

Corporate Risk Register: Start of year FY26/27

Risk Register Summary

Ref.	Risk title	Date Added	Likelihood	Impact	Risk rating	Start of year update
6	Injury/Loss of life & property damage due to unsafe trees	22/23	4	5	20	No change
8	Rights of Way deterioration and reduction in funding	24/25	4	4	16	No change
21	LURA 'duty to seek to further' risk to partnership working and NPMP delivery	24/25	5	3	15	No change
1	East Midlands Combined Councils Authority priorities	24/25	4	3	12	No change
3	Sustainable moorland management	23/24	3	4	12	No change
7	Programme and project (externally funded) bid management	24/25	4	3	12	No change
9	Risk to Authority from Morridge Hill Country project	26/27	3	4	12	New risk
10	Changes to planning legislation, policy and regulation	26/27	3	4	12	New risk - disaggregated from legislative risk
11	Constituent Authorities are not coordinated and working to deliver the NPMP	26/27	4	3	12	New risk
12	Failure to deliver Local Plan update to deadline	26/27	3	4	12	New risk
13	Failure to deliver the PD Nature Recovery Plan	20/21	3	4	12	No change
14	Influence of 'user management' in the National Park	24/25	4	3	12	No change
15	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) - Peak Cluster CO2 Pipeline	24/25	4	3	12	No change
16	Private finance for landscape and nature recovery	24/25	3	4	12	No change
17	Unfavourable outcome from new ELMS development	26/27	3	4	12	New risk - aggregated from previous ELMs risks
18	Cyber incident	26/27	3	4	12	New risk - risk previously on register re-added
20	Defra performance monitoring	24/25	3	4	12	No change
4	UK Government departments and agencies' capacity to support Protected Landscape purposes	24/25	3	3	9	Likelihood reduced
19	DEFRA grant agreement and methods of funding	24/25	3	3	9	No change
2	Review of National Park Authority governance	26/27	2	4	8	New risk - disaggregated from legislative risk
5	Use of the new visitor levy powers by combined authorities in ways which do not support NPMP delivery	26/27	4	2	8	New risk

Risk matrix

		Impact				
		Insignificant	Minor	Medium	Major	Catastrophic
		1	2	3	4	5
Likelihood	Almost certain	5	10	15	20	25
	Likely	4	8	12	16	20
	Possible	3	6	9	12	15
	Unlikely	2	4	6	8	10
	Almost impossible	1	2	3	4	5

Very low to low: Acceptable risk, no action; No review required	Medium: Monitor risk, action where necessary; Quarterly review	High: Take action or escalate externally; Quarterly review	Very high: Immediate action & escalation; Regular SMT review
---	---	---	---

Risk Register

Ref.	Risk title	Risk description <i>If x happens, y will result</i>	Type of risk			Link to NPMP Aim				Link to Authority Plan Objective								Year added to RR	Lead responsible officer	PDNPAs capacity to carry out mitigation actions
			Place	Delivery	Operations	Aim 1: Climate	Aim 2: Nature	Aim 3: Welcome	Aim 4: Community	Enabling delivery	Obj A: Planning	Obj B: Access	Obj C: People	Obj D: Finance	Obj E: Assets	Obj F: Governance	Obj G: IT & Perfor.			
1	East Midlands Combined Councils Authority priorities	<p>If the Authority isn't included in critical decision making led by the new East Midlands Combined Council Authority, then there is a risk that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiple spatial development strategies will emerge creating complexity across wider Peak District - Urban/rural fringe issues will be prioritised - Transport budget could be directed primarily into urban areas - Reduced engagement with NPMP objectives - Authority may have to use legal 'duty to further' power to enforce action 	X			X		X	X									24/25	CEO	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months
2	Review of National Park Authority governance	<p>Defra are reviewing NPA governance, alongside ongoing Local Government Reform which may change the number of Authorities who appoint to our board. These reviews/changes present risks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Defra/government make changes to National Park governance that is counterproductive or not effective. - Changes get made to our board size and appointment method that mean we reduce local accountability and find it harder to be quorate for meetings. <p>However, if favourable, these reviews present the opportunity that such changes will produce more effective and efficient governance.</p>			X										X			26/27	CEO	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months
3	Sustainable Moorland management	<p>If we fail in our convening role in both the delivery of the Moorland Management Group (MMG) and its integration with the other moorland interest groups, we will suffer reputational and operational harm in delivering landscape management as a result of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failure to influence the development of consensus between stakeholders, landowners and key interest groups 2. Failure to demonstrate commitment to reduce the incidence and severity of Moorland Fires 3. Failure to demonstrate commitment to restoring breeding populations pairs of birds of prey to the numbers in the 1990s 	X			X												23/24	CEO	Significant capacity to carry out mitigation actions in next 12 months

