

Risk, Audit and Governance Committee

23 July 2025

Agenda item number 11

Risk Management Policy

Report by Head of Governance

Summary

The Authority's Risk Management Policy has been reviewed and updated

Recommendation

The Risk Management Policy and Risk Appetite Statement is recommended to the Broads Authority for adoption.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Broads Authority has a Risk Management Policy (RMP) setting out the rules and standards for corporate and operational risk management, which is typically scheduled to be reviewed and updated every two years. The RMP guides staff in monitoring and managing risk on a day-to-day basis when planning or implementing activities.
- 1.2. This RMP was last updated on 15 March 2024 and not scheduled to be updated until 2026. However, since adoption of the Policy, the TIAA has undertaken an Assurance Review of Corporate Governance and Risk Management in February 2025. The details of which can be found under agenda item 13, Implementation of internal audit recommendations and summary of progress. This includes recommended changes to the RMP for the Risk, Audit and Governance Committee to consider and endorse on 23 July 2025, and for the Broads Authority to consider for adoption on 25 July 2025.

2. Updated Policy

- 2.1. The Management Team recently reviewed the TIAA recommendations and have incorporated changes into the revised RMP:
- 2.2. The revised policy includes the following recommended changes:
 - to include a risk appetite statement,
 - a process for identifying risk appetite,
 - add details on the process for the review of low scoring, high frequency risks, and high scoring low frequency risks and closing risks,

- resourcing for the day-to-day co-ordination of risk management processes,
- a new process (Risk Proforma) is now available on SharePoint for capturing new risks, and
- Corporate Risk Register should consider additional information such as controls, assurance, gaps, deadlines, owners and targets in line with risk appetite.

2.3. A copy of the updated policy (with tracked changes) is attached at Appendix 1.

3. Options considered

3.1. As the Corporate Risk Register is updated every six months, we took the opportunity to work with the MT to revise the RMP, create the Risk Appetite Statement and Corporate Risk Register all at the same time to align to the audit recommendations. The streamlined process allows the revised RMP to be reviewed and adopted by the members first. Following this, the Authority can present the most current risks immediately, rather than waiting another six months to implement the policy.

3.2. When reviewing the Risk Appetite Statements at other councils, we identified some had included their statement in the policy and others treated the risk appetite statement as a separate document. Given that the Broads Authority RMP is intended to be updated every two years and the Risk Appetite Statement is intended to be a 'living document', the Authority presents our statement as an appendix to the RMP. This approach allows the statement to be updated as needed while protecting the overall integrity of the policy.

3.3. The policy terminology and process align to that being used in the Government's Orange Book on the Management of Risk – Principles and Concepts 2023.

4. Conclusion

4.1. Committee Members are asked to review and endorse the revised Risk Management Policy and Risk Appetite Statement for the Broads Authority to consider.

4.2. The outstanding action from the TIAA Assurance Report requires the Standards Committee to discuss changes to the Code of Conduct regarding member attendance. To ensure these infrequent committee meetings are effective, the TIAA recommendation will be considered after the Government completes its review of the Code of Conduct.

Author: Rob Thomas

Date of report: 08 July 2025

[Broads Plan](#) strategic objectives: Themes A, B, C, D, E and F

Appendix 1 – [Risk Management Policy 2025](#)

Risk management policy

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This document sets out the Broads Authority's rules and standards for managing strategic and operational risk, and guides staff in assessing, monitoring and managing risk on a day-to-day basis.

2. Defining risk

- 2.1. In this context, 'risk' refers to an uncertain event, or set of events, which may affect the Authority's ability to operate its business or achieve its aims and objectives. An 'uncertain event' is one that might happen, rather than one that will definitely happen or is happening already.
- 2.2. Each risk has the key dimensions of 'likelihood' and 'severity'. Likelihood is the probability the event will happen, while severity is the impact the event would have if it happened.

