

Preparing for Appraising the Revised Delivery Solutions for Future Fit Options

This paper sets out the proposed approach to appraising the Future Fit options in terms of the revised delivery solutions developed by SaTH.

In April 2015, the Programme Board (and, subsequently, Sponsor Boards with endorsement from JHOSC) approved the process for appraising options. Appendix One summarises the work that was undertaken previously in fulfilment of Sponsor requirements and sets out how the revised solutions may affect the evidence to be refreshed. No material departure is proposed from the previous process.

In October 2015, the Programme Board decided to defer reaching any conclusion about recommending a 'preferred option' to Sponsor Boards until it is assured that there is an approvable case for investment. Following the receipt of an updated SOC from SaTH, containing revised delivery solutions which appear to be affordable in the context of a wider deficit reduction plan, the Programme needs to test whether or not those solutions would perform differently under the same appraisal process. The more balanced two-site offer will change activity flows, will involve different estates solutions (impacting on deliverability) and may also have some impact on quality and workforce considerations. It is also conceivable that some of the evidence used in the appraisal will have become outdated. The scale of the difference cannot be known until the evidence prepared for the September 2015 appraisal is re-presented to reflect the new solutions. Costs will also be different (including as a result of new backlog maintenance information) though this effect is moderated in converting capital to an Equivalent Annual Cost.

In order to maintain progress with the critical path approved by the Programme Board, the Programme SRO authorised work to refresh the appraisal evidence to commence in mid April in order to be ready for assessing the impact of the revised delivery solutions on Friday 1st July. The project plan for this work is set out in Appendix Two.

The Programme Board is asked to endorse the proposed approach. Unless material changes are proposed by the Board, additional Sponsor approvals should not be required.



APPENDIX ONE - Refreshing the Appraisal

Criterion		September 2015 Appraisal	July 2016 Appraisal		
NON-FINANCIAL					
•	APPRAISAL PANEL	Each organisation that is a sponsor or stakeholder member of the Programme Board was asked to identify representatives to serve on this panel.	 The same balance of membership is proposed for this subsequent appraisal. Sponsor and stakeholder organisations have been asked to review who their representatives are to be, given changes in personnel. 		
•	ACCESS - Is this option materially inferior to others in terms of promoting equity of access to acute hospital services?	Descriptions focused on the access impact of the activity that is displaced when compared with the Do Minimum for emergency/urgent care, planned care and obstetrics. It set out how many people would be affected; the areas affected; where people are displaced to; and by how much their travel times would increase. Breakdown provided by 9 areas and (where possible) groups with protected characteristics. Presented in tabular and isochrone map form covering two sets of assumptions: all activity remains in SaTH and activity goes to nearest site.	 It is proposed that the same analysis is repeated. This will need to reflect the rebasing of activity to 2014-15 and changed assumptions about flows to reflect the more balanced site offer. The analysis will again be undertaken by the Strategy Unit, having first reviewed the latest activity and capacity modelling in order to provide independent assurance to the Programme. Phase 2 activity and capacity assumptions, previously agreed by the programme, will inform the baseline scenarios to be modelled. Where modelling departs from those assumptions (e.g. around potential repatriation of activity into/out of the County), this will be treated as a sensitivity testing various levels of change. 		
•	QUALITY - Is this option likely to be materially different to others in terms of clinical safety and effectiveness, and of patient experience?	 There were two components to the evidence here: Access analysis to EC for time-critical conditions (using Red 1 & 2 ambulance calls as a proxy). This was a simple conveyance time by time-band broken down by 9 areas. A summary of favourable and adverse quality impacts broken down by the 3 quality domains. This was prepared by SaTH clinicians and agreed with revisions by CCGs. 	 It is proposed to repeat the previous components with some variations: Red 1 & 2 data should be updated to 2014-15. The potential for modelling the impact of options of ambulance service activity (within the constraints of the timetable) should be explored. This is likely to be required for Senate review. The quality narratives should be prepared under the auspices of the Clinical Design workstream (liaising with additional SaTH and/or external clinicians as required) to provide a broader clinical consensus. The extent of backlog maintenance works in scope will need to be confirmed (in liaison with the Finance Workstream) in order to assess the quality impact of the condition of the estate in each option. 		



