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

			LIKELIHOOD	
		Low	Medium	
	Low		Not achieving volunteer hours due to Covid-19 impacts, limited volunteering opportunities and suspension of volunteer recruitment to new volunteering roles ( <i>ref. 21/22E</i> )	
IMPACT	Medium		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) Implications of the Landscapes Review 2019 (ref. 21/22A) 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) Not being financially stable in the medium term due to uncertainty of national park grants (ref. 21/22B)	Failure to adequately p threats <i>(ref. 20/21E)</i>
	High	Failure to achieve sustainable gross revenue income targets (£260k) for the PDNP (commercial income and donations including from the Foundation) (ref. 20/21C)	<ul> <li>Failure to develop nature recovery networks in the Peak District National Park (<i>ref. 20/21D</i>)</li> <li>Potential impact on national park purposes if the A57/A628 Mottram Hollingworth tunnel doesn't go ahead (<i>ref. 21/22D</i>)</li> <li>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 (<i>ref. 21/22F</i> updated Q1 2021)</li> </ul>	Area of NP land safeg schemes reduces due Countryside Stewards range of grassland hal Reduced core funding insufficient funding for impacting delivery of e National Park Manage
		Failura ta achiava custainable grace revenue income torgete		Aroo of ND lond oofer

uarded in environmental land management to Brexit uncertainty and continuing hip issues leading to the potential loss of a bitats (*ref. 20/21B*)

for MFFP (£55k deficit) leading to core team and loss of key personnel, elements of the Corporate Strategy and ement Plan (ref. 21/22C)

protect and prepare for Cyber Security

## High



Impact

Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	actio	on (Gr	ng wi een, /		-	-	Timeframe of mitigating actions	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly
					Start	ð	Q2	<b>0</b> 3	Q4			
Four Principal financial risks within the Moorlife 2020 European funded project:	Capping Sterling budget	High x High Red	Consider hedging transaction Project has claimed 70% of Euro funding, and interest rates more favourable;	Impact	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Periodic assessment	Chief Finance Officer Budget	Moorlife pr claim delay exist until f project is c
exchange rate movements; the sterling ceiling set for the total project budget; the contractual treatment of			therefore, exchange rate risk has fallen Reserve of £500k to mitigate impacts of ineligible expenditure.	Likelihood	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium		monitoring group Programme and Resources	
treatment of partner contributions; and the possibility of expenditure being found ineligible (ref. 20/21A)			Continuous monitoring of budget	Rating	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber		Committee or Authority	

## **Risk Rating Legend**

IBER (closely monitor)	AMBER (manage and monitor)	RED (significant focus and attention)
REEN (accept out monitor)	AMBER (management effort worthwhile)	AMBER (manage and monitor)
EEN (accept)	GREEN (accept/review periodically)	GREEN (accept but monitor)
Low	Med	High
	Likelihood	

## ly update

project extension granted until 2022, therefore final elayed until after the end date. Risks will continue to til final claim is received <u>and</u> the final audit of the s complete.

Risk Description	ELF (Head of Landscape) Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	miti	Ĭ (G	ng ad	ction	ber o	r	Timeframe of mitigating actions	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly
					Start	ð	<b>0</b> 2	03	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)	National influencing for post Brexit agri-environmental policies and support systems Local communications across the farming and land management industry Agri-environment scheme promotion and support for farmers and land managers through the 44 Protected Landscape organisations NPMP work	High x High Red	Increase promotion of the service, working with agencies e.g. NFU, CLA, NE, EA, FC, Protected Landscape organisations Public payment for public goods/ benefits Influencing role through PDNPA links and NPE's Future of Farming, national stakeholder meetings and through the forthcoming Farming in Protected Landscapes	Impact	High	High	High	High	High	On going	Quarterly updates on progress	Represen and influe stakehold Promotion delivery, h available with other Agri-envir in Protect continued 1 in the P 65 farmer
(1011 20,212)	Environmental Land Management (ELM) Defra Test and Trial using the National Character Area approach 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		Programme	Likelihood	High	High	High	High	High			Countrysi rates for la and the m grassland the mainte to look aft review of The ELM demonstra National C ELM sche local flexit
	10 Landscape Recovery pilots in 2021. National rollout of ELM is planned for late 2024			Rating	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red			Further or schemes running w invitation Recovery The review will contin