3. Managing risk

- 3.1. The Authority must be able to consider the risks that may threaten or affect the running of its business and delivery of its aims and objectives, and make sure it has controls and mitigation measures in place to minimise those risks.
- 3.2. The international standard for risk management (ISO 31000) sets out useful guidance on risk management, emphasising that it should be integral to all processes and for all staff. Good principles for managing risk are that:
 - It needs to be systematic, structured and timely.
 - It is based on the best available information, including historical data, stakeholder and customer feedback, forecasting and expert judgment. It should be tailored to the organisation's internal and external context and risk profile.
 - It takes human and cultural factors into account, recognising that people's capabilities, behaviours and intentions can either help or hinder the organisation's objectives.
 - It is transparent and inclusive, needing the timely and appropriate involvement of stakeholders and decision makers at each stage, and ensuring proper representation of all those affected.
 - It needs to be iterative, dynamic and responsive to change, taking account of changes in the internal and external environment.
 - It needs to demonstrate continuous improvement.

3.3. Not having risk management procedures in place could result in a failure to identify and monitor risks, or apply appropriate and proportionate mitigation measures. It is also important to bear in mind:

- Our stakeholder and public expectations that we manage risk effectively;
- the demands of legislation and external bodies, such as regulators and auditors;
- the value of risk management in making informed decisions about the effective use of capital and resources, and in reducing costly mistakes or firefighting;
- the desire to make the organisation a better and safer place to work, and for others to work with.

4. Roles and responsibilities

Risk, Audit and Governance Committee

4.1. The Risk, Audit and Governance Committee oversees the development and operation of risk management at a strategic level, and regularly reviews the Corporate Risk Register. The Committee does not review the Directorate Risk Registers.

Management Team

4.2. Management Team (MT) is responsible for monitoring and managing risk across the organisation and making sure we have effective policies and procedures in place. MT oversees the review of the Risk Management Policy and Corporate Risk Register, with support from the Senior Governance Officer. Any significant corporate issues relating to risk management are brought to the Risk, Audit and Governance Committee's attention.

Directors

4.3. Directors are responsible for making sure risk management is embedded into the work of their Directorates, that risk owners and all other staff are aware of its importance, and that appropriate mitigation measures are in place. Directors are also responsible for their Directorate Risk Registers, which focus on day-to-day operational activities. They will bring MT's attention to any concerns or instances where ineffective risk management is impacting on the Authority's business or the achievement of its key aims and objectives.

Risk owners

4.4. Risk owners are responsible for monitoring and managing their assigned risks on a day-to-day basis. They will review their risks at least every six months and make sure the registers are updated accordingly. Risk owners will bring their Director's attention to any concerns or instances where ineffective risk management may be impacting on the Authority's business or the achievement of its key aims and objectives.

Other staff

- 4.5. Risk management is not a specialist activity or only for nominated 'risk owners'. It is a core part of everyone's job and should be embedded throughout the organisation and its activities. A risk management assessment should be part of planning and implementing all activities, with risks identified and mitigation measures put in place.

5. Risk Registers

Types of register

- 5.1. The Authority maintains a strategic Corporate Risk Register. This is supported by operational Risk Registers for its Strategic Services Directorate, Operations Directorate and Finance & Support Services Directorate.
- 5.2. The **Corporate Risk Register** sets out the 'across the board' risks that could threaten the Authority's core business and the way it operates.
- 5.3. **Directorate Risk Registers** identify risks that could threaten day-to-day operational activities. The Registers are maintained by each Director. Where a new risk identified within a Directorate has a revised risk score above 16 (high risk), it will automatically be referred to the Corporate Risk Register for monitoring by the Risk, Audit and Governance Committee and MT. If new mitigation measures put in place then reduce the risk's score to below 16 (moderate to low risk), the risk will be removed from the Corporate Risk Register, but retained on the Directorate register, unless considered to be a corporate risk.
- 5.4. MT has overall responsibility for the registers, and risk owners are responsible for reviewing and updating their individual risks. Every risk should be reviewed before every Risk, Audit and Governance Committee meeting, or earlier where there is a significant change in circumstances, with a note in the register of the date the risk was last reviewed.

