

Risk Identification									Pre-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix				Risk Management					Post-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix			
Risk Number	Risk Title	Risk Detail	Implications (Consequence)	Board Responsibility (YCP Delivery Coordination Board or Infrastructure Delivery Board)	Risk/ Owner Champion	YCP Category	CYC Category	Imminence/ status Current/ Future/ Closed	Likelihood	Impact	Gross Score	Gross Rating	Management Strategy/ Progress	Controls / Management Actions Planned	Action Owner	Action Completion Date (or associated milestone)	Actions On Target	Likelihood	Impact	Net Score	Net Rating
PB01 (a)	Planning permission for YC.	Failure to agree and sign S106	Possible decision to call in by Secretary of State Heightened risk of challenge during JR period. Costs associated with JR. Full benefits not realised. Delay to delivery and loss of funding.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP JP / CJ	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	5	4	21	VH	On-going	(1) DLA Piper legal review of application undertaken in advance of submission - complete. (2) Close discussions with LPA Officers prior to submission - complete. (3) Ensure that scheme as submitted is permitted, which has been created as a result of pre-app discussion and engagement with community - complete. (4) Outline Planning Permission resolution to grant secured subject to s106 agreement and conditions. (5) Conclusion of s106 matters to be progressed and concluded. (6) Risk of Judicial Review to be monitored.	YCP JP / CJ	02-Sep-19	Y	1	4	12	M
PB01 (b)	YC Integration with local plan.	Risk of local plan not being in place prior to YC submission.	Lack of Local Plan and established policies impact determination of planning applications. If applications went to appeal the Secretary of State may not grant permission.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP JP / CJ	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	5	3	16	H	On-going	YC Process and progress have now have overtaken local plan development: (1) Outline Planning Permission resolution to grant secured subject to s106 agreement and conditions. (2) RMA submission planned.	YCP JP / CJ	02-Sep-19	Y	5	1	7	L
PB02 (a)	Off plot Infrastructure Costs	Off plot infrastructure costs are unaffordable on the basis of the £155m budget.	Construction cost inflation, leading to failure of value engineering, and failure to fund all elements of Infrastructure plan. Development (or elements thereof) does not come forward.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP (DW)	Feasibility/ Viability	Financial & Efficiency	Current	3	5	23	VH	On-going	(1) Design & Technical advisers to devise a scheme which matches the funding budget. (2) HIF/EZ/AH are being reviewed and there are opportunities to aid the viability of the scheme. (3) Delivery strategy set on the basis of a specific budget with zero movement through last 3 cost plan iterations prior to Infrastructure Procurement (PSC, IPI & 2) process. (4) Stage 1 tender process completed and analysis/presentation under iteration and review.	Arup (RB)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	3	14	M
PB02 (b)	Overall scheme viability	Risk of the scheme as a whole becoming unviable, unable to deliver sufficient value etc.	Development does not come forward.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP (MS)	Feasibility/ Viability	Financial & Efficiency	Current	3	5	23	VH	On-going	(1) Business Plan/ Viability plan for NR/HE approach agreed to give appropriate level of reasonable landowner return to cover costs/EUV. (2) Dependencies are Funding Plan for off-plot development, agreement of quantum of development in application and agreement in application of Affordable Housing offer/ mix. (3) s106 HoTs agreed ahead of conclusion.	Arup (RB) / NR (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
PB03	IP2 feasibility (Millennium Green Land)	The proposed infrastructure to access the site is not feasible due to inability to comply with the conditions agreed with Millennium Green Trustees on the deadline to serve notice (which requires planning permission and funding to be in place to the satisfaction of YCP).	Delay to point at which notice can be served which is beyond a reasonable margin after the deadline of 31 December 2019. Requirement to negotiate and draw up a revised agreement with MG Trustees. Impact on programme and deliverability.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	YCP (DW)	Stakeholder	Stakeholder	Current	5	4	21	VH	On-going	(1) All matters and terms are agreed with MG trustees and the conditional agreement is in place as of 21/12/18. (2) Maintain and monitor programme and progress to ensure planning permission and funding in place to the satisfaction of YCP prior to 31/12/19. (3) Flag likelihood of deadline being at risk and engage in discussions with MG trustees to agree a reasonable extension to the deadline of 3 months (considered by DLA to be a reasonable request). (3.1) - July '19 - likelihood flagged, mitigating steps in progress. (4) Monitor effect of Judicial Review (risk) on programme and satisfying MG notice milestones/triggers. Must submit RMA by 28/6/19 or mitigated risk is elevated to red.	YCP (DW)	02-Sep-19	Y	4	3	15	M
PB04	IP2 Technical feasibility	The proposed infrastructure to access the site is deemed too technically complex and costly.	The preferred access solution cannot be delivered. Unmanageable funding gap. Project fails and vision not realised. Planning and funding to deliver are triggers to serve notice on MG trustees which must be in place and notice served by 31/12/19	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Arup (RB)	Feasibility/ Viability	Financial & Efficiency	Current	2	4	18	H	On-going	(1) Detailed site access options appraisal undertaken by Arup. Reviewed by the Board in November 2017 and preferred access option A2 confirmed. (2) Decision made by CYC Exec to proceed with a western access option (A2) - alignment that does not require MG land (other than reserved land). (3) Ensure working with preferred contractor to work to bring the scheme in within the required budget. (design stage 4) (4) Engage with technical representatives to ensure bridge fabrication and installation methods mitigate rail disruption risk as far as possible with minimum possessions. (5) Reassurance that ground conditions and method of construction for the bridge are appropriate.	Arup (RB)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	4	12	M
PB06 (a)	HIF - Infrastructure funding and appetite	Inability to secure all/ some identified HIF infrastructure funding due to: a) Delivery timescales b) Business case assessment	Scheme does not proceed Delayed and/ or disjointed development of the site. Increased costs attributed wider funding streams. Critical infrastructure becomes undeliverable in envelope of available funding. Reduced site viability. Full benefits not realised. Extended timescales for site delivery.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP (MS / BM / Homes England)	Cost/ Funding	Financial & Efficiency	Current	2	5	22	VH	On-going	(1) The timely and appropriate resourcing of co-development work (2) Identify what infrastructure is needed and a strategy for how it will be funded in different funding availability scenarios. (3) Resource HIF business case development process appropriately. (4) Review infrastructure delivery programme and establish date by which RIBA stage 3 and Stage 4 will need to be instructed. (5) Agree Governance Arrangements. (6) Submission of planning application to assure on deliverability achieved. (7) HIF application process has passed into the co-development phase.	YCP (MS / BM / Homes England)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	5	22	VH
PB06 (b)	EZ - Infrastructure funding and appetite	Absence of HIF (PB06a) increases reliance on this funding source. Inability to secure required level of infrastructure funding - Level of risk and/ or return not acceptable for planned investment. Delay to delivery programme diminishes EZ revenues	Delayed and/ or disjointed development of the site leading to reduced funding availability and risk that scheme does not proceed. Increased costs attributed to wider funding streams. Critical infrastructure becomes undeliverable in envelope of available funding. Reduced site viability if required for critical infrastructure. Full benefits not realised. Extended timescales for site delivery.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	YCP (MS / BM / Homes England)	Cost/ Funding	Financial & Efficiency	Current	2	5	22	VH	On-going	(1) Principle of EZ borrowing has been established (December 2018). (2) Borrowing remains part of budget which is dependant on HIF which is therefore to be monitored. (3) Resolution to borrow is secure subject to resolution of HIF funding. (4) In the absence of HIF explore opportunities to retain borrowing facility. Note - this is not strictly a Delivery Coordination Board or Infrastructure Board risk, it is a risk for CYC to manage centrally and keep Boards advised.	YCP (MS / BM / Homes England)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	5	17	H

