in the loss or release of sensitive information.
Risk Owner	Pete Notley, Head of Resources
Control mechanisms in place	• Up to date cyber security measures and testing are in place. • Key software and applications have been migrated to cloud-based solutions. • The Authority can remotely wipe devices / digital information if lost. • Regular GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation) training and updates provided to staff and members. • Cyber insurance in place. • Cyber Essentials accreditation in place.
Mitigation actions	• Maintain up to date cyber security measures and testing. • Continue to provide regular GDPR training and updates to staff and members. • Regular monitoring of security status and logs through MS Defender.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Data security and cyber risks	Low	**4** / Low	March 2031	**9** / Medium	Amber	⇔ No change

External Factors impacting the Authority (BP36)

Risk	There is a risk that future events beyond our immediate control (e.g. epidemics / pandemics, catastrophic flooding, landscape / infrastructure instability, wider political and economic factors) create additional workload and resource requirements or undermine delivery of our objectives, which could result in the delivery of the Business Plan being compromised.
Risk Owner	Pete Notley, Head of Resources
Control mechanisms in place	• Established process in place for monitoring the delivery of Service Plans (quarterly by Heads of Service and the Strategic Leadership Team) and the Business Plan (monthly by the Strategic Leadership Team; quarterly by Authority) to understand the impact of additional workload and prioritisation. • Appropriate financial reserves are in place and are regularly reviewed (quarterly by Authority), to ensure adequate financial resilience. • Business Continuity Plan is in place and maintained ready for implementation, to ensure remote working access and continued delivery of core business as far as possible.
Mitigation actions	• Continue to regularly monitor progress against key activities in Service Plans and the Business Plan. • Continue to regularly review reserve holdings and ensure adequate financial resilience. • Maintain the Business Continuity Plan. • Maintain presence and input on key strategic planning groups to ensure early understanding of arising issues.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Delivery of corporate plans	Medium	**6** / Low	March 2031	**9** / Medium	Amber	⟺ No change

Development Management – Enforcement (BP48)

Risk	There is a risk that failure to ensure appropriate compliance with planning controls through effective and timely investigation and enforcement, including formal enforcement action, could result in adverse impacts upon the scenic beauty and cultural heritage of the National Park and World Heritage Site from unauthorised development, and in reputational damage.
Risk Owner	Andrew Smith, Head of Development Management
Control mechanisms in place	• Action plan in place following review of service delivery by Government's Planning Advisory Service in 2022. • Financial reserves are in place and are regularly reviewed to ensure financial resilience, within the context of the Authority's wider finances.
Mitigation actions	• Apply agreed resources for planning enforcement casework service delivery.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Legal and statutory duties	Low	**6** / Low	March 2027	**9** / Medium	Amber	⇔ No change

Farming in Protected Landscapes (FiPL) (BP44)

Risk	There is a risk that poor management of the FiPL scheme could lead to a failure to deliver it, which could result in reputational damage and a missed opportunity to maximise benefits and to deliver future programmes supporting the agricultural transition. There is also a risk that the resource requirements for the FiPL scheme could overburden Authority resources, which could result in the delivery of other priorities being impacted.
Risk Owner	Rob Allison, Head of Strategy and Partnerships
Control mechanisms in place	• The FiPL scheme is being delivered using our agreed project management framework. • The scheme has been developed to fit resources available and has aligned its priorities to maximise resources available to achieve both the Authority's and Partnership's Plan ambitions. • Established process in place for monitoring the delivery of Service Plans (quarterly by Heads of Service and the Strategic Leadership Team) and the Business Plan (monthly by the Strategic Leadership Team; quarterly by Authority). • A planned communications strategy is in place.
Mitigation actions	• Continue to deliver robust governance around the project board and Local Assessment Panel ensuring funder expectations are delivered, including spend expectations.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Reputation	Medium	**8** / Medium	March 2029	**9** / Medium	Amber	↑ Worse Low to medium risk Green to amber status

Resource Availability (CO41)

Risk	There is a risk that inflationary pressures, coupled with risks around the National Park Grant, continue to place pressure on the Authority's ability to fund and deliver its Business Plan. Failure to deliver against the approved budgets may also lead to material changes to the resources projected in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.
Risk Owner	Pete Notley, Head of Resources
Control mechanisms in place	• Medium term financial projections are maintained and monitored, building in reasonable assumptions around inflation. • Commercial strategy is in place and being delivered, to grow earned income or to consider delivery models where direct delivery is not providing value for money. • Established processes in place to implement efficiencies and savings through the budget setting round and through monthly outturns. • In-year budget monitoring is completed monthly across all services, for capital and revenue, to ensure that any variances are reported and fed into both the short- and medium-term projections.
Mitigation actions	• Continue to maintain and monitor medium term financial projections, including a list of potential efficiency measures that could be enacted if required. • Continue to deliver the commercial strategy. • Continue to implement efficiencies and savings through the budget setting round and through monthly outturns. • Identify and pursue other sources of revenue and capital grant funding to support the delivery of the Business Plan.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Financial Governance	Low	**4** / Low	March 2029	**6** / Low	Green	⟺ No change

