

APPENDIX 3: Corporate Risk Register 2021/22 – Q4 position, showing movement since the start of the year

| | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|--|--|
| IMPACT | High | <p>Failure to achieve sustainable gross revenue income targets (£260k) for the PDNP (commercial income and donations including from the Foundation) (ref. 20/21C)</p> <p>Failure to develop nature recovery networks in the Peak District National Park (ref. 20/21D)</p> <p>Potential impact on national park purposes if the A57/A628 Mottram Hollingworth tunnel doesn't go ahead (ref. 21/22D)</p> <p>Farming in Protected Landscapes Fund (FiPL) not getting sufficient uptake by farmers and land managers to spend the circa £1.2m project fund by 31 March 2022 (ref. 21/22F updated Q1 2021)</p> | <p>Area of NP land safeguarded in environmental land management schemes reduces due to Brexit uncertainty and continuing Countryside Stewardship issues leading to the potential loss of a range of grassland habitats (ref. 20/21B)</p> <p>Reduced core funding for MFFP (£55k deficit) leading to insufficient funding for core team and loss of key personnel, impacting delivery of elements of the Corporate Strategy and National Park Management Plan (ref. 21/22C)</p> |
| | Medium | <p>Four Principal financial risks within the Moorlife 2020 European funded project: exchange rate movements; the sterling ceiling set for the total project budget; the contractual treatment of partner contributions; and the possibility of expenditure being found ineligible (ref. 20/21A)</p> <p>Implications of the Landscapes Review 2019 (ref. 21/22A)</p> <p>Impact of the coronavirus pandemic on delivery of planned Corporate Strategy outcomes, the Authority's financial position, staff wellbeing and how we maintain the #PeakDistrictProud message of 'care, respect and enjoy' for all audiences within and outside the National Park both during lockdown and as we come out of it (ref. 20/21F)</p> <p>Not being financially stable in the medium term due to uncertainty of national park grants (ref. 21/22B)</p> | <p>Failure to adequately protect and prepare for Cyber Security threats (ref. 20/21E)</p> |
| | Low | <p>Not achieving volunteer hours due to Covid-19 impacts, limited volunteering opportunities and suspension of volunteer recruitment to new volunteering roles (ref. 21/22E)</p> | |
| | Low | Medium | High |
| LIKELIHOOD | | | |

Corporate Risk Register 2021/22

| Outcome: A sustainable landscape that is conserved and enhanced Lead officer: SLF (Head of Landscape) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|------|------|------|------|------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Risk Description | Existing controls | Risk rating before mitigation L x I | Mitigating action | Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red) | | | | | | Timeframe of mitigating actions | How monitor/ indicator | Quarterly update | |
| | | | | Start | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | | | |
| Area of NP land safeguarded in environmental land management schemes reduces due to Brexit uncertainty and continuing Countryside Stewardship issues leading to the potential loss of a range of grassland habitats (ref. 20/21B) | <p>National influencing for post Brexit agri-environmental policies and support systems</p> <p>Local communications across the farming and land management industry</p> <p>Agri-environment scheme promotion and support for farmers and land managers through the 44 Protected Landscape organisations</p> <p>NPMP work</p> <p>Environmental Land Management (ELM) Defra Test and Trial using the National Character Area approach</p> <p>National pilot of ELM Sustainable Farm Incentive phase 1 will start in 2021 with phase 2 (with more upland options) being rolled out in 2021. A national pilot for Local Nature Recovery is being developed for later in 2021/22. There is also call for up to 10 Landscape Recovery pilots in 2021. National rollout of ELM is planned for late 2024</p> | <p>High x High</p> <p>Red</p> | <p>Increase promotion of the service, working with agencies e.g. NFU, CLA, NE, EA, FC, Protected Landscape organisations</p> <p>Public payment for public goods/ benefits</p> <p>Influencing role through PDNPA links and NPE's Future of Farming, national stakeholder meetings and through the forthcoming Farming in Protected Landscapes Programme</p> | Impact | High | High | High | High | High | High | On going | Quarterly updates on progress | <p>Representation on behalf of the English National Parks and influencing nationally has continued through various stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>Promotion of the opportunities for increased public good delivery, how farming is changing and the range of support available for farmers and land managers has continued with other agencies and partners.</p> <p>Agri-environment scheme promotion including the Farming in Protected Landscapes (FIPL) Programme has continued across all 44 Protected Landscapes. FiPL Year 1 in the Peak District has delivered 72 projects supporting 65 farmers and land managers.</p> <p>Countryside Stewardship Scheme (CSS) annual payment rates for land management options have been reviewed and the majority increased. However, the species-rich grassland restoration option is now at a higher rate than the maintenance option which could reduce the incentive to look after grassland of high environmental quality. The review of capital grant payment rates is on hold.</p> <p>The ELM Test and Trial has been completed and demonstrates that farmers and land managers like the National Character Area descriptions and want the new ELM schemes to be local e.g. local spatial prioritisation, local flexibility, local trusted advice and guidance. Further opportunities to influence the design of the 3 ELM schemes continue to be sought. The SFI pilot is up and running with early lessons feeding in to ELM, and an invitation for expressions of interest for the Landscape Recovery scheme is open and will close in Q1.</p> <p>The review of the NPMP continues to be supported and will continue through next year..</p> |
| | | | | Likelihood | High | High | High | High | High | High | | | |
| | | | | Rating | Red | Red | Red | Red | Red | Red | | | |