Risk Identification									Pre-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix				Risk Management					Post-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix			
Risk Number	Risk Title	Risk Detail	Implications (Consequence)	Board Responsibility (YCP Delivery Coordination Board or Infrastructure Delivery Board)	Risk/ Owner Champion	YCP Category	CYC Category	Imminence/ status Current/ Future/ Closed	Likelihood	Impact	Gross Score	Gross Rating	Management Strategy/ Progress	Controls / Management Actions Planned	Action Owner	Action Completion Date (or associated milestone)	Actions On Target	Likelihood	Impact	Net Score	Net Rating
PB06 (c)	WYCA & WY+TF- Infrastructure funding and appetite	Inability to secure identified level of infrastructure funding due to business case assessment.	Scheme may not proceed. Delayed and/ or disjointed development of the site. Increased costs attributed to wider funding streams. Reduced site viability. Full benefits not realised. Extended timescales for site delivery. All identified transport infrastructure and benefits may not be realised	Infrastructure Delivery Board	YCP (MS / BM / Homes England)	Cost/ Funding	Financial & Efficiency	Current	3	5	23	VH	On-going	(1) Identify what infrastructure is needed and a strategy for how it will be funded in different funding availability scenarios. (2) Resource and progress business case development process appropriately (3) Continue discussions and applications for wider complementary funding. (4) Ensure delivery to programme. (5) Full WYNA Board on 19/11/18. (6) CYC process (December 18) (7) Resolution to make funding available is secure subject to HIF funding decision.	YCP (MS / BM / Homes England)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	5	17	H
PB07	YCP Partnership Agreement	Unable to agree partnership between CYC, NR, NRM and HE due to diverse and/ or conflicting aims and objectives.	Poor/ inefficient/ inconsistent 'Client' performance. Lack of direction/ instruction to Technical Team. Poor management of the Project. Project does not have clear objectives. Full benefits not realised. Unexpected costs for partners. Partnership breaks up. Securing of HIF funding jeopardised by inability to demonstrate deliverability.	Delivery Coordination Board	Delivery Coordination Board	Management	Governance & Management	Current	3	5	23	VH	On-going	(1) Now MOU/HotIs agreed, viability demonstrated, board member respective organisational sign offs are complete (19/12/18). (2) Partnership [Partnering] Agreement to be drafted in legal terms and sign off from respective organisations sought by (31/5/19) - not yet concluded (3) IG taking the lead in driving residual matters to a conclusion with Partners.	YCP (IG)	02-Sep-19	N	1	5	17	H
PB10 (b)	12 Acre Site / York Yard South - Operational railway uses	Non-inclusion of York Yard South land in comprehensive development scheme.	Comprehensive development of the site prevented as would not be able to develop part of the land.	Delivery Coordination Board	NR (MS)	Site	External	Current	2	3	13	M	On-going	(1) DfT engaged and looking to get more certainty on likely land requirements. View from DfT is that probable that some stabling on YYS from 2023 onwards. Freightliner stabling could be accommodated at York Yard South. (2) NR progressing Continuous Modular Strategic Planning (CMSP) study for DfT on Depots & Stabling strategy. Timescale to be determined. (3) NR to establish if alternative stabling site works in terms of rail capacity as part of CMSP study and hence will seek allocation of site (York Yard North) as safeguarded land with DfT to enable release of York Yard South (4) Draft master plan and parameters have been formed on the basis that the site could come forward should this land not be made available so this risk is limited to an impact on viability rather than the scheme going ahead as a whole.	YCP (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
PB12	YCP Project resource and management	Inadequate time commitment from YCP members leading to poor project management/ project performance. Insufficient resource from each Partner organisation to provide sufficient support/engagement.	Poor/ inefficient/ inconsistent 'Client' performance. Poor management of the Project. Lack of direction/ instruction to Technical Team leading to cost increases and project delay. Loss of Project Board confidence. Project fails.	Delivery Coordination Board	DW (with Board assistance)	Management	Governance & Management	Current	2	4	18	H	On-going	(1) Resource from within Partner organisations must be independent and resourced/ agreed appropriately. (2) Additional dedicated and independent resource - in place for current workstreams (3) Homes England, Network Rail and NRM have part-time resource for project but review and greater transparency of roles and responsibilities required. (4) Homes England an Network Rail to resource respective future workstreams appropriately. (5) Roles and responsibilities review completed and consideration of YCP becoming less of an entity as we move in to the delivery phase, the responsibility becoming that of the Partners directly. (6) Homes England Project Director appointed and due in post - Supporting roles (2no.) are to be filled in due course.	YCP (DW)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	4	12	M
PB13	Development market interest (B1a office led component)	This is a risk the YC does present a clear and compelling delivery and marketing strategy and fails to attract Development market interest.	Failure to attract development market interest. Full benefits not realised or delayed. Risk to returns on some funding streams	Delivery Coordination Board	Delivery Team and CYC	Feasibility/ Viability	Financial & Efficiency	Current	2	4	18	H	On-going	(1) Demand in commercial market anticipated from commercial advisors Savills, as outlined in the Market Report. (2) Initial conversations undertaken with a number of interested occupiers from the City, looking for expansion space/ city centre presence. (3) Certainty on funding and planning required before formally soft market testing. (4) Soft market testing proposal developed by Savills in anticipation. To begin in (early 2019) with MIPIM Cannes 2019 as target "launch". (5) High level draft Delivery Strategy developed by Homes England and Network Rail with support from Savills. Will be informed by soft market testing and led by Project Director. (6) CYC to identify target sectors in context of wider Economic Strategy. (7) Work with LEPS, Make it York and Department for International Trade to identify occupiers. (8) Potential for CYC to underwrite risk to allow more speculative schemes to proceed.	YCP (IG)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	4	12	M
PB14	Economic / Property Cycles	Uncertainty/ downturns in the economic or property cycles lead to lack of progress/ appetite. Macroeconomic change and impact on short/ medium/ long term growth.	Delayed delivery of development and benefits. EZ business rates delayed. Investor/ occupier confidence reduced. Residential considered to be resilient in York however Commercial, despite the quality of the scheme, occupiers, investors and developers are more likely to defer decisions on new space until they feel the market is coming back.	Delivery Coordination Board	Working Group	Feasibility/ Viability	Financial & Efficiency	Current	3	4	19	H	On-going	(1) Develop a procurement approach to bring the right level of compulsion on development partners to build. (2) Strategy to secure occupier pre-lets. (3) Target MIPIM when correct material is available. (4) Consideration of how different components of the scheme could come forward without others in order to avoid the whole scheme being slowed.	YCP (IG)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	4	18	H