Risk Register

Ref.	Risk title	Existing mitigation actions <i>If some or significant capacity to mitigate, otherwise record escalation actions</i>	Residual Likelihood	Residual Impact	Residual Risk rating	Further mitigation actions to be implemented <i>n/a if little or no mitigation capacity</i>	Timeline of actions	Monitoring & evaluation indicators	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target risk rating	Notes or comments
1	East Midlands Combined Councils Authority priorities	1. CEO to continue building working relationship with EMCCA mayor Clare Ward, CEO and Directors. 2. Actively engage in opportunities arising from any Peak Partnership Summit follow up	4	3	12	1. Continue to scan decision making environment within the new combined Authority to ensure PDNPA gets a 'seat at the table' on relevant issues/ decisions. 2. Develop a key account plan to ensure we are all making the most of opportunities to engage EMCCA	1. Plan for follow up meeting in Q1 FY26/27. 2. Account plan to be developed by end of Q2	1. PDNPA is included in appropriate decision making which may affect NP purposes 2. An account plan is in place and being actively tracked	3	2	6	
2	Review of National Park Authority governance	1. Inputting into Defra governance review 2. Inputting into Local Government Reform consultations 3. Inputting into CNP governance assessment	2	4	8	Work to influence constituent authorities to positively respond to Defra governance review.	As opportunities arise		2	4	8	Actions already in progress - limited further influence possible therefore target rating does not reduce.
3	Sustainable Moorland management	1. Continue the refreshed approach to the Moorland Management Group including hosting MMG meetings and continuation of moorland group following retreat with ongoing site visits. 2. Partnership working to fund casual seasonal fire rangers. 3. Continue to lead the Fire Operations Group (FOG).	3	4	12	1. Maintain high level CEO support for all existing actions 2. CEO to support Ranger Team Leader in engagement with FOG and MMG. 3. Continue site visits with visits planned in autumn and spring	1. Provisional meeting date for MMG meeting in Autumn 2026. 2. Ongoing 3. Autumn and spring	1. Positive MMG meeting held in Autumn 26 2. FOG group engaged and ongoing, with PDNPA leading it 3. Site visits carried out with good attendance and engagement	2	3	6	

Ref.	Risk title	Risk description <i>If x happens, y will result</i>	Type of risk			Link to NPMP Aim				Link to Authority Plan Objective								Year added to RR	Lead responsible officer	PDNPAs capacity to carry out mitigation actions
			Place	Delivery	Operations	Aim 1: Climate	Aim 2: Nature	Aim 3: Welcome	Aim 4: Community	Enabling delivery	Obj A: Planning	Obj B: Access	Obj C: People	Obj D: Finance	Obj E: Assets	Obj F: Governance	Obj G: IT & Perfor.			
4	UK Government departments and agencies' capacity to support Protected Landscape purposes	If the pressure on the capacity of UK Government departments and agencies continues or gets worse, leading to indecision or bad decision making, then there will be a risk that the Authority will not be able to carry out its statutory purposes as a National Park.		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	24/25	CEO	Little or no capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months
5	Use of the new visitor levy powers by combined authorities in ways which do not support NPMP delivery	If new overnight visitor levy schemes are introduced that do not focus spending of the levy on ways which mitigate for visitor impact, and that different criteria are used for the mayoral authorities that cover the national park, there is a risk that PDNP misses funding opportunities from future visitor levy which could support NPMP delivery.	X	X				X	X				X					26/27	CEO	Significant capacity to carry out mitigation actions in next 12 months
6	Injury/Loss of life & property damage due to unsafe trees	If we do not allocate sufficient staff time and financial resources to surveying and managing PDNPAs in-hand woodlands and trees, which include high numbers of dangerous trees infected with Ash Dieback disease fungus (<i>Hymenoscyphus fraxineus</i>), we are at risk of being liable/uninsured for injury or loss of life & property damage due to unsafe trees			X							X	X	X				22/23	Head of Assets & Enterprise	Significant capacity to carry out mitigation actions in next 12 months
7	Programme and project (externally funded) bid management	If programme and project externally funded bids are not prioritised via appropriate bid management processes, there is a risk to the authority of: - Lost opportunities - Impact on wider Authority project development - Impact on 'business as usual' if bid successful - Internal project / funding conflicts - Impact on bottom line aspirations - Reputational risk	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X				24/25	Head of Assets & Enterprise	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months
8	Rights of Way deterioration and reduction in funding	If the RoW funding remains static or declines further, in contribution with more extreme weather, we are at risk of being unable to maintain agreed priority Rights of Way to an acceptable or statutory standard. This means possible: - Reputational risk - Litigation from path users (damage / injury) - Runaway damage to infrastructure with longer term/higher cost implications - Negative impact special quality features / erosion of pathways - Economic benefits	X	X	X			X				X	X	X				24/25	Head of Assets & Enterprise	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months

