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### 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present the results of the process to appraise the remaining shortlisted options for acute hospital services. Those results are set out in summary here, and discussed in detail in subsequent sections.

- In the non-financial analysis, Option C1 ranked $1^{\text {st }}$ over Option B by a margin of $21.1 \%$. The analysis demonstrates that, although various changes to the weighting and/or scoring of options could reduce that margin, no single analysis undertaken prompts a switch in ranking;
- In the financial analysis conversely, Option B ranked 1st over Option C1 by a margin of $0.8 \%$;
- In the overall economic analysis which combines the result of the financial and nonfinancial analysis, it was found that Options B and C1 score significantly higher than Options A and C2. Depending on the methodology used, Option C1 outperforms Option B by a margin of either $10.2 \%$ ( $50: 50$ weighting of combined scores ${ }^{1}$ ) or $25.7 \%$ (cost per benefit point).

Table 1: Results of Economic Appraisal

| Results of Economic Appraisal |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weighted Scores (50:50) | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| Non-Financial Weighted | 26.2 | 39.5 | 50.0 | 21.9 |
| Financial Weighted | 45.7 | 50.0 | 49.6 | 49.3 |
| Combined Score | 71.9 | 89.5 | 99.6 | 71.2 |
| Margin below $1^{\text {st }}$ | -27.8\% | -10.2\% | 0.0\% | -28.5\% |
| Rank | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Cost per Benefit Point | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| Cost per benefit point | 2434.40 | 1476.92 | 1175.04 | 2696.20 |
| Margin above $1^{\text {st }}$ | 107.2\% | 25.7\% | 0.0\% | 129.5\% |
| Rank | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 |

On the basis of these analyses, therefore, Option C1 appears to be the option that offers the greatest value for money, including in respect of the 'no change' option (Option A).

[^0]
### 2.0 INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 Appraisal Process

The appraisal process consists of three parts and these are each briefly described below. It was endorsed by Programme Board in April 2015 and confirmed (with some minor enhancements) in April 2016. It reflects the guidance set out in the DH Capital Investment Manual and HM Treasury's The Green Book: Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government.


## Financial Appraisal

At the shortlisting stage there was an overarching affordability criterion which reflected the relatively high level information that was available at that point. That criterion has now been subsumed into the financial appraisal undertaken by the Technical Team using data provided by SaTH.

The financial appraisal covers capital, lifecycle and revenue costs, and is summarised 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.

The analysis considers periods of both 30 years and 60 years.

## Non-financial Appraisal

The remaining criteria from the shortlisting process- accessibility, quality, workforce and deliverability - provide the framework for this appraisal.

Full descriptions of the options were developed which addressed all four criteria. The criteria were weighted for importance, and the appraisal panel

## Economic Appraisal

This final appraisal combines the outputs of the financial and non-financial appraisals in order to assess the overall value for money offered by each option.

There are a number of standard methodologies recommended by HM Treasury which can be used at that stage, alone or in combination. This report covers two approaches

## a) Weighting financial and non-financial scores

A non-financial score for each option is derived from the weighted total of the score for each non-financial criterion, giving a maximum of 100 'benefit points'. A financial score is derived from awarding 100 points to the option with the lowest EAC. More costly options are awarded points in inverse proportion to this.

The two scores for each option are then combined, and the impact of different financial and non-financial weightings can be tested. Weightings used in this analysis are 25:75, 50:50 and 75:25.
b) Calculating the cost of each non-financial benefit point

Here, the NPC is converted into an EAC for each option, and a cost per benefit point is calculated. The option with the lowest cost per benefit point would be the preferred option.

### 2.2 Options

Initially, over 40 ideas were developed by an evaluation panel for how the programme's clinical model could be delivered. This panel then grouped these ideas into 13 scenarios.