### rly update

entation on behalf of the English National Parks uencing nationally has continued through various older meetings.

ion of the opportunities for increased public good y, how farming is changing and the range of support le for farmers and land managers has continued her agencies and partners.

vironment scheme promotion including the Farming ected Landscapes (FIPL) Programme has ed across all 44 Protected Landscapes. FiPL Year Peak District has delivered 72 projects supporting ters and land managers.

vside Stewardship Scheme (CSS) annual payment ir land management options have been reviewed majority increased. However, the species-rich nd restoration option is now at a higher rate than intenance option which could reduce the incentive after grassland of high environmental quality. The of capital grant payment rates is on hold.

M Test and Trial has been completed and strates that farmers and land managers like the al Character Area descriptions and want the new hemes to be local e.g. local spatial prioritisation, exibility, local trusted advice and guidance. opportunities to influence the design of the 3 ELM es continue to be sought. The SFI pilot is up and with early lessons feeding in to ELM, and an on for expressions of interest for the Landscape ery scheme is open and will close in Q1.

view of the NPMP continues to be supported and tinue through next year..

Risk Description	LF (Head of Landscape) Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation	Mitigating action	actio	on (Gro	-		nitiga ber or	-	Timeframe of mitigating actions	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly
		High d			Start	ð	Q2	Q3	Q4			
Failure to develop nature recovery networks in the Peak District National Park ( <i>ref.</i> 20/21C)	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 Participation in the Greater Manchester Local Nature Recovery Strategy Pilot Provision of farmer and land manager support through the Authority's farm advice service,	High	Development of one more detailed Nature Recovery Plan for the Peak District with partners and stakeholders 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	Impact	High	High	High	High	High	Ongoing	Delivery of the Peak District Nature Recovery Prospectus Development of a more detailed nature recovery plan for the Peak District	The PD Na approach f for the Plac will be sha Local Natu developed the 1 Natu feed into th Farmer an Authority's Landscape Programm
	the South West Peak Landscape Partnership (SWPLP) (Glorious Grasslands, Slowing the Flow, Wonderful Waders, Future Farmscapes) and Moors for the Future Programmes Dark Peak and South West Peak moorland focus on birds of prey through the Birds of Prey initiative Breeding birds surveys Engagement with moorland		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	Likelihood	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium		Breeding birds survey Birds of Prey initiative meetings and conference calls Ongoing monitoring of M4F, SWP and WP programmes	Focus on b Initiative ar an exceller success wa Engageme Liaison Gro approach t manageme prevention has been o Chatsworth
	owners though the Moorland Liaison Group Engagement with Police and Crime Commissioner			Rating	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber			

### y update

Nature Recovery Prospectus and the suggested in for the development of 1 Nature Recovery Plan lace has been shared with key stakeholders and mared with farmers and land managers in Q1.

ature Recovery Strategies (LNRS) are likely to be ed at a county rather than a National Park level so ture Recovery Plan for the Peak District will need to the LNRS's (6) and vice ser versa.

and land manager support continued through the r's farm advice service, South West Peak pe Partnership, Moors for the Future and the FIPL mes.

n birds of prey continued through Birds of Prey and the 2021 report was completed in Q4. Whilst lent year for short eared owls last year's breeding was more mixed for other species.

nent with moorland owners through the Moorland Group has continued with a focus on a strategic in to fire prevention and mitigation and visitor ment. A report on a strategic approach to wild fire on and mitigation including fire behaviour modelling in completed and will be published in Q1. The next with Liaison meeting is planned for Q1.

