ID Concern [reg.]	Category / Element	Risk Short Title	Description	Desired Outcome	Current Situation	Proposed Strategy	Risk (three-part) Statement			Current Risk			Response	Mitigating Action / Response						Manageability	Residual Risk	Risk Owner	Target Review Date	Close Date	Last Review Date / Notes
							Cause	Risk Event [uncertainty]	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score (PxI)		ID	Action	Action Owner	Due Date	Close Date							
C00494	R3 Regulations	Donations compliance checks (PPERA eligibility + thresholds)	Restore Britain states that donations over £500 require the donor to be on the UK electoral register (excluding Channel Islands and Isle of Man), and that donations above a stated annual threshold must be reported to the Electoral Commission (with donor name and value published). This creates a compliance-critical workflow for eligibility verification, annual aggregation, accept/refuse decisions, and record keeping. (Source: Restore Britain Join Us)	Every donation is screened, accepted/refused correctly, aggregated accurately across the year, and reported when required, supported by an auditable record. **Could Go Wrong?** Impermissible donations are accepted, reporting triggers are missed, donor comms are inconsistent, and the party faces regulatory action and reputational damage.	Donation/membership pages already publish the rules and reserve the right not to accept donations. The operational controls and audit trail still need to be formalised as a consistent system.	Define a donations SOP covering eligibility checks, aggregation logic, evidence required, refusal/refund handling, escalation, and reporting cadence; implement an internal donations register plus a monthly compliance review.	Rapid early growth plus multiple donation routes without a single controlled compliance workflow.	A donation crosses eligibility/threshold rules and is mishandled or not reported.	Regulatory breach, forced remediation, and loss of public trust.	3	4 H-1 C-1 Q-1 S-1	12	Mitigate	#1	Make a Donations Code of Practice.	Winter, David	28Apr26	Open	3	8	Winter, David	10Oct26	Open	28Feb26
														#2	Make an interational Donations register.	Winter, David	28Apr26	Open						
														#3	Schedule a monthly compliance review.	Winter, David	28Apr26	Open						
C00495	M3 Communication	Membership acceptance/termination decisions lack consistent governance	Restore Britain terms describe eligibility and the right to refuse or terminate membership, and that some terms may be provisional pending registration updates. This requires a clear decision framework: criteria, evidence, escalation, and consistent communications across local/national contexts. (Source: Restore Britain Terms & Conditions)	Membership decisions are consistent, fair, explainable, and documented while protecting the organisation. **Could Go Wrong?** Inconsistent refusals/terminations trigger disputes, reputational harm, and internal friction; decisions become person-dependent.	Rules exist in published terms; the governance mechanism (decision rights, records, comms templates, and review) is not yet evidenced as a mature system.	Define membership decision rights, criteria, escalation routes, and comms templates; create a membership decisions log and periodic review routine.	Early-stage operations, limited capacity, and unclear decision rights.	A contentious membership case is handled inconsistently.	Loss of confidence among members/supporters and increased operational load.	3	3 H-1 C-1 Q-1 S-1	9	Mitigate						5	6	Winter, David		Open	28Feb26
C00496	C3 Finance / Funding	Auto-renewal, cancellation, and refund handling creates avoidable disputes	Restore Britain terms describe membership auto-renewal and how cancellation can be made (including by contacting the bank), and that fees are generally non-refundable except where an application is rejected. This requires controlled steps for cancellations, confirmations, edge cases, and complaints handling. (Source: Restore Britain Terms & Conditions)	Members can cancel cleanly with clear confirmation, and finance records reconcile without recurring disputes. **Could Go Wrong?** Members believe they cancelled but renewals continue; inconsistent handling leads to chargebacks, complaints, and reputational damage.	The terms define the rule; operational steps, SLAs, tracking, and evidence trail need to be implemented and monitored.	Create a renewal/cancellation SOP plus standard response templates; implement weekly reconciliation of cancellations vs payment platform status.	Mixed cancellation routes (email + bank) without a single reconciliation loop.	A cancellation request is missed or not actioned in time.	Chargebacks, complaints, and loss of goodwill.	3	3 H-1 C-1 Q-1 S-1	9	Mitigate	#1	Make a renewal/cancellation Scope of Practice	Winter, David	28Apr26	Open	5	6	Winter, David	19Dec26	Open	28Feb26
														#2	Weekly reconciliation of subscriptions.	Winter, David	28Apr26	Open						