At shortlisting, the panel appraised those scenarios and made a recommendation to Programme Board which reflected the five options which had scored most highly. The Board accepted this recommendation and, in addition, -

- Accepted that the 'do minimum' also needed to be included on the shortlist as required by national guidance; and
- Agreed that two 'obstetric variants' should also remain under consideration pending further clarity being gained about the relative location of consultant-led obstetrics services and the proposed Emergency Centre.

The resultant eight options were then developed in terms of physical solutions and associated revenue and capital costs.

At its meeting in August 2015, the Board was advised that:
a) The options involving a new site (D, E1, E2, F) were not affordable, and;
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b) The remaining options ( $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C} 1, \mathrm{C} 2$ ) were potentially affordable in that they would cover their own costs and contribute to the Trust's underlying financial position.

The Board therefore agreed to recommend to Sponsor Boards that the new site options be excluded from further consideration. At the same time, work was undertaken to test previously excluded options. Board accepted the conclusion that the result of the shortlisting process had been robust.

As a result, the revised shortlist was reduced to four options. This recommendation has been approved by all Sponsor Boards, and it is these remaining options (summarised below) which this report addresses.

An appraisal was conducted in September 2015 but the Programme was unable to move forward at that point due the wider financial position in the local health economy.

As a result, SaTH was asked to develop solutions which addressed its most pressing workforce challenges, and to do so within the resource available locally. This present appraisal addresses the same four options but has considered them in terms of the revised delivery solutions developed by SaTH.
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### 3.0 NON-FINANCIAL APPRAISAL

### 3.1 Panel

Programme Board agreed in 2015 that the non-financial appraisal should be undertaken by a larger group than used for the shortlisting to enable a wider and more balanced representation. It maintained the approach of asking for nominations from those bodies which are sponsor or stakeholder members of the Programme (except those conflicted by a subsequent scrutiny role). However, instead of a single member from each organisation, the following distribution was agreed. This reflected a request from the Core Group that sponsor members should have a greater representation than stakeholder members and that, given that the focus of the appraisal is exclusively on acute options, there should be additional representation from SaTH.

Table 2: $\quad$ Non-financial Appraisal Panel

|  | SPONSOR/STAKEHOLDER MEMBERS | REPRESENTATION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | Shropshire Clinical Commissioning Group | 2 clinicians, 1 manager |
| 2. | Telford \& Wrekin Clinical Commissioning Group | 2 clinicians, 1 manager |
| 3. | Powys Teaching Health Board | 2 clinicians, 1 manager |
| 4. | Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital NHS Trust | 8 clinicians, 4 managers |
| 5. | Shropshire Community Health NHS Trust | 2 clinicians, 1 manager |
| 6. | Shropshire Patient Group | 3 patients (1 had to leave <br> early before scoring) |
| 7. | Telford \& Wrekin Health Round Table | 3 patients |
| 8. | Healthwatch Shropshire | 3 patients |
| 9. | Healthwatch Telford \& Wrekin | 3 patients |
| 10. | Powys Patients (via PtHB) | 3 patients |
| 11. | Powys Council | 1 social care |
| 12. | Shropshire Council | 1 social care |
| 13. | Telford and Wrekin Council | 1 soblic health |
| 14. | Weablic health |  |
| 14. | West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS FT | 1 clinician |
| 15. | Welsh Ambulance Services NHS Trust | 1 clinician |
| 16. | Robert Jones \& Agnes Hunt Hospital NHS FT | 1 clinician |
| 17. | South Staffs \& Shropshire Healthcare NHS FT | 1 clinician |
| 18. | LMC/GP Federation | 1 clinician |
| 19. | Shropshire Doctors' Cooperative Ltd | 1 clinician (not nominated) |
| 20. | NHS England | 1 commissioner |

The full panel was convened on $23^{\text {rd }}$ September 2016 at Shrewsbury Town Football Club, and fifty members were in attendance, along with technical advisors, members of the programme team and observers from the Joint HOSC and Powys Community Health Council. The names of panel members are listed in Appendix A.