PB15 (a)	License Condition 7 Consent (42 Acres)	Failure to establish agreed Method of Work for NRM rail crossing to satisfaction of ORR.	Loss of certainty regarding key land plot availability. Comprehensive development of the site disrupted.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	NR (MS)	Feasibility/ Viability	Stakeholder	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) LC7 condition to be satisfied re satisfactory rail access to NRM South Yard by agreeing Method of Work for road/ rail crossing point with ORR. (2) NRM developing MoW to be discussed with ORR in November - complete. (3) Secure viable western access as this lowers risk. (4) Highway authority relaxed about the proposal and can discuss a highway management plan. Just the rail side with ORR remaining to resolve. (5) NRM have a risk assessment from TSP and are continuing dialogue with ORR - Timescales for sign off are to be determined.	YCP (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	3	14	M

Risk Identification									Pre-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix				Risk Management					Post-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix			
Risk Number	Risk Title	Risk Detail	Implications (Consequence)	Board Responsibility (YCP Delivery Coordination Board or Infrastructure Delivery Board)	Risk/ Owner Champion	YCP Category	CYC Category	Imminence/ status Current/ Future/ Closed	Likelihood	Impact	Gross Score	Gross Rating	Management Strategy/ Progress	Controls / Management Actions Planned	Action Owner	Action Completion Date (or associated milestone)	Actions On Target	Likelihood	Impact	Net Score	Net Rating
PB15 (b)	ORR consent to new Level Crossings over NRM Rail Link	Failure to establish agreed Method of Work for NRM rail crossing to satisfaction of ORR.	Loss of certainty regarding key land plot availability. Comprehensive development of the site disrupted.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	NRM (KE)	Feasibility/ Viability	Stakeholder	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) NRM developing MoW to be discussed with ORR in November - complete. (2) NRM have a risk assessment from TSP and are continuing dialogue with ORR - Timescales for sign off are to be determined.	NRM (KE)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	3	14	M
PB16 (a)	Vacant Possession programme	Vacant possession plans not aligning with phasing plan for development	Delivery sequencing/ phasing having to change.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	NR (MS)	Programme	Stakeholder	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) VP plan dated 12/12/18 provided and reflected in master programme and infrastructure procurement key milestones document. (2) Strategy re conflicts/constraints/risks to evolve in discussions with Arup and CYC. (3) 2D overlay prepared along with Geographical Information System version which supports more detailed review and manipulation and flagging of conflicts (4) Infrastructure plan and plot development to align with this and conflicts to be highlighted - Infrastructure phasing plan complete, development plot phasing plan to be completed. . (5) Currently down to managing small areas of the site - MS to consider specific residual site VP conflicts within the register to follow in the next iteration.	YCP (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
PB16 (b)	Unipart - Vacant Possession programme	Unipart vacant possession plans not aligned with phasing plan for development. Unipart do not submit Planning within manageable timescales for YCP.	Phasing impact/delay on works generally and to cinder lane.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	NR (MS)	Programme	Stakeholder	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Unipart/Northminster Planning Application - Resolution to grant secure subject to SoS call in. (2) Monitor Unipart plans/programme to vacate - Unipart have stated that they require until end of June 2020 to vacate. (3) Take appropriate steps to manage contractual relationship with Unipart regarding their occupation/vacation date - Unipart have been offered a contractual right to stay on site until December 2020, subject to conditions. (4) Review programme to assess effect on site development. (5) Note: This area of the site is considered as part of the wider VP plan and will have impact on some element of the programme and demolition of certain buildings - all of which is considered manageable - This timescale should not impact road works, will impact phasing of temporary car parking and plot development.	YCP (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	2	9	L
PB16 (c)	Vacant Possession – NRM Land Approvals	Delay or difficulty in taking the the agreed IP1/IP2 design (including NRM fundamental/functional requirements and use of NRM land, whether for the road, rights of way, permissive paths or disposal for development) through Science Museum Group Board of Trustees for approval, DCMS approval, and (almost certainly) HM Treasury approval.	Delay to vacant possession for the start of the infrastructure works. (approval process is estimated as 3-4 months from having the 'agreed design' in place).	Infrastructure Delivery Board	NRM (KE)	Programme	Stakeholder	Current	1	4	12	M	On-going	(1) Timely conclusion of the design pack basis for the commencement of the PSC (ECI) process to arrive at a pack of information on which NRM can base their approvals processes.	CYC (MH)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	4	12	M
PB17	FOI	There is risk of an FOI request and subsequent challenge due to poor communication/ consultation with stakeholders and local community.	Potential adverse effect on Partners reputation/ credibility. Inadequate consultation causes prolongation of determination of planning applications. Delay in planning application submission and failure to gain planning permission. Heightened risk of challenge during JR period. Costs associated with JR. Delay to delivery and loss of funding.	Delivery Coordination Board	Aberfield YCP (KA/DW)	Stakeholder	Stakeholder	Current	3	2	9	L	On-going	(1) Aberfield appointed as Comms team, working closely with YCP and planning advisors leading up to and in support of the OPA. (2) Staged consultation programme delivered, led by Allies & Morrison (Stages 1-4 complete. Further communication to take place on design of access road). (3) www.yorkcentral.info developed and hosts consultation material (past and present) to aid transparency, including myth busting notes - ongoing strategy to maintain this function is to be considered. (4) GW drafting future comms strategy for Strategic Board/Strategic Board approval. (5) YCP Comms Strategy/Protocol to be developed. (6) Social media has built a base of followers over the past year to April 2019 - content should be programmed (and interaction monitored/ managed) to continue to grow this base.	YCP (KA/DW)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	2	8	L
PB18	Poor ongoing community engagement	Perceived lack of transparency triggers scheme opposition.	Delay in planning application submission, prolongation of determination and potential failure to gain planning permission. Heightened risk of challenge during JR period. Time and resource required to manage potential FOI request. Full benefits not realised. Delay to delivery phase and potential loss of funding.	Delivery Coordination Board	Allies & Morrison (AMcD) Aberfield YCP (KA/DW)	Stakeholder	Stakeholder	Current	3	4	19	H	On-going	(1) Community Forum set up to engage with key stakeholders and local communities. OPA submitted so no further meetings to take place. (2) Aberfield and Allies & Morrison working with YCP to deliver a staged planning engagement strategy (Stages 1-4 complete with positive results and feedback. Further communication to take place on design of access road). (3) Occasional use of My Future York on specific matters including southern connection. (4) Long term engagement strategy to be developed; (5) YCF review meeting with MYC 21/03/19 needs to be to be re-programmed after Purdah as is was postponed due to the change in committee date. (6) My Future York/ My York Central to run meeting to scope new open structure. YCP to summarise amendments to OPA from previous engagement as part of this (ref MYC blogs (prelude and annex) 4 May 2018) to respond to criticism expressed at Planning Committee. Proposal for future structure and facilitation to be agreed by YCP and CYC (ref Jan Exec report) (7) Keep informed e-mail list – invite former YCCF members to join KIL, and explore merging MYC mailing list to reduce risks arising from comms via multiple mailing lists. (8) RMA engagement to meet principles/ charter as set out in YCP Engagement Framework.	YCP (KA/DW)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	2	8	L

Risk Identification									Pre-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix				Risk Management					Post-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix			