### **Outcome:** A sustainable landscape that is conserved and enhanced

Lead officer: BJT (Head of Planning)

Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation	Mitigating action	actio	on (Gre	-		itiga er or	-	Timeframe of mitigating actions	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly
		LxI			Start	ð	Q2	<b>Q</b> 3	Q4			
Potential impact on national park purposes if the A57/A628 Mottram	Holding objection Good communication with Highways England and	Medium x High Amber	Assess and comment on Development Consent Order (DCO)	Impact	High	High	High	High	High	Q1 receipt of DCO Q2/Q3 take	Quarterly updates on DCO position	DCO received February f Members for objection construction constructio
Hollingworth tunnel doesn't go ahead (ref. 21/22D)	supportive partners in Friends of the Peak District and DCC		Reaffirm objection at NPA if concerns upheld Seek support from partners	Likelihood	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	decision to object to Authority		Hearings of focus of ris to indirect scheme or
				Rating	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber			Woodhead

Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation	Mitigating action	acti	on I ( Gro	•		itigat er or	•	Timeframe of mitigating actions	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly
		LXI			Start	g	Q2	<b>Q</b> 3	Q4			
Reduced core funding for MFFP (£55k deficit) leading to	Partial funding of the core team. Core contributions secured via projects where possible	High x High Red	High level advocacy by PDNPA Management Team with Partners	Impact	High	High	High	High	High	Q1 Core Income monitoring added to	Core budget monitored monthly and	Monitoring through MI monthly at
insufficient funding for core team and loss of key personnel, impacting delivery	Reduce hours / redundancy of core team		Identify funding opportunities that support the partnership infrastructure with bidding, supported as appropriate. Financial	Likelihoo	High	High	High	High	High	MFFP Programme Tracker	reported to the CFO quarterly	Anticipated situation fo to forecast implement remainder
of elements of the Corporate Strategy and National Park Management Plan ( <i>ref. 21/22C</i> )			contingency in place for redundancy Monitoring of core income with Chief Finance Officer through MFFP Programme Tracker	Rating	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red			Income (ac income) fo monthly ba

### ly update

ceived and NPA decision to object made at 4<sup>th</sup> y full Authority meeting. rs formalised the existing holding objection to a full n on the basis of the unacceptable impacts of the on the Special Qualities of the National Park.

s continue through April and May 2022, with the risk moving from direct impacts from development, ct impacts of traffic growth from the A57 Link Roads on key corridors of the National Park, namely the ead and Snake Pass routes.

#### y update

ng of Core and Programme Income monitoring MFFP Programme Tracker, which is reported at Resource Management Meetings.

ted core income for 2021/22 is an improving for 2021/22; however, risk remains a red risk, due ast drop in income for 2022/23, resulting in the ntation of a Change Management Process for the er of the financial year 21/22.

(actual + forecast, including anticipated pay for the Programme is reported to RMM on a basis via the Programme Tracker.

## Outcome: A sustainable landscape that is conserved and enhanced

**Lead officer:** SLF (Head of Landscape)

Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before	Mitigating action	actio	ratin on (Gre	-		•	•	Timeframe of mitigating actions	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly
		mitigation L x I			Start	ð	Q2	<b>0</b> 3	Q4			
Farming in Protected Landscapes Fund (FiPL) not getting	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	Impact	High	High	High	High	High	Ongoing to 31 March 2022		Defra conf be re-profi project fun increased
sufficient uptake by farmers and land managers to spend the circa £1.2m project fund by 31 March 2022 <i>(ref.</i>			encourage Defra to change from actual spend to allocation by the end of financial years 1 and 2.	Likelihood	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium			By the end 65 farmers good and t increasing word of mo
21/22F updated Q1 2021)				Rating	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber			The 3 fte F supported

Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before	Mitigating action	acti	k ratin on I ( Gre	•		•	•	Timeframe of mitigating actions	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly
		mitigation L x I			Start	g	Q2	<b>Q</b> 3	Q4			
Failure to achieve sustainable gross revenue income targets (£260k) for the PDNP (commercial income and	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	Impact	High	High	High	High	High	Q1 – spend per head increase however lower footfall due to Covid restrictions	Trading and fundraising income levels.	2021/22 ta Q4 result: Trading in levels. Wit achieving
donations including from the Foundation) ( <i>ref.</i> 20/21C)			Development and promotion of Foundation fundraising plan and project pipeline Bakewell and Derwent Visitor Centre refit and upgrades	Likelihood	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Q2 and Q3 – support by additional part time officer to secure more		
				Rating	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Peak Partners Q3 and Q4 – enhance trading offer and visitor engagement		

### ly update

onfirmed that the  $\pounds$ 1.2M project fund allocation could ofiled and reduced to  $\pounds$ 475k for 2021/22. The fund allocation for 2022/23 and 2023/24 has been ed to circa  $\pounds$ 1.15M per year.

end of Q4 72 projects have been funded supporting ers and land managers. Levels of interest remain ad the programme will continue to be promoted, ngly via case studies and through farmer to farmer mouth.

e FiPL team is now in place and continues to be ed by the Authority's farm advisers.

### ly update

2 target: £90,000 Ilt: £116,641

in all areas has returned to or exceeded pre covid With restrictions now removed the risk of not ng targets is lower

Outcome: An a	gile and efficient organisation	n										
Lead officer: E	F (Head of Information and F	Performanc	e Management)									
Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation	Mitigating action	act	I ( G	-		-	-	Timeframe of mitigating actions	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly
		LxI			Start	g	<b>Q2</b>	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	High x Medium Amber	User training and scenario testing Intra-service firewall reviews	Impact	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	See Service Delivery Plan	Through the security incident log. Significant failures or	Cyber sec staff unde threats. Data Prot mandatec
	firewalls; Mobile device management; email and web filtering and monitoring; user awareness training; comprehensive backup and disaster recovery provisions; penetration testing; vulnerability		Removable device controls IT 'run books development Investigation of external support for incident management and response	Likelihood	High	High	Medium	High	High		breeches will be escalated The risk area is assessed	Internal A Substantia Monitoring to the late
	scanning; Network Access Control (NAC); and patch management.		Security assessment reviews Skills training Vulnerability and activity reporting	Rating	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber		by the Authority's Internal Auditors when developing the annual programme of audit work to be undertaken	Significan Internal A Service ris way.

Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	actio	on (Gre	-	th mit Ambe	-	ng	Timeframe of mitigating actions	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterly
					Start	ð	Q2	с С	Q4			
Not being financially stable in the medium term due to uncertainty	Budget set for 2021/22 includes £610k of savings	Medium x High Amber	Workshop in March to highlight requirements to management team	Impact	Mediu	Mediu	Mediu m	Mediu	Mediu	March	Review presented to RMM April 2021	MTFP cur Members
of national park grants (ref. 21/22B)			MTFP review early in 2021/22 Alternative options for savings from CFO	Likelihood	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Q1 Q2	Budget monitoring Further	2022/23 b Term Fina through 20
				Rating	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber		report to RMM	

### rly update

ecurity training continues to show improvements in derstanding and actions in regards to phishing

otection and Data Security training completed as ed.

Audit April 2021 Cyber Security report gave ntial Assurance.

ing and reporting actions continue to evolve to adapt atest threats.

ant progress has been made over the last year and Audit's report is assuring. Proposed this moves to a risk in 2022/23 and is continued to be managed this

#### ly update

urrently standing item at RMM.

s workshops were held in Sept, Oct & Nov.

balanced budget approved in Feb 2022. Medium nancial Plan also agreed. Cost reduction planning 2022/23.

