LEP FUNDING-- RISK MATRIX – ANNEX A

Issue/Risk	Consequences if allowed to happen	Likeli-hood	Impact	Mitigation	Mitigated Likelihood	Mitigated Impact
Lack of involvement of Ryedale District Council in decision making.	Potential for Ryedale projects to be overlooked.	**4**	**C**	Involvement of Council Leader on Infrastructure Board and Officers as part of Local Growth Team, will ensure Ryedale priorities remain on agenda.	**2**	**B**
Failure to deliver SEP.	No progress with strategic economic development issues across the spectrum; skills, infrastructure, housing etc.	**4**	**D**	LEP must engage with Government and competitively bid for Local Growth Fund for capital projects on an annual basis.	**2**	**B**
Failure to deliver Ryedale projects as part of SEP	No progress with Ryedale's economic and housing priorities.	**4**	**D**	Ensure Ryedale has well developed projects ready for bidding process. Ensure Ryedale projects are in the bidding documents.	**2**	**B**
Failure of Ryedale to engage with LEP activity, including cross administrative boundary issues such as A64.	Ryedale does not have access to Government funding for strategic projects; this is only through the LEP structures and processes	**5**	**D**	Ensure Members and Officers are engaged with LEP processes at appropriate levels.	**1**	**A**
Ryedale projects are not prioritised by the LEP	No progress with Ryedale's economic and housing priorities.	**4**	**C**	Ryedale must provide evidence for and develop quality projects appropriate for LEP funding. Annual funding of LEP with additional in kind support for SEP activity will ensure that Ryedale has a seat at the table.	**2**	**B**

Score	Likelihood	Score	Impact
1	Very Low	A	Low
2	Not Likely	B	Minor
3	Likely	C	Medium
4	Very Likely	D	Major
5	Almost Certain	E	Disaster