Greenside Mine – maintain site stability (CO35)

Risk	There is a risk that the site and in particular tips may become unstable, which could result in a requirement for more extensive maintenance works and attention.
Risk Owner	Rob Allison, Head of Strategy and Partnerships
Control mechanisms in place	• Memorandum of Understanding established with the Mining Remediation Authority. • Agreed inspection regime in place, with the Mining Remediation Authority carrying out twice-yearly inspections. • Established process in place for monthly inspections / monitoring and for minor works to be completed.
Mitigation actions	• Maintain the agreed inspection regime. • Continue monthly inspections / monitoring. • Maintain surface drainage and complete any identified minor works.
Contingency plans	• Close site and prevent unauthorised access. • Communicate with impacted stakeholders. • Seek further guidance and support from the Mining Remediation Authority.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Legal and statutory duties	Low	**5** / Medium	March 2031	**5** / Medium	Green	⇔ No change

SAC (Special Area of Conservation) Planning Reviews (CO4)

Risk	There is a risk that there may be a requirement to review and change planning permissions, which could result in liability for compensation payments and reputational damage.
Risk Owner	Andrew Smith, Head of Development Management
Control mechanisms in place	• Appropriate independent advice taken as required. • Continuing engagement with Natural England around potential habitats impacts. • Engagement with Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs) and MHCLG (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) as necessary.
Mitigation actions	• Initial review to identify affected sites. • Action plan to be put in place and implemented for all affected sites, considering relevant statutory review mechanisms as necessary (e.g. modification, discontinuance, revocation and prohibition). • Continue to engage with Natural England around potential habitats impacts. • Liaise closely with Defra and MHCLG to mitigate risks.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Financial Governance	Low	**6** / Low	March 2027	**6** / Low	Green	⇩ Improved Medium to low risk Amber to green status

NEW: Brockhole – rental partners (CO60)

Risk	There is a risk that rental partners at Brockhole can't operate from the site as planned, which may result in reduced income for LDNPA or greater costs from involvement in operating the site.
Risk Owner	Pete Notley, Head of Resources
Control mechanisms in place	• Regular meetings take place with all partners on site to ensure good relationships are built and any issues are raised well in advance of lease review points. • Active contract monitoring to ensure significant terms of leases are being fulfilled by all parties.
Mitigation actions	• Continue to hold regular meetings with all partners on site to ensure good relationships are built and any issues are raised well in advance of lease review points. • Active contract monitoring to ensure significant terms of leases are being fulfilled by all parties.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Commercial strategy and income from fees and charges	Medium	**8** / Medium	March 2029	**6** / Low	Green	n/a – risk opened in May 2026

Reputation Management (CO38)

Risk	There is a risk that the Authority will gain a negative reputation if we do not communicate our work effectively with target audiences. This could impact the Authority in a range of ways, such as reducing public trust and devaluing our brand, affecting many areas of operation. Scope includes the work of the Authority (statutory and Business Plan) and corporate communications; it does not include Partnership responsibilities or park-wide issues outside of our control.
Risk Owner	Sarah Calderbank, Head of Communications and Engagement
Control mechanisms in place	• An established media training programme is in place for staff. • Media issues and forward look is a standing agenda item at the monthly Strategic Leadership Team meetings. • Established process in place to identify projects and issues that are likely to generate a high level of public interest, and to work with teams to develop communications plans and mitigation actions.
Mitigation actions	• Proactive monitoring of emerging and ongoing issues in media and social media by the Communications team. • Continue to discuss issues generating media and social media interest with the Strategic Leadership Team. • Continue to provide regular briefings to Executive Board, the Chair, members and project leads to mitigate public relations risks. • Media training programme to continue to ensure staff are well equipped to be a spokesperson for the Authority. • Support delivery of community engagement activities, such as parish council events.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Reputation	Medium	**8** / Medium	March 2027	**6** / Low	Green	↑ Worse Current risk score 4 to 6

Commercial Strategy (BP50)