Risk Description	Existing controls	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Mitigating action	actio	on	-	th mit Ambe	-	-	Timeframe of mitigating actions	How monitor/ indicator	Quarterl
					Start	ð	0 <b>2</b>	ы В	Q4			
Implications of the Landscapes Review 2019. Need to swiftly understand the implications on, and appropriately respond to, any funding, and policy and governance framework	Working collectively with other English NPs on progressing the NPE road map in response to the Landscapes Review report	Medium x High	10 English NPAs have agreed the collective focus for our road map as: national parks to be leading nature recovery; shaping the future of farming; being national parks for everyone; and being leaders in tackling the climate change emergency As well as collectively	Impact	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Ongoing	Budget report for national park grant Success of the NPE delivery plans in gaining traction with Defra and	We have Landscap ambition, mission of recovery, with the of landscap recomme pragmation are resound adequate
proposals. A risk the government response fails to help amplify our positive impact both locally and nationally. Alongside a risk that legislation in the form of the			engaging with Defra to secure certainty on future national park grant and identifying key principles for how any possible new National landscapes Service can act in the best service of national parks	Likelihood	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium		other Government departments and partners A governance and policy framework that helps	to carry of through t by availa pressure support v deliver. The 4 NF each NP, being rep
Environment and Agriculture Bills fails to recognise the importance of National Parks and role of National Park Authorities in supporting policies for nature recovery (ref. 21/22A)				Rating	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber		amplify our local and collective national impact	

### ly update

received the Government response to the pes Review and responded to it welcoming the vision & the overall direction travel in terms of the of protected landscapes to be beacons in nature climate action, as places for all and in working communities who live and work in these bes. However there are a handful of specific endations we disagree with; and that we need to be ic about what we can achieve based on what we urced to do. It is therefore important that we are ely supported for the tasks Government wishes us out. All of our activities, from current responsibilities to future ambitions, are self-evidently constrained able resources; and it is inevitable that continuing on our budget in terms of diminished central will impact on our performance and the ability to

PE delivery plans continue to be well received and A is working on local delivery. Our local delivery is ported to Members at P&R committee.

Lead officer: A 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
					Start	g	<b>Q2</b>	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	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	framework in place at strategic, tactical and operational level Authority 6 monitoring on people, money outcomes	quarterly performance monitoring – on people, money outcomes Authority 6	our Covid r routine bus or have be there. Our proact case scena
				Likelihood	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium		performance reporting	
				Rating	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber			

### ly update

f lockdown meetings now moved to operational as usual activity, with staff returning to the office of a one year blended working trial. Other aspects of d response have now been operationalised into business – e.g. cross partner communicators group, been paused for now due to the need not being

active response to planning for reasonable worst enario has meant we are in a good place to plan ow with time and consideration.

ns continue to return to a level of normality and the ealth and well-being of our workforce remains our Levels of sickness have increased by 17% over the year and whilst this is in line with the national nent picture we have and will continue to monitor

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
					Start	ð	03 02	03	04 0			
Not achieving volunteer hours due to Covid-19 impacts, limited volunteering opportunities and suspension of volunteer recruitment to new volunteering roles (ref. 21/22E)	engagement plan to assist volunteer retentionVolunteer activities restartingWorking closely cross departmentally to ensure consistencyVolunteer Engagement Ranger	High x High	<ul> <li>Implement volunteer action plan 2021-24 to better align opportunities for volunteering with PDNPA outcomes and increase diversity amongst our volunteers and offer</li> <li>Restart recruitment of new volunteer roles</li> </ul>	Impact	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Throughout 2021	Volunteer hours and numbers from Better Impact	Volunteer Rangers r New roles Visitor cer
				Likelihood	High	High	Medium	Medium	Low			End Q4 V
	training programme underway			Rating	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green			

## rly update

er activities rebuilding post COVID. Volunteer s returning in greater numbers

es and projects e.g Generation Green) in Trails and centres are supporting volunteer numbers to rise

Volunteer value £200k above target.