Risk Number	Risk Title	Risk Detail	Implications (Consequence)	Board Responsibility (YCP Delivery Coordination Board or Infrastructure Delivery Board)	Risk/ Owner Champion	YCP Category	CYC Category	Imminence/ status Current/ Future/ Closed	Likelihood	Impact	Gross Score	Gross Rating	Management Strategy/ Progress	Controls / Management Actions Planned	Action Owner	Action Completion Date (or associated milestone)	Actions On Target	Likelihood	Impact	Net Score	Net Rating
PB19	Members engagement	Lack of engagement and progress updates leads to loss of Members support.	Members do not support proposals put forward under the RMA. Delay in planning application submission, prolongation of determination and potential failure to gain planning permission. Heightened risk of challenge during JR period. Full benefits not realised. Delay to delivery phase and potential loss of funding.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP (KA/DW)	Stakeholder	Stakeholder	Current	2	4	18	H	On-going	(1) Member briefings to be established in the approach to the next decision point around delivery of infrastructure (RMA submission and commitment of spend). (2) Benefit of Leader and Deputy Leader of CYC seat on Strategic Delivery Board to be considered as part of this process.	YCP (KA/DW)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
PB20	Historic England and Civic Trust Engagement	Lack of support for scheme from Historic England and Civic Trust in response to the proposals under the Infrastructure RMA.	Historic England do not support the scheme and it is not possible to agree satisfactory solution to reach a decision in connection with the RMA.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	YCP (JP)	Stakeholder	Stakeholder	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Engage and continue to engage with Historic England and Civic Trust in order to develop mutually acceptable RMA to enable permission to be granted.	YCP (JP)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
PAR01 Feb-18	Project Management	Inadequate project master programme development, team engagement opportunities and ongoing management.	Poor programme visibility across the project team. Lack of coordinated programme. Team not aware of key workstream and client milestone dates. Poor visibility of YC approval process/ key dates. Risk of missed deadlines, poor project team performance, programme prolongation and additional fee claims.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	YCP Working Group AY	Programme	Stakeholder	Current	2	4	18	H	On-going	(1) A series of post Project Assurance Review actions have been implemented and have functioned well in support of progressing to the submission of the OPA. Structure in place, well established and functioning well. (2) Similar structure and working practices to be considered and implemented across Infrastructure Delivery Board levels and within Master Developer structure as roles and responsibilities move to the Partners independently in order to provide consistency of approach and assurance links between each governance level. (3) Partners to consider and ensure that the appropriate resources and structures are in place within each Partner organisations in order to move into delivery.	YCP (DW) AY (BC/WN)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
PAR02 Feb-18	Risk Management	Inadequate risk register and management activity and poor awareness of risks across the wider project team. One coordinated risk register, relevant and update-to-date version not available.	Poor risk management will impact project momentum, prevent timely management of risk and identification/ implementation mitigation action. Project cost plan and contingency allowances will be inadequate leading to cost increase.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP Working Group External PM	Management	Governance & Management	Current	2	3	13	M	On-going	(1) A series of Risk Management post Project Assurance Review actions have been implemented and have functioned well in support of progressing to the submission of the OPA. Structure in place, well established and functioning well. (2) Similar structure and working practices to be considered and implemented across Infrastructure Delivery Board levels and within Master Developer structure as roles and responsibilities move to the Partners independently in order to provide consistency of approach and assurance links between each governance level. (3) 'Blank Page' Risk Workshops planned at Infrastructure Board Level and Delivery Coordination Board level in order to develop independent registers and associated risk management regimes.	YCP (DW) AY (BC/WN)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
PAR03 Feb-18	Project Governance	Risk of confusion across the team in connection with the decision making process, it's effectiveness and validity.	Poor understanding of the project across the team, potential for different assumptions and conclusions, ultimately hindering project progress and efficient delivery.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP Working Group	Management	Governance & Management	Current	2	3	13	M	On-going	(1) Create project Decisions Log (Complete), (as part of board) (2) Maintain/ review at monthly Arup/YCP PM meetings (ongoing) (3) Store on a shared drive enable full team access. (4) 05/18 - arrangements much improved from late 2017/early 2018 - continue to monitor. (5) Implementation of change management process and control to be established with DW. (6) Governance structures and Terms of Reference for Delivery Coordination Board an Infrastructure Delivery Board in development - fundamental point for readiness for delivery.	YCP (DW) AY (BC/WN)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	3	6	L

Risk Identification									Pre-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix				Risk Management					Post-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix			
Risk Number	Risk Title	Risk Detail	Implications (Consequence)	Board Responsibility (YCP Delivery Coordination Board or Infrastructure Delivery Board)	Risk/ Owner Champion	YCP Category	CYC Category	Imminence/ status Current/ Future/ Closed	Likelihood	Impact	Gross Score	Gross Rating	Management Strategy/ Progress	Controls / Management Actions Planned	Action Owner	Action Completion Date (or associated milestone)	Actions On Target	Likelihood	Impact	Net Score	Net Rating
PAR04 Feb-18	Leadership	Project leadership, roles & responsibilities are not widely understood by the external Technical Team, particularly during the period of transition to delivery phase. Matter is compounded by the lack of Partnership agreement.	(1) Risk of multiple, conflicting priorities remaining unresolved with no clear direction/ decision making on which to move forward. (2) Risk of decisions being made in principle at workstream level to then be over-ruled some time later following review at Board level.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP Working Group Arup	Management	Governance & Management	Current	2	3	13	M	On-going	(1) Update Project Execution Plan with YCP WG and activity manage as a live document. Ensure wider team understand it. (2) Resolution of 'business plan', terms of partnership agreement, and identification of figurehead/leader for conflict resolution. (3) Engage dedicated external Project Management support with correct terms of reference. (4) Project Director appointed and in post - 20 May '19. (5) Individual project teams are to be resourced accordingly. (6) Consideration to be given to heightened leadership risk during interim/transition period and whilst lead Project Manager (THJ) is moving away from the project.	YCP (IG) AY (BC/WN)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
PAR08 Feb-18	Business Plan	The external team are not conversant on the YCP "Business Plan" and delivery model. No appreciation of the agreed YCP project objectives and drivers.	Lack of Project Team cohesion and clear direction. Potential to impact wider Development interest if Business Plan is unclear. Linked with pb02 (A), PB02(B) & PB07 above (Partnership Agreement)	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP Working Group	Feasibility/ Viability	Financial & Efficiency	Current	3	4	19	H	On-going	(1) Creation of Investment Plan for the overall project. (2) Develop Delivery Plan for development. (3) Engage the consultant team in this process to draw on experience. (4) Business Plan to be developed to reflect Homes England and Network Rail Aspirations linked to and consistent with the Partnership agreement.	YCP (IG / MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	4	18	H