WORKFORCE - To what extent will this option improve recruitment & retention and enable better use of the workforce?	A summary of the workforce impact of each options was prepared by SaTH and agreed with revisions by CCGs.	It is proposed that the same process is repeated under the auspices of the Workforce and Clinical Design Workstreams.
DELIVERABILITY - Is there evidence that this option is practically infeasible or materially inferior in terms of deliverability?	 Two perspectives were provided here: A summary of the physical works required with an indicative timetable for delivery The results of a stratified telephone survey as an indication of public acceptability. This was completed by an expert agency and reported by 9 areas. 	 The extent of backlog maintenance works in scope will need to be confirmed by the Finance Workstream. It is proposed that the same process is repeated for the stratified telephone survey though with the survey questions updated to reflect the new delivery options. This commenced in late April due to the time required for contacting a stratified sample.
FINANCIAL	 Capital and revenue costs prepared independently by Provex in terms of Net Present Cost (NPC) - the total future costs of the project over a number of years expressed in terms of today's prices, Equivalent Annual Cost (EAC) - the average annual impact at today's prices. Addressed 63 year timeframe (with 30 year sensitivity) to meet Treasury guidance. 	 It is proposed that the same process is repeated but with costings being prepared internally by SaTH, subject to assurance by the Finance Workstream. This should meet HMT <i>Green Book</i> requirements and broadly align with the previous <i>Economic Analysis of Acute Service Options – 11th August 2015</i>. The critical output for overall economic appraisal is the Equivalent Annual Cost for each option. Affordability to SaTH is tested through this criterion prior to economic appraisal. Only affordable options should be taken forward for full appraisal/consultation. This same process previously led to the exclusion of greenfield options. The Finance Workstream should confirm the extent of backlog maintenance works in scope (i.e. just those relating to works required for reconfiguration or also those generally required).



ECONOMIC

The results of the financial and non-financial appraisals were brought together into an overall economic appraisal by the Programme Office supported by external advice from Provex. Two methodologies recommended by HM Treasury were used:

- Combining financial and non-financial scores via a 50:50 weighting (with sensitivity analysis at 75:25 and 25:75); and
- Calculating a cost per benefit point in terms of £m Equivalent Annual Cost.

• This work would again be led by the Programme Office, drawing on data provided by SaTH and assured by the Finance Workstream.