Ref.	Risk title	Existing mitigation actions <i>If some or significant capacity to mitigate, otherwise record escalation actions</i>	Residual Likelihood	Residual Impact	Residual Risk rating	Further mitigation actions to be implemented <i>n/a if little or no mitigation capacity</i>	Timeline of actions	Monitoring & evaluation indicators	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target risk rating	Notes or comments
4	UK Government departments and agencies' capacity to support Protected Landscape purposes	Engage with National Parks England, PLP, NPP and other fora to influence Government and policy.	3	3	9	1. Actively engage with departments and agencies as opportunities arise. 2. CEO and Chair to actively take part on NP comms group	Ongoing		2	3	6	There is low internal capacity to manage this risk and therefore it should be escalated to external partners - work ongoing to identify most suitable organisations.
5	Use of the new visitor levy powers by combined authorities in ways which do not support NPMP delivery	1. PDNPA influencing EMCCA through consultation response and relationship development 2. Inputting to national consultation directly and via collective NPE response	4	2	8	Target EMCCA ahead of a decision to implement with an offer to help design the implementation process and process for allocating levy funding	Q2	Meeting has been held with EMCCA to discuss ahead of deadlines.	2	2	4	
6	Injury/Loss of life & property damage due to unsafe trees	1. 5-year survey cycle assesses condition of in-hand woodland, which actions remediation work for unsafe trees. 2. Reactive closure of public access to sites at risk in bad weather / storms.	4	5	20	Programme of works under way to address ash dieback infected trees to meet our legal obligations and insurance requirements.	Refer to Woodland Management Plan and Woodland Ash Die Back Works plan.	Ongoing survey and inspection work	4	5	20	Risk remains high but is considered to be adequately managed.
7	Programme and project (externally funded) bid management	1. Ongoing communication with SMT, wider management team, members to support bid management process. 2. In line with standing orders, RMM or Committee approval dependent on financial level. 3. Continue to work with consultant bid writer to project managing large opportunities. 4. Foundation Director regularly sharing Foundation funded project pipeline with SMT.	4	3	12	Review of standing orders and financial regulations will commence after the Legal Officer is in post	To be set once post recruited to	To be set once post recruited to	3	3	9	Actions on hold until Legal Officer is recruited (during D7)
8	Rights of Way deterioration and reduction in funding	1. Seek additional funding opportunities via local authorities, water companies funding, Authority core funding, specific Defra core funding pots e.g. Access uplift, Farming in Protected Landscape 2. Appropriate use of volunteers to maintain and restore Rights of Way	4	4	16	1. Continue to maximise the limited people/monetary resources available to do this work. 2. Ensuring restoration and priority rights of way are included in the wider landscape funding bids. 3. Use success with Sheffield City Council to seek funding from local authorities around Peak District fringes for Rights of Way mitigation plans through Local Plans. 4. Use one off Defra Access funding on priority routes	1. Resources allocated in 2026/27 service plan 2. Across 2026/27 service plan 3. SCC Local Plan and CIL due end 2026 – learning can be carried forward from this 4. Resources allocated in 2026/27 service plan	Six monthly review of Authority Plan and risk register	3	3	9	