C00497	M2 Project Organisation	Personal data governance across NationBuilder and third parties is a hotspot	Restore Britain's privacy documentation describes use of NationBuilder for membership management and sharing with payment processors and other service providers. This creates a governance requirement for a controlled data map, consent/lawful basis handling, processor agreements, DSAR workflows, and a single operational owner. (Source: Restore Britain Privacy Policy)	Clear, compliant data handling across all systems with documented lawful basis, consent capture where needed, and audit-ready records. **Could Go Wrong?** Unclear data flows or missing consents lead to GDPR breaches, complaints, and operational disruption.	High-level commitments exist in the published policy; internal operational controls and evidence (registers, owners, checks) must be established.	Produce a data processing map (systems, fields, purposes, lawful basis); assign a data owner; implement DSAR/erasure workflows and periodic supplier compliance checks.	Multiple platforms plus evolving features (membership, donations, comms, participation tools).	A data subject request or incident occurs without a proven internal workflow.	Regulatory exposure and reduced member confidence.	3	3 H-1 C-1 Q-1 S-1	9	Mitigate	#1	Make a data processing map with compliance checks	Winter, David	28Apr26	Open	3	6	Winter, David	17Oct26	Open	28Feb26
C00498	M3 Communication	Cookie consent and tracking controls may not match stated policy	Restore Britain's privacy documentation references cookie categories (e.g., essential/analytics/marketing) and implies a need for clear cookie-policy alignment and consent controls. This creates a requirement to validate consent mechanisms, documentation completeness, and ongoing change control. (Source: Restore Britain Privacy Policy)	Cookie usage is transparent, consent-managed, and evidenced (banner, preferences, records, and policy alignment). **Could Go Wrong?** Tracking runs without appropriate consent capture or policy alignment, leading to complaints and reputational damage.	Policy outlines intent; implementation and completeness (banner behaviour, documentation, governance checks) must be validated and maintained.	Confirm cookie banner behaviour; complete cookie documentation; implement periodic checks and release governance for policy/tech changes.	Website tooling defaults plus fast publication cycles.	Tracking runs without appropriate consent capture or clear disclosure.	Compliance risk and loss of trust.	3	3 H-1 C-1 Q-3 S-1	9	Mitigate	#1	Implement cookie handling web logic.	Winter, David	29Apr26	Open	3	6	Winter, David	11Jul26	Open	28Feb26

ID Concern [reg.]	Category / Element	Risk Short Title	Description	Desired Outcome	Current Situation	Proposed Strategy	Risk (three-part) Statement — Cause	Risk Event [uncertainty]	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score (PxI)	Response	ID	Action	Action Owner	Due Date	Close Date	Manageability	Residual Risk	Risk Owner	Target Review Date	Close Date	Last Review Date / Notes
C00499	M3 Communication	Whistleblowing channel misuse and unsafe submissions	Restore Britain publishes a tiered whistleblowing approach (low sensitivity via submission link; medium via Signal; high via an Onion address) and warns against uploading confidential/personal/classified documents via the low-sensitivity route. This requires strong intake controls, user guidance, and disciplined internal handling. (Source: Restore Britain Whistleblowing)	Submissions arrive through appropriate channels and are processed safely, minimising risk to sources and the organisation. **Could Go Wrong?** A whistleblower submits high-risk material through an unsafe channel; identity is exposed; material is mishandled.	Public guidance exists; internal triage, staff training, evidence handling SOPs, and escalation points must be operationalised.	Implement intake triage and channel-correction scripts; train handlers; create a secure evidence workflow and escalation path for high-risk submissions.	Public unfamiliarity with secure disclosure plus urgency of reporting.	High-risk disclosure is submitted via the wrong channel.	Source harm risk plus reputational/legal exposure.	4	4 H-1 C-1 Q-1 S-1	16	Mitigate	#1	Make training program for handlers.	Winter, David	29Apr26	Open	4	12	Winter, David	15Aug26	Open	28Feb26
														#2	Implement a secure - evidence workflow	Winter, David	29Apr26	Open						
														#3	Make a policy for priority handling of comments tagged as Whistleblow	Winter, David	29Apr26	Open						
C00500		Legal-risk disclosures (Official Secrets / confidentiality) overwhelm capability	Restore Britain's whistleblowing guidance includes legal notices about Official Secrets Act exposure and states it cannot give legal advice or protect those bound by secrecy obligations. This creates a governance requirement for triage, boundary-setting, and referral to independent legal advice. (Source: Restore Britain Whistleblowing)	High-risk submissions are triaged correctly with safe handling, clear boundaries, and documented decisions. **Could Go Wrong?** The organisation engages incorrectly with a legally restricted disclosure, mishandles sensitive content, or creates implied assurance.	Boundaries are stated publicly; internal steps for triage, legal escalation, and decision recording need definition and rehearsal.	Create a legal-risk triage checklist; formalise legal counsel review points; use response templates reinforcing no legal advice and signposting to independent counsel.	Public submissions include content with legal restrictions.	A sensitive disclosure is received and mishandled.	Legal exposure and operational disruption.				Mitigate								Winter, David		Open	