PAR10 Feb-18	Task Orders / Team Performance	Task Order process/ administration - source of frustration with YCP and Arup and hindrance to project progress, team collaboration and transparency.	Potential to erode project team collaboration, trust and communication. Workstream programme slippage and inefficient delivery. Breakdown of Arup's supply chain relationships - A&M, T&T and GPB	Infrastructure Delivery Board	YCP Working Group Arup	Management	Governance & Management	Current	2	2	8	L	On-going	(1) Arup: to build on agreement/ commitment given in November 2018: - Task orders to be set out as per agreed format established in task order 1; - Review task order inter-relationships and budgets against task order schedule; and - Task order approval to staged approval from YCP working group of draft scope and fee, developed scope and fee, approval. (2) Working group (DW): to consider with YCP Board a delegated authority structure that permits TO sign off without the need to await Board meetings. (3) Careful project team management to avoid disrupting current team structure and risk causing further project delivery delay. (4) Consideration of clarity of instructions and how they are articulated on both sides (Task order and supporting information). (5) All above tasks complete and relationship/performance is considered to be well managed and under control. Clear mechanism for control and point of contact for instructions in place - Michael Howard now in post and dealing with Arup relationship and performance with regular ongoing liaison on progress/performance held outside of technical sessions.	YCP (DW) Arup (RB) AY (BC/WN)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	1	1	VL
PAR16 (b) Feb-18	Archaeology risk - Construction/delivery. Site wide risk	Risk of archaeological discovery (including burial grounds) during delivery.	Possible requirement for archaeological dig which delays programme and threatens funding milestones	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Arup	Programme	External	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Monitor during delivery phase and engage directly with CYC and Historic England as necessary (2) Responses to be sought from Arup on GI findings and to evaluate if further trials are necessary at this stage.	Arup (PW)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	3	14	M
PAR19 Feb-18	Ownership of Square and open spaces (public realm)	Inability to confirm long term ownership/ management responsibility for the square.	Potential impact on masterplan workstream and planning process (EIA) and the long term management of these spaces. Note: This is now moving to be more about long term management and maintenance - and likely to be dealt with via s106	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP Working Group	Feasibility/ Viability	Governance & Management	Current	3	2	9	L	On-going	(1) Headline consideration a part of the planning application and MOU (2) Further detailed strategy to be considered as part of Delivery Strategy post planning .	YCP (IG / MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	2	9	L
PAR21 Feb-18	Cycle and Pedestrian Permeability	Inability to agree a future cycle/ pedestrian route as an alternative to Leeman Road.	Challenge through consultation/ determination period - Delay to programme, submission dates and funding milestones. NRM objective of bringing the museum together not met.	Delivery Coordination Board	AY (CJ)	Scope	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	4	19	H	On-going	(1) Additional focus on resolving these matters emphasised within the LPA meetings. (2) Meeting held with LPA to explain the details of permeability through the NRM, quality of alternative routes and impact on times and distances for peds and cyclists. (3) Resolution to grant OPA secured subject to s106 agreement and conditions, and outcome of stopping up order process. (4) Consideration to be given of new administration priorities and views not withstanding the OPA that has been approved. (5) Focus to be maintained on the quality of the proposed alternative route as part of the stopping up order process (note below).	YCP (JP) AY Planning (CJ)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	4	19	H
PAR23 (a) Feb-18	Design quality - Public Realm	Risk that design quality benchmarks required by City Planners are not affordable or affect viability	Potential to delay planning application, prolonging determination period and threaten securing planning approval.	Delivery Coordination Board	AY (CJ)	Feasibility/ Viability	Financial & Efficiency	Current	3	4	19	H	On-going	(1) Continue regular dialogue of CYC Planners to understand requirements and ensure Design Guide addresses concerns. (2) Ensure Project Board have visibility of progress and emerging issues. (3) Above steps completed and Design Guide agreed as part of the OPA. (4) Resolution to grant OPA secured subject to s106 agreement, conditions and referral to SoS. (5) Each RMA submitted will be required to be accompanied with a Design Guide Compliance Statement. (6) Linkage to and consideration of budget is to be maintained throughout - nothing contained in any compliance statement is to be unaffordable.	AY Planning (CJ)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	2	8	L
PAR23 (b) Feb-18	Design quality - Buildings	Risk that design quality benchmarks in connection with sustainability required of City Planners are not affordable or affect viability	Potential to delay planning application, prolonging determination period and threaten securing planning approval.	Delivery Coordination Board	AY	Feasibility/ Viability	Financial & Efficiency	Current	3	4	19	H	On-going	(1) Continue regular dialogue of CYC Planners to understand requirements and ensure Design Guide addresses concerns. (2) Ensure Project Board have visibility of progress and emerging issues. (3) Above steps completed and Design Guide agreed as part of the OPA - Resolution to grant OPA secured subject to s106 agreement, and conditions. (4) Each RMA submitted will be required to be accompanied with a Design Guide Compliance Statement.	AY Planning (CJ)	20-Dec-19	Y	2	2	8	L

Risk Identification									Pre-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix				Risk Management					Post-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix			
Risk Number	Risk Title	Risk Detail	Implications (Consequence)	Board Responsibility (YCP Delivery Coordination Board or Infrastructure Delivery Board)	Risk/ Owner Champion	YCP Category	CYC Category	Imminence/ status Current/ Future/ Closed	Likelihood	Impact	Gross Score	Gross Rating	Management Strategy/ Progress	Controls / Management Actions Planned	Action Owner	Action Completion Date (or associated milestone)	Actions On Target	Likelihood	Impact	Net Score	Net Rating
PAR27 Feb-18	Project Team Performance	Structural changes to the Project Technical Team impact project cohesion and programme momentum.	Breakdown of project team and loss of project momentum. All short to medium terms milestone are not achieved. Project incurred significant abortive and re-engagement costs.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP	Management	Governance & Management	Current	2	4	18	H	On-going	(1) Performance to be monitored in accordance with current practices, with review in connection with emerging workstreams as they progress and in particular we the project transitions into delivery. (2) New working practices established. (3) Ongoing performance monitoring and collaboration. (4) AY continue to be engaged following Project Assurance Review, subsequent PM & Assurance Support function and later expanded PM & Assurance Support role. (5) AY engaged in the role of Planning Agent on the RMA. (6) Slowing of pace on ARUP RMA work to control performance and spend.	YCP (DW) Arup (RB) AY (BC/WN)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
PAR28 Feb-18	Project Management	Poor management of Project Execution Plan (PEP) and failure to deliver PEP deliverables - e.g. individual project briefs, monthly MS project updates, meeting regime and risk management activity.	Lack of team coordination and progress. Programme delay and poor alignment of workstream activity. Loss of leadership confidence and delivery confidence.	Delivery Coordination Board	Arup	Management	Governance & Management	Current	4	3	15	M	On-going	(1) Re-establish PEP deliverables - Arup monthly reporting has been re-activated. (2) Agree strategy/ templates for programme, cost and risk reporting - to YCP and to Project Board. (3) AY engaged to undertake Project Assurance Review, subsequent PM & Assurance Support function and later expanded PM & Assurance Support role coordinated with and expanded AY Planning Support role (OPA and RMA).	YCP (DW) Arup (RB) AY (BC/WN)	02-Sep-19	Y	4	3	15	M