Ref.	Risk title	Risk description <i>If x happens, y will result</i>	Type of risk			Link to NPMP Aim				Link to Authority Plan Objective								Year added to RR	Lead responsible officer	PDNPA's capacity to carry out mitigation actions	
			Place	Delivery	Operations	Aim 1: Climate	Aim 2: Nature	Aim 3: Welcome	Aim 4: Community	Enabling delivery	Obj A: Planning	Obj B: Access	Obj C: People	Obj D: Finance	Obj E: Assets	Obj F: Governance	Obj G: IT & Perfor.				Obj H: Climate
9	Risk to Authority from Morridge Hill Country project	<p>The Morridge Hill Country Project is the first project being delivered by the Authority through a special purpose vehicle. Therefore, there are the following risks that if the special purpose vehicle is not set up with the correct governance and structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reputational risk to the Authority of not being fit for purpose or a good delivery partner - Financial risk of not having adequate controls in place - Resource / people risk of not employing people in the correct way - Delivery risk of being unable to deliver agreed outcomes 	X	X	X	X	X												26/27	Head of Assets & Enterprise	Significant capacity to carry out mitigation actions in next 12 months
10	Changes to planning legislation, policy and regulation	<p>Upcoming changes to national planning policy, spatial development strategies and planning regulations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reform to the National Planning Policy - Planning and Infrastructure Bill - Introduction of a Land Use Framework - Other changes to planning regulation <p>Present risks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new NP Local Plan will be outweighed by new NPPF, resulting in unfavourable local decisions - New Spatial Development Strategies in MCAs lack coordination and alignment with NP local plan + NP purposes - Changes to national planning policy take a more flexible approach to development in the countryside resulting in increased unfavourable development, e.g. ribbon development - There will be changes in landscape character due to suburban style development and loss of rural character, contrary to special qualities - There will be impact on local services and communities due to increased population/changed demographics 	X							X									26/27	Head of Planning & Conservation	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months
11	Constituent Authorities are not coordinated and working to deliver the NPMP	<p>If our constituent authorities (CAs), crucially the new combined authorities and possible new unitary authorities, do not understand their operations in the PL and coordinate in delivery of NPMP, there are risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To the Special Qualities and delivery of the NPMP - To relationships between PNDPA and CAs if we use the LURA 'duty to seek to further'. 	X	X		X	X	X	X										26/27	Head of Planning & Conservation	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months

Ref.	Risk title	Existing mitigation actions <i>If some or significant capacity to mitigate, otherwise record escalation actions</i>	Residual Likelihood	Residual Impact	Residual Risk rating	Further mitigation actions to be implemented <i>n/a if little or no mitigation capacity</i>	Timeline of actions	Monitoring & evaluation indicators	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target risk rating	Notes or comments
9	Risk to Authority from Morridge Hill Country project	Morridge Hill Project Manager seeking legal advice on most appropriate structure	3	4	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. April RMM to advise on May Authority report seeking approval to submit the expression of interest 2. May Authority report seeking approval to submit the expression of interest 3. Early engagement with farmers and land managers so the project has the right stakeholders involved 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 21 April RMM 2. 22 May Authority meeting 3. After May Authority approval 	See timeline	2	4	8	
10	Changes to planning legislation, policy and regulation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New Local Plan development in place by year end which responds to local development issues 2. NP family responses to NPPF consultation 	3	4	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow up local plan with new design guide to promote good design 2. Exploring Article 4 directions to reduce impacts from permitted developments and all more control 3. Continue prioritisation of historic enforcement cases – currently working on cases with historic enforcement notices 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From 2027 2. From end 2026 3. Continuing to clear enforcement backlog 	3. Authority Plan & annual enforcement report	2	3	6	
11	Constituent Authorities are not coordinated and working to deliver the NPMP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continuing relationship development with MCAs through key officer meetings 2. Responding to consultations including on transport, visitory levy etc 3. Taking up invitations to join working groups in MCAs e.g. spatial development groups 	4	3	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Take up opportunities for relevant engagement and relationship building – unknown geographies, workstreams, projects 2. Consider proactive engagement opportunities e.g. data sharing, strategic policy development 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongoing 2. Within next 12 months 	2. Via risk process	3	3	9	