Format

- 5.5. All registers have the following information:
 - Area impacted by the risk (people, finance, performance, reputation or assets)
 - Risk name and description
 - Date entered on risk register
 - Initial risk scores (likelihood and severity)
 - Tasks to mitigate the risk (controls/safeguards/precautions)
 - Revised risk scores (likelihood and severity)
 - Additional actions required
 - Risk owner (by job title)

6. Assessing risk tolerance levels

- 6.1. The Authority assesses risk against the matrix and scoring descriptions in Tables 1 to 4. For each risk, the dimension scores of **likelihood** and **severity** are multiplied to produce an **initial risk score**. When mitigation measures are identified, the two dimensions are scored and multiplied again to produce a **revised risk score**. This score is categorised as being a low, medium or high **level of tolerance**.

Table 1

Risk scores matrix

Likelihood	5	5	10	15	20	25
	4	4	8	12	16	20
	3	3	6	9	12	15
	2	2	4	6	8	10
	1	1	2	3	4	5
		1	2	3	4	5
Severity						

Table 2

Likelihood definitions

Rating	Definition	Value
Highly likely	The event is expected to occur	5
Probable	The event will probably occur	4
Possible	The event may occur at some time	3
Unlikely	The event is not expected to occur in normal circumstances	2
Rare	The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances	1

Table 3

Severity definitions

Schedule	Cost	Performance and quality	Value
<2 weeks delay	<1% of budget	Cosmetic impact only	1 Insignificant
2 weeks to 1 month's delay	1%-<2%	Some minor elements of objectives affected	2 Minor
1 month to <2 months delay	2%-<8%	Significant areas of some objectives affected	3 Moderate
2 months to <4 months delay	8%-<12%	Wide area impact on some objectives	4 Major

Schedule	Cost	Performance and quality	Value
>4 months delay	>12% of budget	Significant failure resulting in the project not meeting its objectives	5 Extreme

Table 4

Risk level tolerance

Total score	Risk treatment
High 16-25 Red risk	Risks are so significant that risk treatment is mandatory
Medium 6-15 Amber risk	Risks require a cost benefit analysis to determine the most appropriate treatment
Low 1-5 Green risk	Risks can be regarded as negligible, or so small that no risk treatment is required

- 6.2. When a potential new action or objective is assessed for risk, MT will review the revised risk score suggested by the risk owner to make sure it is robust and reasonable.
- 6.3. Where a risk score is above the tolerance level of 16 (high risk), the Chief Executive will immediately bring the risk to the attention of the Chair of the Authority and the Chair of the Risk, Audit and Governance Committee.

7. Risk management tools

Risk identification

- 7.1. Identifying a new risk can happen at any time, but is most likely:
- when the Authority takes on a new responsibility, scheme or project;
 - as a result of an unforeseen incident or event; or
 - as part of the annual review of risks by MT or Directorate teams.
- 7.2. A number of tools can help with risk identification, including those outlined below.
- PESTLE looks at factors outside the organisation that can influence it, and stands for:
- Political – government policy and stability
 - Economic – employment rates, material costs and interest/exchange rates
 - Social – demographics, cultural trends and changes in lifestyle
 - Technology – innovation and development
 - Legal – employment, health and safety legislation and regulations
 - Environmental – climate, carbon footprint, sustainability, recycling, waste disposal

APRICOT looks at factors within the organisation that may be affected, and stands for:

- Assets – land, buildings, contents, materials and equipment
- People – safe working systems, health and welfare
- Reputation – poor media coverage, political embarrassment
- Information – IT failures
- Continuity of Operations – failure to deliver or poor service
- Targets – failure to meet strategic objectives and achieve value for money

7.3. The staff intranet includes a section on risk management and safety which includes a Risk Assessment Template for identifying new risks.

Risk mitigation

7.4. Once a risk is identified, mitigation measures need to be considered. Initially, this can be defined simply as ‘tolerate, transfer, treat or terminate’.

7.5. A new risk should be reported to the appropriate Director as soon as possible by any officer so it can be entered in the relevant Directorate Risk Register. The Director will then assess whether the risk should be entered in the Corporate Risk Register.

7.6. When a new corporate risk is identified, MT will assess the risk appetite, mitigating measures in place or proposed, and whether these will manage the risk to ‘as low as reasonably practicable’. This process looks at whether the likelihood and severity of the risk is addressed adequately, and whether the Authority needs to enter into the risk, assuming it is optional, bearing in mind how the activity itself will further the Authority’s objectives and the level of risk associated with it.