PAR30 Feb-18	Strategic Leadership	Poor Technical Team performance due to lack of strategic leadership and management.	Poor team performance and workstream slippage. Lack of transparency across the technical team. Breakdown of Arup supply chain relationships. Loss of client confidence. Poor interface with YCP working group and Project Board.	Delivery Coordination Board	Arup	Management	Governance & Management	Current	3	4	19	H	On-going	(1) YCP and Arup performance review meeting held November 2017. (2) New working practices established. (3) Ongoing performance monitoring and collaboration. (4) Improvement client and technical team engagement and visibility - also at Project Board level. (5) AY engaged to undertake Project Assurance Review, subsequent PM & Assurance Support function and later expanded PM & Assurance Support role coordinated with and expanded AY Planning Support role (OPA and RMA). (6) Establish Roles And Responsibilities session to ensure all parties are clear on another's roles and responsibilities. (7) Above steps implemented - Arrangements currently in transition - this risk and mitigation steps still apply to current RMA workstream and infrastructure. (8) Reinforcement of line of communication/instructions from Partnership/CYC via MH.	YCP (DW) Arup (RB) AY (BC/WN)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	3	14	M
PAR31 Feb-18	Strategic Leadership	Lack of engagement/ positive and constructive interaction between Arup team and YCP Board. During previous phases of the project, the Arup team have had greater opportunity to engage with YCP Board members.	Lack of confidence and trust in the performance of the Arup team. Excessive 'distance' from Board decision making and confirmation of instructions.	Delivery Coordination Board	YCP Board	Management	Governance & Management	Current	2	4	18	H	On-going	(1) Agree strategy to allowance greater interaction between Arup team and Project Board - ahead of key milestones, key presentations, occasional attendance from Board members at DTM (2) Arup involvement in Board sessions working well, possible benefit in establishing an additional debate forum where necessary - to be considered. Primary focus is to ensure instructions are clear and understood along with the importance of milestones on key decisions. (3) Increase delegated authority for YCP. (4) Arrangements in transition - this risk still applies to current workstreams of RMA and Infrastructure Works.	YCP (DW)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
PAR32 Feb-18	Site utilities	The is currently a lack of understanding regarding the extent of utilities on the site. (not getting utilities to site)	Delay to programme, submission dates and funding milestones.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Arup	Site	Stakeholder	Current	1	4	12	M	On-going	(1) Trigger survey work as dictated within the master programme - ongoing. (2) Continue to engage, Arup have completed their related work, there are utilities, there is concern around new capacity - Completed as part of strategy work. (3) Arup to present current progress and next steps including utilities strategy - complete. (4) Much work completed and much improved understanding around strategy.	YCP (DW) Arup (PW)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	4	12	M
RR01	Sustainability Approach Inconsistencies	Risk that the sustainability aspirations of the scheme driven by CYC are not met - exemplar sustainability aspirations not sufficient	Further to the submission of the OPA, potential changes due to revised thinking from the new administration and increased/revived scrutiny. Full Council Member identifying needs/demands which are not met. Prolongation of period leading up to submission of RMA, prolonged determination period and threat to securing RMA planning approval.	Delivery Coordination Board	Arup	Feasibility/ Viability	Financial & Efficiency	Current	1	5	17	H	On-going	(1) Continue regular dialogue of CYC Planners to understand requirements. (2) Ensure Project Board have visibility of progress and emerging issues. (3) Resolution to grant consent in place subject to sustainability discussion and priorities of new administration (along with s106 agreement and conditions).	AY Planning (CJ)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	3	14	M
RR04	Judicial Review	Risk that the application(s) could be challenged during the Judicial Review period. Linked with PB01 (a) above.	Heightened risk of challenge during JR period. Costs associated with JR. Risk of OPA permission being quashed. Full benefits not realised. Delay to delivery and loss of funding.	Delivery Coordination Board	Working Group (JP/CJ)	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	4	19	H	On-going	(1) Continue with robust mitigations set out above - Complete (2) Undertake health check of ES - Complete (3) Monitor and respond as necessary during the JR period.	YCP (JP) AY Planning (CJ)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	4	19	H
RR05	Spot Building Listing.	Risk that applications could be submitted to spot list buildings on site in response to planning submissions.	Fundamental block on the development of specific buildings/areas (Freightliner Depot and ramp up to coal drops). Impact on viability and programme.	Delivery Coordination Board	Working Group (JP/CJ)	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	1	4	12	M	On-going	(1) Applications for exemption certificates / Certificates of Immunity for the subject buildings/areas progressed but frustrated by resource matters within Historic England. (2) Parameter plans agreed as part of the OPA which show buildings to be demolished. (3) Matter to be monitored. (4) Historic England have received a request to list the Mess Room building (adjoining the rear of the Bull Nose Building) - to be monitored - NRM to engage as building owner.	YCP (JP) AY Planning (CJ)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	2	2	VL
RR06	Bridge Agreement - Statutory Consents	Risk that the bridge agreement required for the scheme cannot be agreed/put in place within the necessary timescales.	Risk of concerns being raised by the Environment Agency leading to potential delay. Environment agency concerns - various. Delay to Programme Loss of funding	Infrastructure Delivery Board	CYC (GF)	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) CYC and Highway Consultant team engagement with NR Asset Protection team re bridge design in accordance with standard Highway Authority/NR design processes. (2) CYC to seek ongoing updates on progress from Arup. (3) Preparations and documents are in place in preparation ahead of following due process. (4) Delivery team now owners of this risk and action - to be managed by GF/MH.	CYC (GF/MH)	04-Oct-19	Y	2	2	8	L
RR07	Dependencies on Station and Western Access	Dependencies on ownership of station and western access. Rail industry consent for access to west of station. Car park and works to cinder lane area.	Lack of progress on site infrastructure Failure in place-making	Delivery Coordination Board	NR (MS)	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Early design work on station dependent on securing design work funding. (2) Station Change discussions with Station Facility Owner and Beneficiaries to commence once sufficient design detail available.	NR (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	3	14	M

Risk Identification									Pre-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix				Risk Management					Post-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix			
Risk Number	Risk Title	Risk Detail	Implications (Consequence)	Board Responsibility (YCP Delivery Coordination Board or Infrastructure Delivery Board)	Risk/ Owner Champion	YCP Category	CYC Category	Imminence/ status Current/ Future/ Closed	Likelihood	Impact	Gross Score	Gross Rating	Management Strategy/ Progress	Controls / Management Actions Planned	Action Owner	Action Completion Date (or associated milestone)	Actions On Target	Likelihood	Impact	Net Score	Net Rating
RR08	Diversion of Cinder Lane.	Public right of way on Cinder Lane to be diverted to new alignment through site	Failure to develop out plots in agreed alignment.	Delivery Coordination Board	NR (MS)	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Ensure diversion forms an element of Outline Planning Application - Complete. (2) Resolution to Grant OPA secure subject to s106 agreement and conditions - Alignment of road secured under the parameter plans.	AY Planning (CJ/ CA)	02-Sep-19	Y	3	3	14	M