Ref.	Risk title	Risk description <i>If x happens, y will result</i>	Type of risk			Link to NPMP Aim				Link to Authority Plan Objective								Year added to RR	Lead responsible officer	PDNPAs capacity to carry out mitigation actions	
			Place	Delivery	Operations	Aim 1: Climate	Aim 2: Nature	Aim 3: Welcome	Aim 4: Community	Enabling delivery	Obj A: Planning	Obj B: Access	Obj C: People	Obj D: Finance	Obj E: Assets	Obj F: Governance	Obj G: IT & Perfor.				Obj H: Climate
12	Failure to deliver Local Plan update to deadline	<p>If the Local Plan update is not delivered by the current deadline of December 2026, and therefore new National Planning Policy Framework being in place, there are risks of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having to repeat consultation steps under new regulatory processes which brings additional capacity requirement - Evidence becoming out of date over time and having to spend money on updating this - Plan becoming out of date plan, meaning more weight will be given to national policy in planning decisions over local considerations 	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X								26/27	Head of Planning & Conservation	Significant capacity to carry out mitigation actions in next 12 months
13	Failure to deliver the PD Nature Recovery Plan	<p>If we fail to lead the further development and delivery of the Peak District Nature Recovery plan we will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not meet one of the key aspirations in the DEFRA Grant Agreement 2. Be at risk of DEFRA grant recovery 3. Fail to deliver both NPMP partnership and Authority Action Plan actions 4. Suffer reputational risk 5. Risk the loss of natural capital assets, wildlife enhancement, loss of priority/key habitats such as grassland (Failure to sustain the area of non-protected species-rich grassland through retention, enhancement and creation) 		X		X	X							X					20/21	Head of Planning & Conservation	Significant capacity to carry out mitigation actions in next 12 months
14	Influence of 'user management' in the National Park	<p>If 'user management' is not given appropriate focus and/or funding to address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local community impact 2. Stakeholder impact 3. Recreation Hubs, area management and hot spots 4. Landscape/feature condition 5. Rights of Way condition 6. Behaviour change 7. Carrying capacity 8. Transport; <p>then there is a direct risk to our purposes, duty and special qualities.</p>	X	X				X	X		X	X							24/25	Head of Planning & Conservation	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months

Ref.	Risk title	Existing mitigation actions <i>If some or significant capacity to mitigate, otherwise record escalation actions</i>	Residual Likelihood	Residual Impact	Residual Risk rating	Further mitigation actions to be implemented <i>n/a if little or no mitigation capacity</i>	Timeline of actions	Monitoring & evaluation indicators	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target risk rating	Notes or comments
12	Failure to deliver Local Plan update to deadline	Majority of LP development is currently complete and on track for December 2026 deadline	3	4	12	Financial resource available for roles required to complete on time, to be deployed when needed	During 2026	Plan submitted by Dec 26	2	3	6	
13	Failure to deliver the PD Nature Recovery Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Take up opportunities arising through national collaborations (PLP, NPE, NPUK officers' groups, etc) to influence agri-environmental policies and support systems so that they support NRP delivery. 2. Develop opportunities through FIPL and Morridge Hill Country project to support farmer collaboration on NRP delivery. 3. Promote EIA guidance through farm advisors. 4. Spatial tagging of NRP to LCAs to support land managers and farmers to more easily identify actions within their area to target for delivery 5. Establish Nature Recovery Plan Delivery Group and integrating into NPMP development process. – by June 2026 through SNO role 	3	4	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promote and support understanding and interest in public payment for public goods through farm advisor roles. 2. Enhance comms with examples of practical delivery with farmers & land managers e.g. ELM test, WP practical field trials, supporting more native woodland creation and mitigation of Ash Dieback, FIPL. 3. Seeking further funding for farmer support 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongoing 2. Ongoing 3. To be actioned 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring FIPL, landscape trees farm advice role and other project based reporting 2. Individual projects e.g. through FIPL 	3	3	9	
14	Influence of 'user management' in the National Park	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongoing assessment, evidence gathering, data and evidence synthesis regarding use of landscape. 2. Communicate findings to Members annually 3. Continue SMT focus 4. CEO & HoS attending VPDD regular meetings and wider Partnership 5. Dialogue with NPMP delivery groups to gain support / look for partnership solutions 6. Approach partners to sign Tourist Charter. – Sarah 7. Promote and signpost partners to National Park Centres, pop ups and Welcome Volunteers to support visitor engagement 	4	3	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish a trial at key hot spot area of Castleton/ Winnats/ Mam Tor and work in partnership to facilitate solutions within trial area. 2. Local Plan review developing recreational policy to support development which increases capacity of visitor infrastructure 3. Engage with and coordinate across Mayoral Combined Authorities to influence funding available in this area, particularly on transport. 4. Continue to engage in opportunities to develop access and travel including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop Park & Stride plans - Active Travel funding - Mini Switzerland 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scheduling follow up with officer group in D7 to update on actions. 2. Local Plan development to be completed by end 2026. 3. Meeting with EMCCA on transport to be rescheduled 4. Active Travel next 18 months 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Biannual gatherings of working group to monitor delivery of key actions 2. Meeting with PINs in April 26 	3	2	6	