Corporate Risk Register 2021/22

| Outcome: A sustainable landscape that is conserved and enhanced Lead officer: SLF (Head of Landscape) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Risk Description | Existing controls | Risk rating before mitigation L x I | Mitigating action | Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red) | | | | | | Timeframe of mitigating actions | How monitor/ indicator | Quarterly update |
| | | | | Start | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | | |
| Failure to develop nature recovery networks in the Peak District National Park (ref. 20/21C) | <p>Development of a Peak District Nature Recovery Prospectus including a high level map through NPE. This will be one of 10 for all English National Parks as part of the further development of the NPE Nature Recovery Plan</p> <p>Participation in the Greater Manchester Local Nature Recovery Strategy Pilot</p> <p>Provision of farmer and land manager support through the Authority's farm advice service, the South West Peak Landscape Partnership (SWPLP) (Glorious Grasslands, Slowing the Flow, Wonderful Waders, Future Farmscapes) and Moors for the Future Programmes</p> <p>Dark Peak and South West Peak moorland focus on birds of prey through the Birds of Prey initiative</p> <p>Breeding birds surveys</p> <p>Engagement with moorland owners through the Moorland Liaison Group</p> <p>Engagement with Police and Crime Commissioner</p> | High x High Red | <p>Development of one more detailed Nature Recovery Plan for the Peak District with partners and stakeholders</p> <p>Further develop and (if funding is obtained) expansion of the White Peak practical field trials, engaging with farmers and land managers to address biodiversity loss in the farmed landscape. Promoting the results of the White Peak Defra ELM test and trial and the practical field trials</p> <p>Encouraging creation of new native woodlands, wood and scrub pasture and trees in the landscape with species not vulnerable to diseases like ash die-back</p> | Impact | High | High | High | High | High | Ongoing | <p>Delivery of the Peak District Nature Recovery Prospectus</p> <p>Development of a more detailed nature recovery plan for the Peak District</p> <p>Breeding birds survey</p> <p>Birds of Prey initiative meetings and conference calls</p> <p>Ongoing monitoring of M4F, SWP and WP programmes</p> | <p>The PD Nature Recovery Prospectus and the suggested approach for the development of 1 Nature Recovery Plan for the Place has been shared with key stakeholders and will be shared with farmers and land managers in Q1.</p> <p>Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS) are likely to be developed at a county rather than a National Park level so the 1 Nature Recovery Plan for the Peak District will need to feed into the LNRS's (6) and vice ser versa.</p> <p>Farmer and land manager support continued through the Authority's farm advice service, South West Peak Landscape Partnership, Moors for the Future and the FIPL Programmes.</p> <p>Focus on birds of prey continued through Birds of Prey Initiative and the 2021 report was completed in Q4. Whilst an excellent year for short eared owls last year's breeding success was more mixed for other species.</p> <p>Engagement with moorland owners through the Moorland Liaison Group has continued with a focus on a strategic approach to fire prevention and mitigation and visitor management. A report on a strategic approach to wild fire prevention and mitigation including fire behaviour modelling has been completed and will be published in Q1. The next Chatsworth Liaison meeting is planned for Q1.</p> |
| | | | | Likelihood | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | | | |
| | | | | Rating | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | | | |

Corporate Risk Register 2021/22

| Outcome: A sustainable landscape that is conserved and enhanced Lead officer: BJT (Head of Planning) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Risk Description | Existing controls | Risk rating before mitigation L x I | Mitigating action | Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red) | | | | | | Timeframe of mitigating actions | How monitor/ indicator | Quarterly update |
| | | | | Start | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | | |
| Potential impact on national park purposes if the A57/A628 Mottram Hollingworth tunnel doesn't go ahead (ref. 21/22D) | Holding objection Good communication with Highways England and supportive partners in Friends of the Peak District and DCC | Medium x High Amber | Assess and comment on Development Consent Order (DCO) Reaffirm objection at NPA if concerns upheld Seek support from partners | Impact | High | High | High | High | High | Q1 receipt of DCO Q2/Q3 take decision to object to Authority | Quarterly updates on DCO position | DCO received and NPA decision to object made at 4 th February full Authority meeting. Members formalised the existing holding objection to a full objection on the basis of the unacceptable impacts of the scheme on the Special Qualities of the National Park. Hearings continue through April and May 2022, with the focus of risk moving from direct impacts from development, to indirect impacts of traffic growth from the A57 Link Roads scheme on key corridors of the National Park, namely the Woodhead and Snake Pass routes. |
| | | | | Likelihood | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | | | |
| | | | | Rating | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | | | |

| Outcome: A sustainable landscape that is conserved and enhanced Lead officer: CD (Head of Moors for the Future Partnership) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|------|------|------|------|------|---|---|--|
| Risk Description | Existing controls | Risk rating before mitigation L x I | Mitigating action | Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red) | | | | | | Timeframe of mitigating actions | How monitor/ indicator | Quarterly update |
| | | | | Start | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | | |
| Reduced core funding for MFFP (£55k deficit) leading to insufficient funding for core team and loss of key personnel, impacting delivery of elements of the Corporate Strategy and National Park Management Plan (ref. 21/22C) | Partial funding of the core team. Core contributions secured via projects where possible Reduce hours / redundancy of core team | High x High Red | High level advocacy by PDNPA Management Team with Partners Identify funding opportunities that support the partnership infrastructure with bidding, supported as appropriate. Financial contingency in place for redundancy Monitoring of core income with Chief Finance Officer through MFFP Programme Tracker | Impact | High | High | High | High | High | Q1 Core Income monitoring added to MFFP Programme Tracker | Core budget monitored monthly and reported to the CFO quarterly | Monitoring of Core and Programme Income monitoring through MFFP Programme Tracker, which is reported monthly at Resource Management Meetings. Anticipated core income for 2021/22 is an improving situation for 2021/22; however, risk remains a red risk, due to forecast drop in income for 2022/23, resulting in the implementation of a Change Management Process for the remainder of the financial year 21/22. Income (actual + forecast, including anticipated pay income) for the Programme is reported to RMM on a monthly basis via the Programme Tracker. |
| | | | | Likelihood | High | High | High | High | High | | | |
| | | | | Rating | Red | Red | Red | Red | Red | | | |