Risk	There is a risk that we fail to successfully deliver our commercial strategy which could result in ineffective use of capital resources and / or reputational harm to the Authority.
Risk Owner	Gavin Capstick, Chief Executive
Control mechanisms in place	• Robust business cases and delivery plans are developed for all commercial strategy projects, which are approved by the Commercial Strategy Board / Resources meetings. • Project delivery reports are provided to the identified Senior Responsible Officer and Commercial Strategy Board / Resources meetings. • Benefits realisation reports, including the Commercial Strategy Board's benefits tracker, are monitored by the Commercial Strategy Board / Resources meetings.
Mitigation actions	• Continue to manage all commercial strategy projects in line with the established control mechanisms.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Commercial strategy and income from fees and charges	Medium	**8** / Medium	March 2031	**6** / Low	Green	↑ Worse Current risk score 4 to 6

World Heritage Inscription – management of attributes of Outstanding Universal Value (BP38)

Risk	There is a risk that if it is considered that our attributes of Outstanding Universal Value are not being managed in such a way as to maintain integrity and authenticity as a World Heritage Site, this could result in being put on the UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) 'at risk register'; significant reputational damage; and ultimately the loss of World Heritage Site status (which has a low likelihood).
Risk Owner	Hanna Latty, Director of Sustainable Development
Control mechanisms in place	• There is active Partnership engagement with Historic England, DCMS (Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport), ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), the World Heritage Site Steering Group and appointed Specialist Advisors, and UNESCO to manage and monitor the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value.
Mitigation actions	• Complete the 2026 State of Conservation report. • Continue to use the suite of Authority and Partnership monitoring tools to monitor the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value and deliver commitments made in the 2024 State of Conservation report.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Reputation	Medium	**4** / Low	March 2031	**4** / Low	Green	⇩ Improved Amber to green status

Human Resourcing (BP46)

Risk	There is a risk that the challenging recruitment market leads to vacancies remaining unfilled, which could impact negatively on teams' morale, well-being and delivery.
Risk Owner	Ben Leavesley, Head of People and Organisational Development
Control mechanisms in place	• Applicant Tracking System 'Webrecruit', with in-built careers page embedded. • Line manager recruitment training delivered. • Role established in the People team with a focus on recruitment and payroll. • Retention management tools established, for example market factor supplements, professional development funding and employee assistance programmes.
Mitigation actions	• Develop the 'climb your own mountain' recruitment campaign, continuing to present the Authority in a professional, forward thinking way, including presentation of the employee value proposition and renewed job descriptions. • Continue to develop the recruitment strategy to meet the needs of the Authority (e.g. for passive candidates, under-represented groups, disciplines with skills shortages). • Review line manager training participant feedback and evolve training to meet line managers' needs.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Staff recruitment and retention	High	**4** / Low	March 2027	**4** / Low	Green	⇔ No change

Employee Engagement (CO36)

Risk	There is a risk that whilst employees are broadly positive in most areas of the Authority, there are some challenges for communication and collaboration, which could impact on staff morale and productivity.
Risk Owner	Ben Leavesley, Head of People and Organisational Development
Control mechanisms in place	• Organisational Development and Engagement Plan in place. • Annual staff surveys in place, with action plan. • Improved induction programme in place to ensure new employees have a positive introduction to the whole organisation and have all the information they need to excel in their new roles.
Mitigation actions	• Produce 2026/27 Organisational Development and Engagement Plan, roll out across the organisation and ensure line managers are facilitating the opportunity for teams to engage with different events. • Continue to support line managers with team development, where appropriate.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Staff recruitment and retention	High	**6** / Low	March 2027	**4** / Low	Green	⟺ No change

Workforce Planning (CO56)

Risk	There is a risk that without robust succession and deputisation plans in place, the Authority may have vulnerability around roles that are a single point of failure or are at a senior level, which could result in an inability to meet the organisation's strategy or could affect day to day operations.
Risk Owner	Ben Leavesley, Head of People and Organisational Development
Control mechanisms in place	• Honorarium and deputisation process in place within policies. • Training and Continuous Professional Development budgets (and Apprenticeship Levy) in place for training needs. • Career graded roles embedded within the organisation.
Mitigation actions	• Identify deputy / deputies within each team structure, with individual training needs analysis to ensure continuity of service. • Outline recruitment plans for each senior role or single point of failure. • All responsibilities and accountabilities held for all single post holders i.e. Section 151 Officer. • Continue to apply career graded roles as required and appropriate.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Staff recruitment and retention	High	**6** / Low	March 2027	**4** / Low	Green	⇔ No change

Potential groupthink impact on decision making (CO59)

Risk	There is a risk of lack of challenge to decision making due to the profile of the management team and members which could mean we reach consensus too quickly without sufficient challenge, leading to poor decisions and a reputational risk.
Risk Owner	Gavin Capstick, Chief Executive
Control mechanisms in place	• The risk is reviewed monthly by the Strategic Leadership Team and quarterly by Authority. • Established process in place for the Communications team to review key decisions from a public relations perspective. • Away hours allow members a private space for challenge.
Mitigation actions	• Continue to ensure the Authority consults with a broad range of partners about key decisions. • The Communications team to continue to review key decisions from a public relations perspective. • Continue to use member away hours to allow a private space for challenge. • Explore how we can broaden the background and representation of members.