Ref.	Risk title	Risk description <i>If x happens, y will result</i>	Type of risk			Link to NPMP Aim				Link to Authority Plan Objective								Year added to RR	Lead responsible officer	PDNPAs capacity to carry out mitigation actions
			Place	Delivery	Operations	Aim 1: Climate	Aim 2: Nature	Aim 3: Welcome	Aim 4: Community	Enabling delivery	Obj A: Planning	Obj B: Access	Obj C: People	Obj D: Finance	Obj E: Assets	Obj F: Governance	Obj G: IT & Perfor.			
15	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) - Peak Cluster CO₂ Pipeline	<p>If the proposal for two new CO₂ pipelines goes ahead, we are at risk of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harm to Special Quality features (in particular, landscape character, archeology, wildlife/nature and farming economy). - Impact on delivery of landscape and nature recovery targets, e.g. if pipeline impacts delivery areas funded by FIPL, PLTOF target areas. - Increase in future mineral extraction plans due to grounds for more sustainable extraction and production. <p>However, the potential benefit of the pipeline in climate change mitigation is a key consideration.</p>	X	X			X											24/25	Head of Planning & Conservation	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months
16	Private finance for landscape and nature recovery	<p>If we fail to engage with developing opportunities to access private finance for landscape and nature recovery by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exploring opportunities for PDNPA to sell credits and develop ourselves as a credible body - Developing a 'proof of concept' pilot project working collaboratively with land managers to access private finance at scale - Providing clear information to support land managers to engage in private finance opportunities <p>There are risks that we will not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access private funding required to deliver NPMP and EIP/TOF nature targets - Enable other land managers in PDNP to access funds to delivery nature recovery 	X	X			X											24/25	Head of Planning & Conservation	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months

Ref.	Risk title	Existing mitigation actions <i>If some or significant capacity to mitigate, otherwise record escalation actions</i>	Residual Likelihood	Residual Impact	Residual Risk rating	Further mitigation actions to be implemented <i>n/a if little or no mitigation capacity</i>	Timeline of actions	Monitoring & evaluation indicators	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target risk rating	Notes or comments
15	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) - Peak Cluster CO ₂ Pipeline	Continue positively engaging at the pre-application advice stage with a view to influence the development.	4	3	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make capacity available in the planning team (strategic planning manager role) to oversee such developments. 2. Once development consent order is received, we will write local impact report and consider location and method to avoid sensitive features and influence restoration work. 3. If proposal is extremely harmful, we may need to consider further action to effect outcomes e.g. LURA 4. Write a local impact report in response to development consent order 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongoing 2. Currently waiting for EIA screening opinion 3. Unknown/after the DCO is received 4. Unknown 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objective setting in Strategic Manager role 2. Full proposal expected later this year 	4	2	8	
16	Private finance for landscape and nature recovery	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishing a legal entity to deliver landscape recovery via private finance through the Morridge Hill County Landscape Recovery Round 2 Pilot Project as a proof of concept. 2. Developing landscape recovery for the farmer-led Peatland Farmers Group in the White Peak. 3. Agree terms of reference to become a BNG responsible body and practical implications for monitoring, fee setting etc 	3	4	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Working with National Park Partnership Private Finance Leads to increase knowledge and understanding of appropriate staff. 2. Share learning as models emerge via the Land Managers Forum. 3. Share learning across NPA Landscape Recovery Leads. 4. Retain insight from contacts at NPE 	Ongoing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ask Morridge Hill Project Manager 2. Currently inactive – review needed 3. Speak to Senior Nature Lead/Conservation Manager as responsible officers 4. Conversations with NPE staff 	2	4	8	