RR09 (a)	HS2 Challenge (Platforms)	Risk of challenge from HS2 in connection with HS2 requirements for new platforms 12 & 13.	Prolongation of determination of planning applications.	Delivery Coordination Board	NR (MS)	Stakeholder	Stakeholder	Current	1	3	6	L	On-going	(1) To be tested to ensure sufficient land safeguarded with LC7 consultation for land at location in Nov 2018. (2) MS has seen a revised alignment that is more beneficial, NR to confirm if alignment is agreed by Industry - will then be able to sign off and use this as the basis for design moving forward.	NR (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	3	6	L
RR09 (b)	HS2/TFN Challenge (Bridge Footprint/Track Alignment)	Risk of challenge from HS2 or TFN in connection with proposed new bridge alignment and future access plans to train stabling (York Yard North)	Prolongation of determination of planning applications.	Delivery Coordination Board	NR (MS)	Stakeholder	Stakeholder	Current	1	5	17	H	On-going	(1) Review and response to queries raised by HS2 (2) MS has seen a revised alignment that is more beneficial, NR to confirm if alignment is agreed by Industry - will then be able to sign off and use this as the basis for design moving forward.	NR (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	5	17	H
RR10	New Severus Bridge Landing Point.	The area of land required to position the new bridge landing point is in Poppeleton Road Primary School grounds possibly requiring a S77 notice to be served.	Programme delay - S77 notice period/process could take 9-10 months leading to a need to proceed at risk awaiting consent from DfE.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	CYC (DW)	Site	External	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Issue of ownership resolved - Exec Approval given on 30 August to transfer land to Highways responsibility - agreed. (2) Bridge and landing point now subject to planning approval (RMA)	CYC (DW)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	2	8	L
RR11	ORR General Consent for bridge spans (Severus Bridge and Wilton Rise Bridge)	Risk that third party consent for construction of new bridge spans over railway not obtained	Programme delay should consent not be provided; knock-on impact on completion of Bridge Agreement between Network Rail and CYC.	Delivery Coordination Board	NR (MS)	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	1	3	6	L	On-going	Network Rail to engage with ORR to secure consent through standard process.	NR (MS)	04-Oct-19	Y	1	3	6	L
RR12	Network Rail approval for Holgate Beck re-culverting	Risk that consent for re-culverting of the Holgate Beck, as a Network Rail Asset, is not obtained due to Arup/CYC not progressing in timely fashion and/or NR delay in approval processes.	Programme delay should consent not be provided prior to construction works	Delivery Coordination Board	CYC (GF)	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	4	19	H	On-going	(1) Arup/CYC to prepare for and progress Form 1/Form 2 approval processes. (2) Standard Network Rail approval process to be followed. (3) Issues to be escalated through CYC/YCP and NR governance structures as required. (4) CYC ownership of culvert to be explored.	CYC (GF/MH)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
RR13	Network Rail approval for works to Leeman Road Tunnel	Risk that consent for works to the Leeman Road Tunnel, as a Network Rail bridge asset, is not obtained	Programme delay should consent not be provided prior to construction works	Delivery Coordination Board	NR (MS)	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Risk is delay by NR in dealing with Form 1/Form 2 approval processes. (2) Risk needs to be added to Register re Arup/CYC not progressing in timely fashion and hence need to provide programme for approvals. (3) Standard Network Rail approval process to be followed. (4) Issues to be escalated through YCP and NR governance structures as required.	NR (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	2	8	L
RR14	Network Rail approval for Station Western Entrance	Risk that station change approval is not secured from the rail industry due to NR not providing resources to approve designs in a timely fashion.	Programme delay should consent not be provided prior to construction works	Delivery Coordination Board	NR (MS)	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Network Rail engaged to determine information required for securing approval dependent on securing design work funding. (2) Detailed design of proposed upgrades to tunnel to be undertaken in consultation with NR and rail industry stakeholders to commence once sufficient design detail available. (3) Early feasibility work on layout completed by A&M. (4) Standard Network Rail approval process to be followed (5) Issues to be escalated through YCP and NR governance structures as required.	NR (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
RR15	Environment Agency Land Drainage Consent	Risk that EA consent for re-culverting of the Holgate Beck, as a 'Main River', is not obtained	Programme delay should consent not be provided prior to construction works	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Arup	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	2	4	18	H	On-going	(1) Detailed design of proposed re-culverting to be undertaken (2) Early engagement with EA to be held to de-risk the approval process (3) Principle established in the resolution to grant OPA. (4) Standard EA process to be followed.	Arup (PW)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	3	13	M
RR16	Utility company approvals	Risk that NRSWA C4 Detailed Quotations are not available for diversion of existing utility apparatus	Programme delay should quotations not be available at the point of awarding a construction contract	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Arup	Programme	Legal & Regulatory	Current	1	3	6	L	On-going	(1) C4 Detailed Quotations to be requested in tandem with the detailed design process and provided to tenderers for construction contracts - In progress	Arup (PW)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	2	2	VL
RR17	Car parking provision (Interim)	Risk that sufficient car parking is not available for railway station and NRM usage	Revenue risk to both Network Rail and NRM due to decreased patronage and visitor numbers; potential breach of station franchise agreement	Delivery Coordination Board	Arup	Site	Financial & Efficiency	Current	2	4	18	H	On-going	(1) Temporary car parking proposals to be developed and temporary planning consent secured through detailed/RMA planning application(s).	Arup (PW)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	4	12	M
RR18	Main Contractor Insolvency	Risk that once appointed the contractor goes into administration	The tender process requires re-starting/negotiating	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Delivery Team and CYC	Stakeholder	Financial & Efficiency	Current	1	4	12	M	On-going	(1) Robust financial checks to be carried out on tendering contractors. Performance Bond and Parent Company Guarantee to be in place before start on site.	Delivery Team and CYC	02-Sep-19	Y	1	4	12	M
RR19	Exceptionally adverse weather delays programme	Risk that once on site works are delayed by exceptionally adverse weather	Delay to programme and costs incurred by client for main contractor delay	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Delivery Team and CYC	Site	Financial & Efficiency	Current	2	2	8	L	On-going	(1) Robust drafting of contract terms and conditions to place risk of weather with Contractor - complete in Stage 1 tender documents. (2) Rail possessions are key focus for weather risk. Bridges designed as a "kit of parts" erected during a number of short, night-time possessions. This approach is more flexible - i.e. possessions can be relatively quickly re-organised in an extreme weather event.	Delivery Team and CYC	02-Sep-19	Y	2	2	8	L

Risk Identification									Pre-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix				Risk Management					Post-mitigation * CYC Scoring Matrix			
Risk Number	Risk Title	Risk Detail	Implications (Consequence)	Board Responsibility (YCP Delivery Coordination Board or Infrastructure Delivery Board)	Risk/ Owner Champion	YCP Category	CYC Category	Imminence/ status Current/ Future/ Closed	Likelihood	Impact	Gross Score	Gross Rating	Management Strategy/ Progress	Controls / Management Actions Planned	Action Owner	Action Completion Date (or associated milestone)	Actions On Target	Likelihood	Impact	Net Score	Net Rating
RR20	Industrial action	Risk that industrial action is called by a union whilst works on site	Delay to programme and costs incurred by client for main contractor delay	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Delivery Team and CYC	Site	Financial & Efficiency	Current	1	2	2	VL	On-going	(1) Robust drafting of contract terms and conditions particularly around industrial action risks and passing the risk to the main contractor - complete in Stage 1 tender documents	Delivery Team and CYC	02-Sep-19	Y	1	2	2	VL