Risk appetite

7.7. The Broads Authority’s “risk appetite” is the amount of risk the organisation is willing to accept in the pursuit of its long-term objectives.

7.8. The overall risk appetite is set by the MT and is reviewed periodically in Appendix 1. This provides guidance to everyone on acceptable levels of risk taking, to encourage a consistent approach to risk management.

7.9. The following risk appetite definitions should be used to assess the overall Risk Appetite Statement and against each of the risks in the Directorate Risk Register as being ‘averse’, ‘minimal’, ‘cautious’, ‘open’ and ‘eager’.

7.10. Failure to manage risks in any of these categories may lead to financial, reputational, legal, regulatory, safety, security, environmental, employee, customer and operational consequences.

Risk Appetite Statement

~~7.6.~~7.11. The Risk Appetite Statement is a standalone document, in appendix 1, that provides an overall view of risk appetite across the Broads Authority. It is considered a "live document" and will be updated periodically by the MT.

8. Review timetable

8.1. In addition to the regular review by risk owners, MT will review the ~~Corporate~~-Risk Registers regularly to consider whether:

- the identified risks are appropriate and up-to-date;
- the actions, targets, ~~and~~ controls and assurances in place are adequate and appropriate;
- establishing deadlines for implementing actions;
- allocating owners to each risk;
- allocating the appropriate resources to coordinate and action;
- the revised risk score is appropriate;
- any additional action is needed to help mitigate the risk;
- any new risks should be added to the Register, either for new activities or for existing activities where the risk level may have increased;
- to review low scoring but high frequent risks and high scoring but low frequent risks; and
- to close risks with a score of 16 or less unless requested by members to remain on the registers.

8.2. The Corporate Risk Register will be reviewed at every meeting of the Risk, Audit and Governance Committee. Where a risk score has increased, the reasons for the change will be set out.

Policy updated: March 2024

Next update due: March 2026

Contact officer: Head of Governance ~~Senior Governance Officer~~

Appendix 1: Broads Authority's Risk Appetite Statement 2025

Risk Appetite Statement

June 2025

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Broads Authority Risk Appetite	3
3. Broads Authority Risk Appetite by Category	4
4. Terminology and Definitions	17

1. Introduction

The Vision for the Broads National Park is based on Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA's) vision for protected landscapes:

'A coherent national network of beautiful, nature-rich spaces that all parts of society can easily access and enjoy. Protected landscapes will support thriving local communities and economies, improve our public health and wellbeing, drive forward nature recovery, and build our resilience to climate change.'

The Broads Authority is unique in that it is also responsible for water navigation within the National Park.

The Broads Authority has a duty to manage the Broads for the following three purposes:

- Conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Broads;
- Promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Broads by the public; and
- Protecting the interests of navigation.

The Broads Plan 2022- 2027 has outlined six themes / objectives with ambitious plans to deliver:

- THEME A: Responding to Climate Change and Flood Risk
- THEME B: Improving Landscaping for Biodiversity and Agriculture
- THEME C: Maintaining and Enhancing the Navigation
- THEME D: Protecting Landscaping Character and the Historic Environment
- THEME E: Promoting Understanding and Enjoyment
- THEME F: Connecting and Inspiring Communities

The Broads Authority's risk appetite, outlined in our Risk Management Policy, is the amount of risk the organisation is willing to accept in the pursuit of these objectives. The Government has stated:

"Public Sector organisations cannot be risk averse and be successful. Risk is inherent in everything we do to deliver high-quality services. Effective and meaningful risk management in government remains as important as ever in taking a balanced view to managing opportunity and risk. It must be an integral part of informed decision-making..."
(Government's Orange Book).

While certain parts of the Broads Authority operate within strict statutory or professional frameworks, the inherent nature of working outdoors, particularly in a National Park and

near water, involves tasks that carry risk. However, many of these risks can be measured and managed effectively to achieve our objectives.

2. Broads Authority Risk Appetite

The Broads Authority overall risk appetite is minimal and work towards very safe business delivery options that have a low degree of inherent risk.

As you will see in the table below there are some parts of the Authority that are more cautious than others in delivering the organisations objectives.

3. Broads Authority Risk Appetite by Category

The following table assesses risk categories against the risk appetite methodology.