Ref.	Risk title	Risk description <i>If x happens, y will result</i>	Type of risk			Link to NPMP Aim				Link to Authority Plan Objective								Year added to RR	Lead responsible officer	PDNPAs capacity to carry out mitigation actions	
			Place	Delivery	Operations	Aim 1: Climate	Aim 2: Nature	Aim 3: Welcome	Aim 4: Community	Enabling delivery	Obj A: Planning	Obj B: Access	Obj C: People	Obj D: Finance	Obj E: Assets	Obj F: Governance	Obj G: IT & Perfor.				Obj H: Climate
17	Unfavourable outcome from new ELMS development	<p>If Environmental Land Management Subsidies (ELMS), including Sustainable Farming Incentive (SFI), Countryside Stewardship mid/higher-tier, capital works and Landscape Recovery, do not support the delivery of the NPMP and NRP because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 'pause' to SFI and Capital Grants due to the overcommitment of budget - The delay of the launch of the new Higher Tier - The lack of consistent/clear messaging about the 'direction of travel' for upland farming/land management - National Park Authorities not being given a role in delivering and attributing ELMS <p>There are risks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land management incentives which are counter to NPMP delivery resulting in possible increase in farming practices that are detrimental to the place (i.e. increased grazing intensity) - Land managers and farmers will not be able to access funding to deliver the NPMP and NPR resulting in reduced engagement with nature recovery from farmers / land managers - Lack of trust in Government being extended to PDNPA resulting in a deterioration of relationships with the farming community 	X	X		X	X	X	X										26/27	Head of Planning & Conservation	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months
18	Cyber incident	<p>If we don't adequately protect and prepare for Cyber Security threats there are risks of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of data - Loss of work time as the IT network is unavailable - Being held to ransom for data - Confidential information being made available in the public domain 		X	X	X	X	X	X										26/27	Head of Resources	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months

Ref.	Risk title	Existing mitigation actions <i>If some or significant capacity to mitigate, otherwise record escalation actions</i>	Residual Likelihood	Residual Impact	Residual Risk rating	Further mitigation actions to be implemented <i>n/a if little or no mitigation capacity</i>	Timeline of actions	Monitoring & evaluation indicators	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target risk rating	Notes or comments
17	Unfavourable outcome from new ELMS development	<p>1. Seeking opportunities to advocate for favourable ELMS development for the NP, in collaboration with other NP officers.</p> <p>2. Support farmers to enter ELMS which support delivery of NPMP/NRP through delivery of projects including the FiPL programme and Morridge Hill Country project</p>	3	4	12	<p>1. Explore opportunities for NPA to continue to delivery farm advice and how we prioritise resource for this.</p> <p>2. Engage in development of NPE policy paper on future of farming and land management in English NPs</p> <p>3. Use FiPL funding allocation for farmer collaboration to support farmers to advocate for positive outcomes of ELMS development</p> <p>4. Revive land manager forum to support collaboration between and support for farmers and land managers</p> <p>5. Look for funding opportunities to strategically deliver nature recovery at regional level in collaboration across LNRS bodies, e.g. through MCAs etc</p> <p>Further mitigation by management of risk 17 (private finance).</p>	<p>1. Review as new organisational structure settles in</p> <p>2. Proposed policy paper in 2026</p> <p>3. Current FiPL timeline</p> <p>4. Nothing planned but structure exists to revive so could be relatively quick</p> <p>5. Nothing planned</p>	3. FiPL reporting	3	3	9	
18	Cyber incident	<p>1. 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 and vulnerability scanning, 2 factor authentication</p> <p>2. Network Access Control (NAC); further 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.</p>	3	4	12	Ensure existing mitigation is complied with and up to date	Across service plan period 2026-27	Quarterly risk register updates	3	4	12	Risk remains high but is considered to be adequately managed.