RR21	Resource/labour not available	Risk that insufficient resources are available for the contractor to deliver the works	Delay to programme and funding spend profile	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Delivery Team and CYC	Site	Financial & Efficiency	Current	2	3	13	M	On-going	(1) Ensure drafting of tender documents quality section covers resourcing and planning - complete in Stage 1 tender documents	Delivery team and CYC	02-Sep-19	Y	1	3	6	L
RR22	Failure of tender process	Risk that selected contractor fails to perform with the given procurement stage triggering the need to recast the project and re-procure.	Delay to programme and funding spend profile	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Delivery Team and CYC	Site	Financial & Efficiency	Current	2	3	13	M	On-going	(1) Ensure contractors are engaged with and aware of timescales of the tender process. Early contractor engagement/discussions - Complete (2) 4 Stage1 tenders received, one conditional, tender report and recommendation complete, confirmation to successful and unsuccessful tenderers pending.	Delivery team and CYC	02-Sep-19	Y	1	3	6	L
RR23	Stopping up of Leemann Road	Risk that the Stopping Order is not approved	NRM Central Gallery cannot be delivered and land is not transferred to Homes England to delivery housing.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	YCP/Homes England	Planning/ Consents	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	4	19	H	On-going	(1) Appointment of specialist consultant to provide/prepare a clear strategy and to manage the process to a successful conclusion. - SCP Appointed. (2) Targeting DfT enquiry decision October 2020 - achieving the October 2020 target date rests on the OPA decision notice being issued in July 2019 - If we don't get the Stopping Up order decision by October 2020, it is likely to lead to delay / cost increases on IP1 and IP2. (3) Review and respond to advice around when there will be certainty around the success of the SUO or otherwise and prepare for an alternative	Working Group (TD)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	4	12	M
RR24	GSMR mast relocation	Risk of not securing vacant possession of land within alignment of new ECML bridge	Effect on programme for ECML road bridge construction	Infrastructure Delivery Board	NR (MS)	Programme	Stakeholder	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) New mast site to be established - identified - final report due to be circulated. (2) Programme to be prepared for relocation once mast site established.	YCP (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	2	8	L
RR25	Diversion of Sidings	Risk of not securing vacant possession of land within alignment of new ECML bridge	Effect on programme for ECML road bridge construction	Infrastructure Delivery Board	NR (MS)	Programme	Stakeholder	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Network Change for new sidings alignment to be submitted - Concluded (2) Programme for works to remove OLE to be established - In progress (3) Programme for works to re-align sidings to be established - In progress	YCP (MS)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	2	8	L
RR26	Public Engagement for RMA	There is a risk that the planning consultation is inadequate and does not support the road in principle or the design solution.	The programme cannot tolerate and slippage and therefore there is a high risk of delay to programme, planning submission dates and funding milestones.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	YCP Working Group	Stakeholder	Stakeholder	Current	2	2	8	L	On-going	(1) YCP intend to engage with the local community at the appropriate time to communicate details of the scheme. A scope and programme of engagement has been prepared with dates to be agreed (post-OPA decision)+W49. - Subject to review. (2) Review outstanding commitment to consult York Blind & Partially Sighted Society and an early design stage. (3) Engagement in connection with Wilton Rise bridge also to be considered.	YCP (KA/DW)	02-Sep-19	Y	1	2	2	VL
RR28	YorCivils Lot 4 Value Threshold	Risk that the total value of works intended to be delivered through Lot 4 exceeds the maximum allowable value.	Procurement/programme delay, reduction of intended infrastructure scope, potential impact on funding business cases.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Delivery Team and CYC	Management	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Review and update cost plan on the basis of package intent across IP0, IP1, IP2 & IP2+ in order to validate total works value against Lot 4 value and seek assurances from CYC procurement and YorCivils team - Complete (2) Monitor against final tender sums returned from the preferred contractor - Stage 1 tender complete and within reasonable tolerance at this stage - monitor through PSC process and stage 2 process on IP1 and IP2.	Delivery Team and CYC	01-Nov-19	Y	2	2	8	L
RR 29	YorCivils Successor Framework	Risk that the contractor selected to deliver IP0, IP1, IP2 & IP2+ is not successful in securing a place on the YorCivils successor framework which is due to be established during 2019.	Procurement/programme delay. Re-procurement of contractor to progress forward under a new PSCC and onward delay in the development of Stage 4 design/pricing of works through to approval, contract award and start on site.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Delivery Team and CYC	Management	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Close liaison with YorCivils to monitor progress of the framework procurement process.	Delivery Team and CYC	02-Sep-19	Y	2	2	8	L
RR30	General Election	Risk that a General Election may be called during 2019	Impact on subsequent RMA planning committee decision making influenced by political environment whether as a result of a general or local election. Delay to procurement decision making/sign off/commitment timescales. Delay in funding decision making for Hf and Homes England's ability to sign up to the Partnership Delay to delivery phase of c3 months (minimum) and potential impact/loss of funding.	Delivery Coordination Board	Delivery Coordination Board	Stakeholder	Legal & Regulatory	Current	3	5	23	VH	On-going	Monitor and respond to the political environment.	YCP Working Group	02-Sep-19	Y	3	5	23	VH
RR32	ECML Bridge - Stainless Steel fabrication	Risk that whilst, delivering a zero maintenance solution, there are significant challenges in a) identifying a fabricator to fabricate and erect the stainless steel structural elements over the railway and b) the cost implications due to shortage of competition.	Delay to programme Potential requirement for re-redesign.	Infrastructure Delivery Board	Delivery Team and CYC	Feasibility/ Viability	Financial & Efficiency	Current	3	3	14	M	On-going	(1) Arup technical paper prepared for review by CYC - decision on most appropriate way forward to be taken with the benefit of technical/market intelligence forming the basis of the report. (2) Contractors are understanding of the issue and the 'ECI' in the procurement process with help develop the most appropriate material and method.	Delivery Team and CYC	02-Sep-19	Yes	3	3	14	M
RR33	Land - Gaps in Title	Risk that the identified gaps in title identified remain unresolved.	Challenges around being able to progress and conclude s106 matters. Challenge around the preparation and issue of a 'clean' licence to occupy the CYC and the infrastructure contractor to undertake the works.	Delivery Coordination Board	Delivery Coordination Board	Site	Legal & Regulatory	Current	1	3	6	L	On-going	(1) Review and reaction in response to Summary Note' document prepared by DIA and issued by Network Rail. (2) HE are now down to one small gap to review and conclude. (3) Further consideration to be given to how gaps are dealt with where crucial to the s106 agreement, and subsequent plot delivery.	YCP Working Group (MS)	02-Sep-19	No	1	3	6	L
RR34	Brexit Risk	Risk that increased in tariffs and supply chain pressure/limitation affects the cost and supply of materials for the project.	Increased costs and availability/programme challenges/timescales	Delivery Coordination Board	Delivery Coordination Board	Site	Financial & Efficiency	Current	2	2	8	L	On-going	(1) Consideration of bidding contractors views on acceptance or sharing of Brexit related tariff and supply chain risks in the contract terms - completed as part of Stage 1 tender process. (2) Adapt contract clauses to suit reasonable risk apportionment - Completed as part of Stage 2 tender process - acceptance of tariff increases as a client risk on an open book basis.	CYC (CM)	02-Sep-19	Y	2	2	8	L