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
Strategic			Planning	Strategy & Projects		<p>We are mindful of the risks relating to Planning and the statutory requirements from central government in relation to the natural and built environment. We have a cautious appetite to risk to preparing Planning Policy. In terms of Supplementary Planning Documents used to advise the public of best practice we also have a cautious approach.</p> <p>Externally funded projects inherently carry risk. Test and trial, discovery and innovation projects should be more open to project level risks. These projects have risk registers with identified mitigations to help reduce risks and impacts. Therefore, we are taking an open approach, while considering the impacts of risk 9 in our Corporate Risk Register (CRR).</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
Governance		Governance				<p>We are mindful of the risks associated with our governance and the potential for harmful actions to undermine public confidence in the Broads Authority as outlined in CRR Risk 2. We recognise our statutory responsibilities in delivering plans, priorities, decision-making, accountability and performance.</p> <p>We actively seek new ways of working to support members in making more efficient and effective decisions. Consequently, we strive for safe business delivery options with a low degree of inherent risk.</p>
Operations Project/Programme Commercial		Construction Maintenance & Ecology Rangers Safety Planning	Construction Maintenance & Ecology Rangers			<p>We are aware of the risk that disruption to key project partners could have on delivering our objectives as outlined in CRR Risk 9. We work collaboratively between internal teams (ecology, navigation, access) and external partners (landowners, Non-Government Organisations, Natural England, Environment Agency) to jointly plan our work to minimise disruption and active implementation of the PRINCE2 project management framework. We therefore take</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
						<p>a cautious approach to implementing our programme.</p> <p>We are aware of safety-related incidents from operational works could result in death or serious injury as outlined in CRR Risk 7. We follow operational safety assurance with comprehensive Provision and Use of Work Equipment Regulations / Lifting Operations and Lifting Equipment Regulations compliance checks; staff and contractor competence assessments; specific risk assessments for all works and equipment use. We therefore take a minimal risk approach to this work.</p> <p>Our Ranger Services involves approaching public to challenge and change behaviour. This is important for the safety of the person being spoken to and sometimes others. The unknown is how the person will react to the approach. There are several mitigations and procedures in place to ensure the Ranger are safe while doing this but ultimately depends on the dynamic risk assessment of the Ranger at the time. Therefore, our approach to this work is cautious.</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
						<p>Rangers carry out regular, routine checks on all infrastructure, like the safety of moorings and navigation areas, to ensure the risk to boaters navigating is minimised. Given the risk associated to this work we take a minimal approach.</p> <p>The Construction, Maintenance and Ecology Team undertake regular reviews and implementation of safe management systems and safe systems of work for all relevant work processes to prevent incidents and accidents. Effective monitoring of incidents, accidents, associated hazards and relevant data in development of these systems. Therefore, our approach to this work is minimal.</p> <p>Planning risks arising from expectations of public in requesting information and professional advice in relation to development and the need for planning permission. Similarly works to listed buildings and trees, Section 106 agreements, Section 33 planning zones, Section 111 functional duties and unilateral agreements. We therefore take a minimal approach to</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
						processing all types of applications and agreements.
Legal	Planning	Construction Maintenance & Ecology Rangers				<p>We are mindful of the risks associated with failing to meet our environmental responsibilities, which could undermine public trust in the Broads Authority and compromise our statutory purposes (CRR Risk 6). We recognise our legal obligations in areas such as biodiversity net gain, protected species, and environmental permitting. To ensure compliance, we embed environmental regulations into all operational activities through our internal ecology team. We maintain regular engagement with the Environment Agency and Natural England. We conduct routine audits to monitor performance and identify areas for improvement. We are committed to continuous improvement and seek innovative, minimal approaches to delivering our environmental duties effectively and transparently.</p> <p>Risks arise from processing all types of planning applications and legal agreements. Managing public expectations when people</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
						<p>request information and professional advice about development and whether planning permission is needed. Handling complaints and unauthorised works can lead to enforcement actions or even court proceedings, which carry higher risks. We only pursue prosecutions when there is strong, clear evidence and Byelaw offences are clearly established. As a result, our approach to enforcement is averse.</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
Property		Construction Maintenance & Ecology				We recognise the critical importance of maintaining the integrity and safety of our physical assets, including plant, vessels, depots, and navigation structures, in line with our statutory responsibilities (CRR Risk 3). To mitigate risks, we implement robust maintenance schedules, condition monitoring, and environmental safeguards to prevent pollution or degradation during operational works. These measures are essential to ensure safe, compliant and sustainable service delivery. We are aware of the potential risks arising from asset deficiencies or ineffective safety management, which could result in non-compliance, harm to employees, contractors, service users, or the public. Therefore, our approach is minimal.
Financial	Finance	Construction Maintenance & Ecology				We are aware of the risks associated with reduced income and increasing costs, which may impact our ability to deliver statutory functions and Broads Plan objectives (CRR Risk 4). To manage these pressures, we balance in-house delivery with external contracting, optimise plant deployment, and actively seek external funding through