Ref.	Risk title	Risk description <i>If x happens, y will result</i>	Type of risk			Link to NPMP Aim				Link to Authority Plan Objective								Year added to RR	Lead responsible officer	PDNPA capacity to carry out mitigation actions	
			Place	Delivery	Operations	Aim 1: Climate	Aim 2: Nature	Aim 3: Welcome	Aim 4: Community	Enabling delivery	Obj A: Planning	Obj B: Access	Obj C: People	Obj D: Finance	Obj E: Assets	Obj F: Governance	Obj G: IT & Perfor.				Obj H: Climate
19	DEFRA grant agreement and methods of funding	The 2026/27 Defra core grant remains the same as 2025/26, which is a reduction in grant in real terms. It is likely to be the same for 2027/28 and 2028/29. One off funding has been provided as capital funds, for access and for wildlife rich habitats. If this continues there are risks around: - Reduction in grant - Being unable to deliver National Park purposes, the Protected Landscapes Targets and Outcome Framework and Environmental Improvement Plan - Being unable to spend capital, access and wildlife rich habitats funds in required time - Being unable to undertake usual maintenance of assets, as the team are focussed on capital expenditure	X	X	X	X	X	X	X										24/25	Head of Resources	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months
20	Defra performance monitoring	If the Authority cannot evidence or meet the performance requirements of the targets and outcome framework and Environmental Improvement Plan then there is a risk to: - the National Park grant - reputation - access to additional DEFRA funding - access to external funding - overall NP Authorities and Teams over the long term		X	X	X	X	X	X										24/25	Head of Resources	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months
21	LURA 'duty to seek to further' risk to partnership working and NPMP delivery	If the LURA is not; - recognised as legislation intended (i.e. to further the purpose of designation) - fully embraced by relevant authorities (RAs) - supported by clear non-compliance consequences, then, there is a risk that RAs will seek to weaken the aspirations of the NPMP to make their delivery less onerous which could impact the successful delivery of the Plan. Internally, the additional work to deal with legislation raises resource/capacity concerns as the emerging workload is not supported by additional grant funding and any opportunities resulting from LURA will require additional / reallocation of capacity to realise and maintain over short timescales.	X			X	X	X	X								X		24/25	Head of Resources	Some capacity to carry out mitigation in next 12 months

Ref.	Risk title	Existing mitigation actions <i>If some or significant capacity to mitigate, otherwise record escalation actions</i>	Residual Likelihood	Residual Impact	Residual Risk rating	Further mitigation actions to be implemented <i>n/a if little or no mitigation capacity</i>	Timeline of actions	Monitoring & evaluation indicators	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target risk rating	Notes or comments
19	DEFRA grant agreement and methods of funding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous review of Medium term Financial Forecast, service budgets & organisation structure to ensure budgets balance Vacancy control remains in place to assess roles when they become vacant Regularly monitor inflation rates and interest costs. Prioritisation of spending one off capital funds Utilisation of reserves for Authority critical spend as required. Regularly monitor income targets to maximise income streams 	3	3	9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Develop 2026/27 capital projects to be funded by one off capital and monitor implementation on a monthly basis Continue to influence Defra and Government that National Park Authority funding needs to be adequate allocated in a way that enables work to be planned <p>Further mitigation by management of risk 16 (private finance) and risk 17 (ELMS development).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Developed by 30 April; Monitored across 2026/27 Across 2026/27 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring monthly by Finance Manager and Head of Assets and Enterprise All opportunities taken 	3	2	6	
20	Defra performance monitoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Peak District Strategy and Performance Team is part of a data checking group with reps from other NP which is proactively reviewing data for Defra and providing feedback. Reactive actions based on flow of information from DEFRA on the framework. 	3	4	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewing performance management of Authority Plan so it aligns to information Defra seek at the annual review S&P will use PLTOF to inform development of next NPMP in consultation with NE or guidance. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In place for annual review meeting in December 2026 Report to Members at May 2026 Authority along with NPMP AMR. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly NPMP Delivery Group with partner delivery teams to maintain collaboration and momentum. 	3	3	9	
21	LURA 'duty to seek to further' risk to partnership working and NPMP delivery	<p>Before update on regulations is shared, we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work to forge closer working relationships with all relevant authorities through NPMP Partnership Group. Reactively manage arising tensions where policy overlap occurs (e.g. MCA plans). Develop awareness on best practise and legal precedent from arising examples in other PLs. 	5	3	15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Once update on ministerial regulations is received, we will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek internal legal advice on how best to implement changes to duty across Authority. Ensure we comply with DEFRA guidance on the 'seek to further' duty once published. CEO to make submission to Campaign for National Parks evidence gathering process for positive cases. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Awaiting update 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> CEO part of the NP comms group. Annual NPMP Partnership Group with senior leaders of RAs to maintain collaboration and momentum. Campaign for National Parks evidence gathering process. 	5	3	15	Currently risk is not being downwardly managed because regulations have not been received so further actions are not yet possible.