Risk appetite work area	Risk appetite level	Tolerable risk score / level	Target date to close risk	Current risk score / level	Status	Direction of travel since Feb 2026
Reputation	Medium	**8** / Medium	March 2031	**4** / Low	Green	⇔ No change

Key:

Green	Mitigation plans progressing well and risk under control
Amber	Some issues with mitigation plans, but should be recoverable
⇔ No change	No change to the current risk score or status
⇩ Improved	Current risk score has decreased, or risk status has improved
⇧ Worse	Current risk score has increased, or risk status has worsened

Annex 3: Risk Appetite Map, showing the tolerable risk scores which are aligned with the risk appetite

Risk appetite level **Area of work**	**Low appetite** We will either choose options which have a low inherent risk, or we will ensure sufficient resources are allocated to fully mitigate any risks.	**Medium appetite** We may accept slightly higher levels of risk in pursuit of our objectives, where this will allow us to realise benefits or take advantage of opportunities.	**Higher appetite** We are more likely to choose options which have a higher level of inherent risk, or we will allocate less resources to mitigating the risks.
Legal and statutory duties	Within tolerance **BP48 Development Management - Enforcement: 6 / Low**	Above tolerance	
Data security and cyber risks	Within tolerance **CO40 Cyber Risk and Data Security: 4 / Low**	Above tolerance	
Conduct of officers and members	Within tolerance	Above tolerance	
Financial Governance	Within tolerance **CO41 Resource Availability: 4 / Low** **CO4 SAC Planning Reviews: 6 / Low**	Above tolerance	
Commercial strategy and income from fees and charges	Within tolerance **BP50 Commercial Strategy: 8 / Medium** **CO60 Brockhole – rental partners: 8 / Medium**		Above tolerance
Reputation	Within tolerance **BP38 World Heritage Site: 4 / Low** **CO59 Potential Groupthink: 8 / Medium** **CO38 Reputation Management: 8 / Medium** **BP44 Farming in Protected Landscapes: 8 / Medium**		Above tolerance
Delivery of corporate plans	Within tolerance **BP36 External Factors impacting Authority: 6 / Low**		Above tolerance
Organisational change / development	Within tolerance		Above tolerance
Staff recruitment and retention	Within tolerance **BP46 Human Resourcing: 4 / Low** **CO36 Employee Engagement: 6 / Low** **CO56 Workforce Planning 6: / Low**		Above tolerance
Tolerable risk level / score	**Low / 1 – 6**	**Medium / 8 – 12**	**High / 15 – 16**	**Critical / 20 – 25**

Annex 4: Risk Appetite Map, showing the tolerable risk scores which are not aligned with the risk appetite

Risk appetite level **Area of work**	**Low appetite** We will either choose options which have a low inherent risk, or we will ensure sufficient resources are allocated to fully mitigate any risks.	**Medium appetite** We may accept slightly higher levels of risk in pursuit of our objectives, where this will allow us to realise benefits or take advantage of opportunities.	**Higher appetite** We are more likely to choose options which have a higher level of inherent risk, or we will allocate less resources to mitigating the risks.
Legal and statutory duties	Within tolerance ⟵	Above tolerance ⟶ **CO35 Greenside Mine: 5 / Medium**	
Data security and cyber risks	Within tolerance ⟵	Above tolerance ⟶	
Conduct of officers and members	Within tolerance ⟵	Above tolerance ⟶	
Financial Governance	Within tolerance ⟵	Above tolerance ⟶	
Commercial strategy and income from fees and charges	Within tolerance ⟵		Above tolerance ⟶
Reputation	Within tolerance ⟵		Above tolerance ⟶
Delivery of corporate plans	Within tolerance ⟵		Above tolerance ⟶
Organisational change / development	Within tolerance ⟵		Above tolerance ⟶
Staff recruitment and retention	Within tolerance ⟵		Above tolerance ⟶
Tolerable risk level / score	**Low / 1 – 6**	**Medium / 8 – 12**	**High / 15 – 16**	**Critical / 20 – 25**