Corporate Risk Register 2021/22

| Outcome: A sustainable landscape that is conserved and enhanced | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Lead officer: SLF (Head of Landscape) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | Existing controls | Risk rating before mitigation L x I | Mitigating action | Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red) | | | | | | Timeframe of mitigating actions | How monitor/ indicator | Quarterly update |
| | | | | Start | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | | |
| Farming in Protected Landscapes Fund (FiPL) not getting sufficient uptake by farmers and land managers to spend the circa £1.2m project fund by 31 March 2022 (ref. 21/22F updated Q1 2021) | Continuing involvement in the Defra Core Working Group | High x High Red | Seek to move some of the project funds from Y1 to Y2 and Y3 through the Defra Core Working Group. Also to encourage Defra to change from actual spend to allocation by the end of financial years 1 and 2. | Impact | High | High | High | High | High | Ongoing to 31 March 2022 | | Defra confirmed that the £1.2M project fund allocation could be re-profiled and reduced to £475k for 2021/22. The project fund allocation for 2022/23 and 2023/24 has been increased to circa £1.15M per year. By the end of Q4 72 projects have been funded supporting 65 farmers and land managers. Levels of interest remain good and the programme will continue to be promoted, increasingly via case studies and through farmer to farmer word of mouth. The 3 fte FiPL team is now in place and continues to be supported by the Authority's farm advisers. |
| | | | | Likelihood | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | | | |
| | | | | Rating | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | | | |

| Outcome: A National Park loved and supported by diverse audience | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|---|--|---|
| Lead officer: SW (Head of Engagement) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | Existing controls | Risk rating before mitigation L x I | Mitigating action | Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red) | | | | | | Timeframe of mitigating actions | How monitor/ indicator | Quarterly update |
| | | | | Start | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | | |
| Failure to achieve sustainable gross revenue income targets (£260k) for the PDNP (commercial income and donations including from the Foundation) (ref. 20/21C) | Service delivery plans Authority-approved budget Peak District National Park Foundation | Medium x High Amber | Revamped online shop and new products Resumption of Covid suspended trading activities at earliest opportunity Development and promotion of Foundation fundraising plan and project pipeline Bakewell and Derwent Visitor Centre refit and upgrades | Impact | High | High | High | High | High | Q1 – spend per head increase however lower footfall due to Covid restrictions Q2 and Q3 – support by additional part time officer to secure more Peak Partners Q3 and Q4 – enhance trading offer and visitor engagement | Trading and fundraising income levels. | 2021/22 target: £90,000 Q4 result: £116,641 Trading in all areas has returned to or exceeded pre covid levels. With restrictions now removed the risk of not achieving targets is lower |
| | | | | Likelihood | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Low | | | |
| | | | | Rating | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | | | |

Corporate Risk Register 2021/22

| Outcome: An agile and efficient organisation Lead officer: EF (Head of Information and Performance Management) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Risk Description | Existing controls | Risk rating before mitigation L x I | Mitigating action | Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red) | | | | | | Timeframe of mitigating actions | How monitor/ indicator | Quarterly update |
| | | | | Start | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | | |
| Failure to adequately protect and prepare for 8 Security threats (ref. 20/21E) | Client and Server access controls; anti-virus; anti-spam; user access controls; locked down devices; storage encryption; active managed firewalls; Mobile device management; email and web filtering and monitoring; user awareness training; comprehensive backup and disaster recovery provisions; penetration testing; vulnerability scanning; Network Access Control (NAC); and patch management. | High x Medium Amber | User training and scenario testing Intra-service firewall reviews Removable device controls IT 'run books development Investigation of external support for incident management and response Security assessment reviews Skills training Vulnerability and activity reporting | Impact | Medium | Medium | High | Medium | Medium | See Service Delivery Plan | Through the security incident log. Significant failures or breaches will be escalated The risk area is assessed by the Authority's Internal Auditors when developing the annual programme of audit work to be undertaken | Cyber security training continues to show improvements in staff understanding and actions in regards to phishing threats. Data Protection and Data Security training completed as mandated. Internal Audit April 2021 Cyber Security report gave Substantial Assurance. Monitoring and reporting actions continue to evolve to adapt to the latest threats. Significant progress has been made over the last year and Internal Audit's report is assuring. Proposed this moves to a Service risk in 2022/23 and is continued to be managed this way. |
| | | | | Likelihood | High | High | Medium | High | High | | | |
| | | | | Rating | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | | | |

| Outcome: An agile and efficient organisation Lead officer: Head of Finance (JW) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Risk Description | Existing controls | Risk rating before mitigation L x I | Mitigating action | Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red) | | | | | | Timeframe of mitigating actions | How monitor/ indicator | Quarterly update |
| | | | | Start | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | | |
| Not being financially stable in the medium term due to uncertainty of national park grants (ref. 21/22B) | Budget set for 2021/22 includes £610k of savings | Medium x High Amber | Workshop in March to highlight requirements to management team MTFP review early in 2021/22 Alternative options for savings from CFO | Impact | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | March Q1 Q2 | Review presented to RMM April 2021 Budget monitoring Further report to RMM | MTFP currently standing item at RMM. Members workshops were held in Sept, Oct & Nov. 2022/23 balanced budget approved in Feb 2022. Medium Term Financial Plan also agreed. Cost reduction planning through 2022/23. |
| | | | | Likelihood | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | | | |
| | | | | Rating | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | | | |

Corporate Risk Register 2021/22

| Outcome: All outcomes Lead officer: AGM (Chief Exec) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Risk Description | Existing controls | Risk rating before mitigation L x I | Mitigating action | Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red) | | | | | Timeframe of mitigating actions | How monitor/ indicator | Quarterly update | |
| | | | | Start | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | | |
| Impact of the coronavirus pandemic on delivery of planned Corporate Strategy outcomes, the Authority's financial position, staff wellbeing and how we maintain the #PeakDistrictProud message of 'care, respect and enjoy' for all audiences within and outside the National Park both during lockdown and as we come out of it (ref. 20/21F) | Government legislation and guidance Working with partners via Local resilience forums Monitoring impact on our people Monitoring impact on our finances | High x High | Seeking to reduce costs Use of the Governments support schemes (such as the Job Retention Scheme) Outturn – support from reserves from 19/20 resources Good recovery planning in line with government guidance Working closely with local partners and nationally | Impact | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Easing of lockdown planning framework in place at strategic, tactical and operational level RMM quarterly monitoring – people, money, outcomes - and monitoring of income impact and COVID-19 reserve use 6 month performance monitoring in place for corporate strategy delivery | RMM, quarterly performance monitoring – on people, money outcomes Authority 6 monthly performance reporting | Easing of lockdown meetings now moved to operational business as usual activity, with staff returning to the office as part of a one year blended working trial. Other aspects of our Covid response have now been operationalised into routine business – e.g. cross partner communicators group, or have been paused for now due to the need not being there. Our proactive response to planning for reasonable worst case scenario has meant we are in a good place to plan ahead now with time and consideration. Operations continue to return to a level of normality and the safety, health and well-being of our workforce remains our priority. Levels of sickness have increased by 17% over the previous year and whilst this is in line with the national employment picture we have and will continue to monitor closely. |
| | | | | Likelihood | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | | | |
| | | | | Rating | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | | | |

Corporate Risk Register 2021/22

| Outcome: All outcomes Lead officer: TR (Head of People Management) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Risk Description | Existing controls | Risk rating before mitigation L x I | Mitigating action | Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (Green, Amber or Red) | | | | | | Timeframe of mitigating actions | How monitor/ indicator | Quarterly update |
| | | | | | Start | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | |
| Not achieving volunteer hours due to Covid-19 impacts, limited volunteering opportunities and suspension of volunteer recruitment to new volunteering roles (ref. 21/22E) | Communication and engagement plan to assist volunteer retention Volunteer activities restarting Working closely cross departmentally to ensure consistency Volunteer Engagement Ranger training programme underway | High x High | Implement volunteer action plan 2021-24 to better align opportunities for volunteering with PDNPA outcomes and increase diversity amongst our volunteers and offer Restart recruitment of new volunteer roles | Impact | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Throughout 2021 | Volunteer hours and numbers from Better Impact | Volunteer activities rebuilding post COVID. Volunteer Rangers returning in greater numbers New roles and projects e.g Generation Green) in Trails and Visitor centres are supporting volunteer numbers to rise End Q4 Volunteer value £200k above target. |
| | | | | Likelihood | High | High | Medium | Medium | Low | | | |
| | | | | Rating | Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber | Green | | | |