



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 February 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. Business Plan risks are those which specifically threaten the delivery of the objectives and milestones identified within our Business Plan. 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.
3. Our external auditors 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 (via email) in November 2025, highlighting the key risks at the end of September 2025.
4. Corporate and Business Plan risks are also reported quarterly to Resources Committee, where members critically review our management of these key risks.

Policy context

5. 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 our 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.
6. Our Risk Management Strategy was last approved in April 2025 by Governance Committee. An updated strategy is being brought to this committee for review and approval.

Links to Business Plan

7. 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.

Options

8. Members are presented with the following options:
 - a) Consider and note our key corporate and Business Plan risks; 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.
12. 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

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

Legal considerations

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

Human resources

16. Risk management is critical to service delivery and organisational improvement; and is at the centre of good management.
17. 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.
18. Heads of Service are responsible for ensuring that robust risk management is operated within their service, in line with our strategy.

Diversity implications

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

Sustainability

20. 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 | 18 March 2026 |

Annex 1: Executive summary

1. At the end of February 2026, there were nine corporate risks and six Business Plan risks being monitored within the Risk Register database; these are detailed in Annex 2.
2. There were no risks at a critical or high level, and no risks with a current risk score of 10 or above.
3. There were no risks with a red status. Five risks had an amber status, indicating there are issues with mitigation plans, but they should be recoverable:
 - **Cyber Risk and Data Security**
 - **External Factors Impacting the Authority**
 - **Development Management – Enforcement**
 - **Special Area of Conservation Planning Reviews**
 - **World Heritage Inscription**
4. Five risks had a current risk score above tolerance levels:
 - **Cyber Risk and Data Security**
 - **External Factors Impacting the Authority**
 - **Development Management – Enforcement**
 - **Special Area of Conservation Planning Reviews**
 - **Resource Availability**
5. In Annex 2, we have shown the direction of travel of each risk since an update was last shared with Governance Committee.
6. One risk had an increased risk score / level and a worse status than in September:
 - **Cyber Risk and Data Security** – the current risk score / level increased from 4 / low to 9 / medium and the status changed from green to amber. This is because security training uptake still requires improvement. We have introduced a new performance indicator for all services in 2026/27, which will monitor the percentage of mandatory cyber security e-

modules which have been completed; this is to encourage compliance and highlight the issue.

7. The risk score / level or status of four risks improved from September:
 - **Resource Availability** – the current risk score / level has reduced from 9 / medium to 6 / low, and the status has changed from amber to green.
 - **Brockhole** – the current risk score / level has reduced from 9 / medium to 6 / low, and the status has changed from amber to green.
 - **Reputation Management** – the current risk score / level has reduced from 9 / medium to 4 / low. The status remains green.
 - **Commercial Strategy** – the current risk score / level has reduced from 9 / medium to 4 / low, and the status has changed from amber to green.
8. At the end of each quarter, risk owners are asked to review the stated control mechanisms and confirm they are still in place and effective. This is to provide assurance to members about the controls in place for corporate and Business Plan risks, as recommended by internal audit. The control mechanisms for all risks were last reviewed by risk owners at the end of December 2025, and all were confirmed to be in place and effective. At the time of writing, proposed changes to governance arrangements are due to be taken to March's Authority committee for approval. If those changes are approved, the control mechanisms for some of our risks will be updated to reflect the new arrangements.
9. 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 February, one risk met these criteria:
 - **Greenside Mine** (potential impact is very high). The contingency plans are shown on page 7 of Annex 2.
10. Since the last update to Governance Committee:
 - No corporate or Business Plan risks have been opened or closed.

- The Strategic Leadership Team have completed an annual review of all corporate and Business Plan risks. The updated risk details are included in Annex 2.
 - The target dates to close the risks have been extended as appropriate. Where risks are ongoing, we have shown a target date to close the risk of March 2031, in line with the end of the new five-year Medium Term Financial Strategy.
 - The risk description for the **Brockhole** risk has been updated to reflect the latest position with delivering a new operating model at the site.
 - The risk description for the **Resource Availability** risk has had minor changes to the wording.
 - The control mechanisms and mitigation actions for all risks have been updated, where necessary.
 - The risk owner of the **Greenside Mine** risk has changed to reflect that the Property team will move from the Resources service to Strategy and Partnerships on 1 April.

- 11. Included in our Risk Management Strategy is 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. The tolerable risk score will usually align with the risk appetite level. For areas of work where we have a lower risk appetite, tolerable risk scores will tend to be lower than for risks in areas where we have a higher risk appetite.