### 3.2 Evidence

The panel was supplied with evidence which addressed the four non-financial criteria. This was supplied to the panel in advance of the appraisal (both electronically and in hard copy), and presentations of the evidence were made on the day. Substantial time was also set aside to enable panel members to seek clarification about the evidence provided.

## Accessibility

The travel time analysis for this criterion was based on actual activity levels at SaTH during 2015-16. This enabled an assessment to be made of the travel time from each full postcode to each hospital site.

It models the impact of each option in terms of that historic activity, to show what the impact would have been were the configurations described in each option to have been in place. It is broken down into the following categories:

- Urgent Care
- Emergency Care
- Complex Planned Care
- Non-complex Planned Care
- Outpatients
- Women's and Children's Services.

For attendances at the EC, road travel times only are presented since admission is expected to be by ambulance only; for DTC, road and public transport times are presented. Both reflect off-peak conditions (9a.m. to 4 p.m.) when the bulk of activity takes place.

The focus of this analysis is on the differential impact of each option - that is, the marginal change that would result from implementing options $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C} 1$ and C 2 by comparison with Option A (the 'do minimum').

This impact is further broken down in terms of nine geographic localities and, so far as has been possible from the available data, of groups with protected characteristics (e.g. gender, ethnicity, age and deprivation).

A narrative summary of the analysis is provided in the option templates, and the detailed data tables and maps can be found in the appendices for cross-referencing.

Maps show the differential effects of assuming all activity continues to take place on a SaTH site. To reflect patient choice, data tables also show the impact of travelling to a nearer alternative provider.

Shaded areas on the maps reflect the average travel time for each Lower Super Output Area
(LSOA), each of which has a population of between 1,000 and 3,000 . It is important that panel members are mindful of the relative geographic size of LSOAs since there is no material difference between a large red rural area and a small red urban area.

## Quality

There were two main components in relation to the quality criterion. The first concerned the impact of the options on time critical journeys to EC; the second summarised the impact of each option on the three quality domains of safety, effectiveness and patient experience.

## a) Care of patients with time-critical conditions

Data is provided on time-critical ambulance conveyance times by locality. This information relates to 'Red 1' (West Midlands Ambulance Service) and 'Category A' (Welsh Ambulance Service) with a handful of additional incidents where the chief complaint was recorded as Red 1, Cardiac Arrest or Life Threatening Illness. These are considered, at point of triage, as being the most time critical episodes of ambulatory care.

## b) Other clinical quality considerations

Summary tables providing an indication of the potential impact of each option in terms of the three quality domains were developed. The key considerations addressed were the favourable and adverse impacts of:
i) Consolidating emergency and planned services on single sites;
ii) Whether or not consultant-led obstetric activity is co-located with EC; and
iii) The extent of new or significantly refurbished facilities, and the physical disposition of services within each site, which might also be considered to have an impact on both patient and staff experience.

## Workforce

Clinical workforce shortages are an increasingly critical element of the programme's case for change.

The impact of these shortages were set out in relation to Option A. For the other options, the potential of each option to improve recruitment and retention was summarised.

## Deliverability

For this criterion, the estates work required to deliver each option was summarised, drawing on work undertaken by external technical advisors. Outline plans and timescales were presented to the panel workshop.

Beyond physical deliverability, there are also differential issues in terms of the acceptability of each option to the public and other stakeholders, with supporting evidence from a stratified telephone survey.

### 3.3 Weighting Criteria

The panel was asked to assign a relative weighting to each criterion. To inform this, the panel was presented with the weightings agreed in the shortlisting process and in the 2015 appraisal, and with a weighting derived from the public telephone survey.