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
						<p>grants and partnerships. We also recognise that poor or incomplete safety processes can lead to incidents, staff absence, public claims, and costly legal proceedings. Therefore, Construction and Maintenance & Ecology take a minimal approach to finance, with a strong focus on safe, efficient, and low-risk delivery.</p> <p>We are aware there are risks arising from not managing finances in accordance with requirements and financial constraints resulting in poor returns from investments, failure to manage assets/liabilities or to obtain value for money from the resources deployed, and/or non-compliant financial reporting. Currently the risk appetite for investments is risk averse and is included as part of the annual Capital, Treasury and Investment strategy. Poor management of funds can lead to governance, legal and reputational damage.</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
People		Our people				<p>People are critical to everything we do. There are lots of different career, within the varied work of the Authority, from Rangers and Ecologists to Press, Finance and Planning Officers. We are aware of the impact risk have on our people to meet our objectives. This includes the loss of key staff (CRR Risk 1), large-scale public health crisis (CRR Risk 5) and Safety-related incidents (operational works) resulting in death or serious injury (CRR Risk 7). We undertake succession planning and cross-cutting training across 40 staff and apprentices to mitigate loss of expertise. We undertake operational safety assurance to make our staff, volunteers and visitors safe. We follow relevant employment legislation and policies to support our people and deliver performance. Therefore, we take a minimal approach to risk appetite with people.</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
Technology	Technology					<p>We are aware of risks arising from technology not delivering the expected services due to inadequate or deficient system/process development and performance or inadequate resilience.</p> <p>The Authority actively seeks to deploy systems that are up to date, deliver resilience and ease of use while being secure and relevant to the task in hand. We therefore adopt an adverse stance towards technology.</p>
Information	Technology					<p>We are aware of the risks arising from a failure to produce robust, suitable and appropriate data/information and to exploit data/information to its full potential. This is outlined in our CRR Risk 10. Implementation of secure GDPR compliant data systems is mandatory. The Authority is Cyber aware and undertakes vulnerability testing on a regular basis. We therefore adopt an adverse stance towards information management.</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
Security	Technology					<p>We are aware of the risks arising from a failure to prevent unauthorised and/or inappropriate access to key government systems and assets, including people, platforms, information and resources. This encompasses the subset of cyber security. This is a key risk for our organisation as discussed in CRR Risk 11.</p> <p>Both on premise and cloud solutions are locked down to allow only authorised access. Wherever possible the Authority will implement multi factor authentication to verify user access. We therefore adopt an adverse stance towards security.</p>
Reputational		Construction Maintenance & Ecology				<p>The Authority recognises the need for transparency and honesty in all circumstances including, but not limited to decision making, adverse events or service failures. We actively seek to foster positive relationships with media organisations while challenging inaccurate or unbalanced media coverage.</p> <p>We seek to promote a positive reputation and minimise the risk of incidents which could lead to a negative perception of the</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
						<p>organisation and the appeal of the area. The Authority seeks to engage positively and proactively with media, partners and stakeholders and through its own communication channels.</p> <p>The Authority promotes safe practices regarding boating and water safety throughout a range of communications and interactions to minimise the possibility of accidents.</p> <p>Our communication activity is underpinned with a suite of policy documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications and Branding Approach (2022) • Emergency Communications Plan (2022) • Social Media Guidance (2017) • Customer Service Standards (2020) • Branding guidelines • Accessibility guidelines and templates <p>Development, regular review and implementation of processes and policies that allow safe management of the Broads area. The Authority strives to effectively discharge its responsibilities for health and safety, protecting its staff and volunteers,</p>

Risk Category	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager	Comments
						visitors, and users of the waterways. Good and viable communication of these and them being understood and seen to be effective is highly linked to a positive reputation.