APPENDIX TWO - Appraisal Plan

Option Appraisal Tasks GOVERNANCE 1 SRO confirms approach & timescale 2 CCGs confirm any enhancements to evidence requirements 3 Programme Team (STP Op Gp) notes approach & timescale 4 Programme Board notes approach & timescale ACTIVITY & CAPACITY MODELUNG 5 SaTH to provide SOC activity and capacity modelling for review 6 SU to review and assure SOC modelling assumptions and outputs 7 CCGs to confirm activity and capacity for use in access modelling ACCESS SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE 13 Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce narratives	April 9102 50100	/2016 /2016 /2016 /2016 /2016 /2016 /2016	May 9102 9102 9103 9	June 50016	July July 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
GOVERNANCE 1 SRO confirms approach & timescale 2 CCGs confirm any enhancements to evidence requirements 3 Programme Team (STP Op Gp) notes approach & timescale 4 Programme Board notes approach & timescale ACTIVITY & CAPACITY MODELUNG 5 SaTH to provide SOC activity and capacity modelling for review 6 SU to review and assure SOC modelling assumptions and outputs 7 CCGs to confirm activity and capacity for use in access modelling ACCESS SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE 13 Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce	201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201	/201 /201 /201 /201 /201 /201	201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201		
1 SRO confirms approach & timescale 2 CCGs confirm any enhancements to evidence requirements 3 Programme Team (STP Op Gp) notes approach & timescale 4 Programme Board notes approach & timescale 5 SaTH to provide SOC activity and capacity modelling for review 6 SU to review and assure SOC modelling assumptions and outputs 7 CCGs to confirm activity and capacity for use in access modelling ACCESS 8 SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE 13 Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce	21/04/ 22/04/ 25/04/ 26/04/ 27/04/ 28/04/	02/05 03/05 03/05 04/05, 05/05, 06/05 11/05/	12/05, 13/05, 16/05, 17/05, 19/05, 23/05, 24/05, 24/05, 25/05, 25/05, 25/05, 25/05, 30/05, 31/05, 01/06,	02/06/ 03/06/ 06/06/ 07/06/ 08/06/ 10/06/ 13/06/ 11/06/ 11/06/ 11/06/ 22/06/ 23/06/ 23/06/	29/06/27 28/06/
2 CCGs confirm any enhancements to evidence requirements 3 Programme Team (STP Op Gp) notes approach & timescale 4 Programme Board notes approach & timescale ACTIVITY & CAPACITY MODELLING 5 SaTH to provide SOC activity and capacity modelling for review 6 SU to review and assure SOC modelling assumptions and outputs 7 CCGs to confirm activity and capacity for use in access modelling ACCESS 8 SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE 13 Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce					
3 Programme Team (STP Op Gp) notes approach & timescale 4 Programme Board notes approach & timescale ACTIVITY & CAPACITY MODELUNG 5 SaTH to provide SOC activity and capacity modelling for review 6 SU to review and assure SOC modelling assumptions and outputs 7 CCGs to confirm activity and capacity for use in access modelling ACCESS 8 SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE 13 Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce					
4 Programme Board notes approach & timescale ACTIVITY & CAPACITY MODELLING 5 SaTH to provide SOC activity and capacity modelling for review 6 SU to review and assure SOC modelling assumptions and outputs 7 CCGs to confirm activity and capacity for use in access modelling ACCESS 8 Ut to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE WORKFORCE Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce		444444			
ACTIVITY & CAPACITY MODELLING 5 SaTH to provide SOC activity and capacity modelling for review 6 SU to review and assure SOC modelling assumptions and outputs 7 CCGs to confirm activity and capacity for use in access modelling ACCESS SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE WORKFORCE Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce	+++++				
SaTH to provide SOC activity and capacity modelling for review SU to review and assure SOC modelling assumptions and outputs CCGs to confirm activity and capacity for use in access modelling ACCESS SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE WORKFORCE Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce	+++++			+++++++++++++	
SaTH to provide SOC activity and capacity modelling for review SU to review and assure SOC modelling assumptions and outputs CCGs to confirm activity and capacity for use in access modelling ACCESS SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE WORKFORCE Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce	+ + + + + + +			 	
SU to review and assure SOC modelling assumptions and outputs CCGs to confirm activity and capacity for use in access modelling ACCESS SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce		 		 	
ACCESS 8					
8 SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE 13 Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce					
8 SU to update all access modelling outputs to reflect agreed SOC modelling QUALITY 9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE 13 Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce	+ + + + + + +			 	
QUALITY WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce	++++	 			
9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE 13 Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce					
9 WMAS/WAST to provide Red 1/2 data for 2014-15 10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE 13 Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce					
10 SU to refresh time-critical patient access modelling 11 WMAS/WAST to assess net impact on utilisation/performance 12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE 13 Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce					
12 Clinical Design workstream prepares quality impact summaries WORKFORCE Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce					
WORKFORCE Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce	\bot				
Workforce Workstream to lead preparation of workforce					
	++++++				
14 Workforce workstream reviews workforce narratives	+++++				
15 Clinical Design workstream reviews workforce narratives					
DELIVERABILITY				 	
16 Agency undertake survey					
17 Agency submit draft report 18 Agency submit final report	+ + + + + +	+ 			
19 SaTH provides estates impact summaries (OBC detail)	+++++	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	 	 	
25 Sam provides estates impact summaries (656 detail)	 	 			
NON-FINANCIAL APPRAISAL PANEL					
20 PMO requests confirmation of panel membership					
21 Sponsors/stakeholders confirm representatives					
22 PMO gives min. 6 weeks' notice of date/venue to panel members					
23 SU compile appraisal evidence pack					
24 Programme Team/SRO approve evidence pack	+++++				
25 PMO send packs to members					
26 Panel Workshop			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 	
FINANCIAL & ECONOMIC APPRAISAL	 		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 	
SaTH refreshes financial appraisal (ORC detail/HMT					
27 requirements)					
28 Finance workstream reviews financial appraisal					
IDENTIFICATION OF PREFERRED OPTION					
29 SU complete appraisal report					
30 Programme Team/SRO approve report					
31 Programme Board receives report and recommends preferred option					
32 CCG Boards identify preferred option (extraordinary joint meetings)					