- 12. 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 the benefits and opportunities of taking the course of action outweigh the risk, and effective mitigation can be put in place. It may also be acceptable for a risk to sit above the agreed risk appetite level if it is a risk which we have not chosen to take, and where it is not possible to reduce the risk any further.

- 13. The Strategic Leadership Team have completed an annual review of the tolerable risk scores for our corporate and Business Plan risks to check they

are appropriate in the context of our risk appetite. All risks have tolerable risk scores in line with our stated risk appetite, except for **Greenside Mine**.

14. The risk appetite map in Annex 3 shows the key corporate and Business Plan risks where the risk appetite and tolerable risk scores are aligned.
15. The risk appetite map in Annex 4 shows the **Greenside Mine** risk, where the tolerable risk score sits above the 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 (likelihood 1 – very low; impact 5 – very high). 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 February 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|--|
| Data security and cyber risks | Low | 4 / Low | March 2031 | 9 / Medium | Amber |  Worse Low to medium risk Green to amber status |

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Resources Committee) to understand the impact of additional workload and prioritisation. Appropriate financial reserves are in place and are regularly reviewed (quarterly by Resources Committee), 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Sep 2025 |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|
| 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Sep 2025 |
|----------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|
| Legal and statutory duties | Low | 6 / Low | March 2027 | 9 / Medium | Amber |  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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|
| Financial Governance | Low | 6 / Low | March 2027 | 9 / Medium | Amber |  No change |


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, Assistant Director of Sustainable Development |
| Control mechanisms in place | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is active Partnership engagement with Historic England, DCMS (Department for 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Sep 2025 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|
| Reputation | Medium | 4 / Low | March 2031 | 4 / Low | Amber | ↔ No change |

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|
| Financial Governance | Low | 4 / Low | March 2031 | 6 / Low | Green |  Improved Medium to low risk Amber to green status |


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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the agreed inspection regime. • Continue monthly inspections / monitoring. • Maintain surface drainage and complete any identified minor works. • Prepare a National Lottery Heritage Fund bid for a development phase project application at Greenside Lead Mine. |
| Contingency plans | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|----------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|
| Legal and statutory duties | Low | 5 / Medium | March 2031 | 5 / Medium | Green |  No change |


Brockhole (CO58)

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Risk | There is a risk that the initiatives to embed a new operating model for Brockhole fail, leaving the Authority with the cost of operating the site and no, or reduced, rental income. |
| Risk Owner | Pete Notley, Head of Resources |
| Control mechanisms in place | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project and programme methodology in place to ensure the transition process is managed. Ongoing support to our partner in the short term to ensure the arrangement is successfully embedded. |
| Mitigation actions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trading reserve still to be maintained at £0.5m to cover potential loss of income and / or having to take back on operating costs. |

| 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 Sep 2025 |
|--|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|
| Commercial strategy and income from fees and charges | Medium | 12 / Medium | March 2027 | 6 / Low | Green |  Improved Medium to low risk 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|
| 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|
| 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|--|
| Staff recruitment and retention | High | 6 / Low | March 2027 | 4 / Low | Green |  No change |

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|--|
| Reputation | Medium | 8 / Medium | March 2027 | 4 / Low | Green |  Improved Medium to low risk |

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The risk is reviewed monthly by the Strategic Leadership Team and quarterly by Resources Committee. • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|
| Reputation | Medium | 8 / Medium | March 2031 | 4 / Low | Green | ↔ 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Resources Committee). • A planned communications strategy is in place. |
| Mitigation actions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|
| Reputation | Medium | 8 / Medium | March 2029 | 4 / Low | Green |  No change |

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robust business cases and delivery plans are developed for all Commercial Strategy projects, which are approved by the Commercial Strategy Board / Resources Committee. • Project delivery reports are provided to the identified Senior Responsible Officer and Commercial Strategy Board. • Benefits realisation reports, including the Commercial Strategy Board’s benefits tracker, are monitored by the Commercial Strategy Board. |
| Mitigation actions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sep 2025 |
|--|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|
| Commercial strategy and income from fees and charges | Medium | 8 / Medium | March 2031 | 4 / Low | Green |  Improved Medium to low risk Amber to green status |

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 and / or risk status has improved |





















Worse

Current risk score has increased and / 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 | 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. |
|--|---|---|--|
| Area of work | | | |
| 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 CO58 Brockhole: 12 / Medium | Above tolerance  | |
| Reputation | Within tolerance  BP38 World Heritage Site: 4 / Low | Above tolerance  CO54 Potential Groupthink: 8 / Medium CO38 Reputation Management: 8 / Medium BP44 Farming in Protected Landscapes: 8 / Medium | |
| 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 | 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. |
|--|--|---|--|
| Area of work | | | |
| 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 |