4. Terminology and Definitions

The following table provides the definitions of each appetite and level of acceptable risk.

Descriptions come from the Government [Risk Appetite Guidance Note August 2021](#).

Appetite	Definitions	Level of Acceptable Risk
Averse	Avoidance of risk and uncertainty in achievement of key deliverables or initiatives is key objective. Activities undertaken will only be those considered to carry virtually no inherent risk.	None
Minimal	Preference for very safe business delivery options that have a low degree of inherent risk with the potential for benefit/return not a key driver. Activities will only be undertaken where they have a low degree of inherent risk.	Low
Cautious	Preference for safe options that have low degree of inherent risk and only limited potential for benefit. Willing to tolerate a degree of risk in selecting which activities to undertake to achieve key deliverables or initiatives, where we have identified scope to achieve significant benefit and/or realise an opportunity. Activities undertaken may carry a high degree of inherent risk that is deemed controllable to a large extent.	Medium
Open	Willing to consider all options and choose one most likely to result in successful delivery while providing an acceptable level of benefit. Seek to achieve a balance between a high likelihood of successful delivery and a high degree of benefit and value for money. Activities themselves may potentially carry, or contribute to, a high degree of residual risk.	High
Eager	Eager to be innovative and to choose options based on maximising opportunities and potential higher benefit even if those activities carry a very high residual risk.	Very High

The following table provides a definition of each recommended risk category.

Recommended risk categories and definitions are set out on the [Government's Orange Book](#).

Risk Category	Definition
Governance	Risks arising from identifying and pursuing a strategy, which is poorly defined, is based on flawed or inaccurate data or fails to support the delivery of commitments, plans or objectives due to a changing macro-environment (e.g. political, economic, social, technological, environment and legislative change)
Operations	Risks arising from inadequate, poorly designed or ineffective/inefficient internal processes resulting in fraud, error, impaired customer service (quality and/or quantity of service), non-compliance and/or poor value for money
Legal	Risks arising from a defective transaction, a claim being made (including a defence to a claim or a counterclaim) or some other legal event occurring that results in a liability or other loss, or a failure to take appropriate measures to meet legal or regulatory requirements or to protect assets (for example, intellectual property).
Property	Risks arising from property deficiencies or poorly designed or ineffective/ inefficient safety management resulting in non-compliance and/or harm and suffering to employees, contractors, service users or the public.
Financial	Risks arising from not managing finances in accordance with requirements and financial constraints resulting in poor returns from investments, failure to manage assets/liabilities or to obtain value for money from the resources deployed, and/or non-compliant financial reporting
Commercial	Risks arising from weaknesses in the management of commercial partnerships, supply chains and contractual requirements, resulting in poor performance, inefficiency, poor value for money, fraud, and /or failure to meet business requirements/objectives

Risk Category	Definition
People	Risks arising from ineffective leadership and engagement, suboptimal culture, inappropriate behaviours, the unavailability of sufficient capacity and capability, Page 16 industrial action and/or non-compliance with relevant employment legislation/HR policies resulting in negative impact on performance.
Technology	Risks arising from technology not delivering the expected services due to inadequate or deficient system/process development and performance or inadequate resilience.
Information	Risks arising from a failure to produce robust, suitable and appropriate data/information and to exploit data/information to its full potential.
Security	Risks arising from a failure to prevent unauthorised and/or inappropriate access to key government systems and assets, including people, platforms, information and resources. This encompasses the subset of cyber security.
Project/Programme	Risks that change programmes and projects are not aligned with strategic priorities and do not successfully and safely deliver requirements and intended benefits to time, cost and quality.
Reputational	Risks arising from adverse events, including ethical violations, a lack of sustainability, systemic or repeated failures or poor quality or a lack of innovation, leading to damages to reputation and or destruction of trust and relations