C00501		Whistleblower rights and complaints logging must be evidence-driven	Restore Britain's whistleblower privacy/protection documentation describes rights (object/restrict/erase) and that complaints are logged and reviewed, with records retained for accountability and potential regulatory inspection. This requires a working complaints register, decision trail, and clear ownership. (Source: Restore Britain Whistleblower Privacy & Protection Policy)	Complaints and objections are handled consistently within timelines, with full traceability of decisions and evidence. **Could Go Wrong?** Complaints are handled ad hoc; records are incomplete; the organisation cannot demonstrate compliance if challenged.	Policy commitments are written; operational tooling (registers, owners, SOP, review cadence) must be implemented and used consistently.	Implement a whistleblowing complaints register; define review roles (investigations lead, legal oversight); standardise decision record format and retention rules.	High-sensitivity workflow without mature back-office routines.	A complaint/objection arrives and is not handled per policy.	Regulatory risk and reduced willingness to whistleblow.				Mitigate								Winter, David		Open	
C00502		FOI suggestion triage and delivery pipeline lacks end-to-end controls	Restore Britain's FOI Investigations page describes: submissions via form; review for relevance/legal viability/public interest; possible refinement/combining; logging of all submissions; and that not every suggestion will be filed. This requires a governed pipeline from intake to closure. (Source: Restore Britain FOI Investigations)	FOI suggestions are triaged and progressed through a controlled pipeline with clear criteria and transparent status tracking. **Could Go Wrong?** Backlog grows; suggestions are lost; inconsistent criteria lead to disputes and public dissatisfaction.	Public-facing process is described; internal trackers, roles, SLAs, and reporting rhythm must be established for scale.	Create an FOI register with status stages; define triage criteria and SLAs; implement monthly review and publish a high-level status summary where appropriate.	High volume of public suggestions plus limited investigative capacity.	Submissions accumulate without a controlled pipeline.	Reduced credibility and missed investigative opportunities.				Mitigate								Winter, David		Open	
C00503		FOI publication and redaction governance is insufficient	Restore Britain states FOI responses belong to the public and aims to publish documents received, recognising limits (e.g., personal data and sensitive material). This requires a publish/hold decision gate, redaction rules, and quality controls before publication. (Source: Restore Britain FOI Investigations)	FOI outputs are published responsibly with appropriate redaction, context, and quality control. **Could Go Wrong?** Sensitive personal data is inadvertently published; misleading context is posted; credibility is damaged.	Intent is stated; publication controls (review gates, redaction standards, approvals, and audit trail) must be operationalised.	Define a publication SOP: legal review triggers, redaction checklist, context/attribution standard, approvals, and a decision trail for publish/hold.	Pressure to publish quickly plus variable document sensitivity.	An FOI response is published without sufficient review/redaction.	Legal exposure, complaints, reputational harm.				Mitigate								Winter, David		Open	

ID Concern [reg.]	Category / Element	Risk Short Title	Description	Desired Outcome	Current Situation	Proposed Strategy	Risk (three-part) Statement			Current Risk			Response	Mitigating Action / Response						Manageability	Residual Risk	Risk Owner	Target Review Date	Close Date	Last Review Date Notes
							Cause	Risk Event [uncertainty]	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score (PxI)		ID	Action	Action Owner	Due Date	Close Date							
C00504	Third-party intake tools introduce cross-border processing complexity		Restore Britain policies acknowledge use of third-party platforms for online services and indicate supplier processing that may involve international transfers, requiring safeguards and governance (contracts, DPAs, SCCs/adequacy where relevant). This needs a supplier assurance loop. (Source: Restore Britain privacy/whistleblowing documentation)	Third-party tools are governed via DPAs, transfer safeguards, security assurance, and periodic reviews with change control. **Could Go Wrong?** Data is processed in unexpected jurisdictions without proper safeguards; a breach occurs; compliance cannot be evidenced.	Risk is acknowledged in policy; operational assurance (contracts, supplier register, periodic checks) must be maintained as tools evolve.	Maintain a supplier register (membership, donations, forms, comms); verify transfer mechanisms and DPAs; implement annual review and change-control for tooling.	Convenience-driven adoption of SaaS tooling in a fast-moving environment.	A tool change or incident exposes cross-border processing gaps.	Regulatory exposure and loss of confidence.				Mitigate									Winter, David		Open	
C00505	Policy publication cadence outpaces governance controls		Restore Britain is publishing policy proposals and long-form policy papers. As the library grows, a controlled pipeline is needed for drafting, internal review, approvals, versioning, and corrections to keep messaging consistent and defensible under scrutiny. (Source: Restore Britain Policies)	Each policy publication has clear ownership, review gates, version control, and a traceable record of changes and corrections. **Could Go Wrong?** Inconsistent statements appear across documents; factual errors persist; corrections aren't traceable; reputational harm follows.	Policy pages exist and are expanding; governance routines need formalising as a repeatable system with defined roles and gates.	Implement a policy pipeline (draft peer review sign-off publish feedback amend); create a version register and corrections protocol.	High-speed content production without a single governed workflow.	A policy paper is published with avoidable defects or inconsistencies.	Credibility loss and increased scrutiny load.				Mitigate									Winter, David		Open	