Panel members agreed to use the same weighting used in the 2015 appraisal:
Table 3: Agreed Non-financial Weightings

| Evaluation Criteria | Shortlisting <br> 2015 | Appraisal <br> 2015 | Public <br> Survey 2015 | Public <br> Survey 2016 | agreed <br> weighting |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCESSIBILITY | $29.0 \%(2)$ | $25.1 \%(3)$ | $26.4 \%(2)$ | $25.8 \%(3)$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 1 \%}$ |
| QUALITY | $32.3 \%(1)$ | $31.2 \%(1)$ | $27.5 \%(1)$ | $27.1 \%(1)$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 2 \%}$ |
| WORKFORCE | $27.4 \%(3)$ | $27.3 \%(2)$ | $26.4 \%(2)$ | $27.0 \%(2)$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 3 \%}$ |
| DELIVERABILITY | $11.3 \%(4)$ | $16.3 \%(4)$ | $19.7 \%(4)$ | $20.1 \%(4)$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 3 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

Additional weightings were used to test the sensitivity of the results, and these are set out in Appendix B.

### 3.4 Scoring Options

Panel members were asked to score each of the four options against each of the four criteria using a range of 1-7, where a higher number indicated a stronger performance against a criterion.

Panel members recorded their own scores initially, and these were then combined and weighted to produce initial weighted totals. The totals were presented back to the panel which was then invited to discuss any areas of particular divergence in scores.

Following discussion, panel members were given the opportunity to revise any of their scores if they wished to. None chose to.

### 3.5 Non-Financial Results

The following table summarises the results of the non-financial appraisal. Detailed results can be found in Appendix B.

Table 4: Summary of Non-financial Scores

| TOTALS | Agreed <br>  Weighting | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |  |
| ACCESSIBILITY |  | 59.8 | 45.2 | 65.1 | 47.7 |
| QUALITY |  | 39.0 | 65.0 | 91.5 | 24.7 |
| WORKFORCE | $27.3 \%$ | 26.0 | 67.0 | 76.8 | 26.2 |
| DELIVERABILITY | $16.3 \%$ | 19.6 | 40.5 | 42.4 | 22.2 |
|  | $100.0 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 4 4 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 7 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 5 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0 . 8}$ |
|  | RANK | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |
|  | DIFFERENCE | $47.7 \%$ | $21.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.2 \%$ |

A number of sensitivity analyses were undertaken to test the validity of the results. This included breaking down weighted scores in terms of the following groupings:

- Clinicians and non-clinicians (where the former includes social care and public health professionals);
- Geographic groupings (those whose organisations are solely focused on Shropshire, Telford \& Wrekin or Powys plus other non-geographic organisations), and
- The type of body represented (commissioners, SaTH, other providers and public or patient representatives which included Local Authority representatives).

The following table summarises the scores from these groupings.
Table 5: Summary of Non-financial Sensitivity Analysis

| Scoring Analysis | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| OVERALL | $\mathbf{1 4 4 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 7 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 5 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0 . 8}$ |
| Clinicians | 69.2 | 103.4 | 138.6 | 59.4 |
| Non-clinicians | 75.2 | 114.2 | 137.2 | 61.4 |
| Shropshire | 26.1 | 41.2 | 57.8 | 22.4 |
| Telford \& Wrekin | 33.5 | 67.8 | 49.1 | 31.6 |
| Powys | 28.9 | 24.1 | 48.6 | 18.1 |
| Non-geographic | 55.9 | 84.5 | 120.2 | 48.8 |
| Commissioners | 32.5 | 46.6 | 51.9 | 25.7 |
| SaTH | 33.6 | 49.2 | 72.4 | 26.7 |
| Other Providers | 36.2 | 59.7 | 73.7 | 32.7 |
| Public/Patient | 42.1 | 62.1 | 77.8 | 35.7 |

The colour coding highlights the highest scoring options (deep green) through to the lowest scoring options (deep red). It enables an at-a-glance assessment of any areas of significant divergence between groups.

## a) Weightings

i) Applying equal weightings to all criteria resulted in the same ranking though with a slightly reduced margin of $19.4 \%$ between C1 and B.
ii) Applying the weightings derived from the public telephone survey also resulted in the same ranking though with a reduced margin of $20.2 \%$ between C 1 and B .
iii) Since C 1 outperformed B against all criteria, no change in the weightings could switch the ranking. If the only criterion was Deliverability (a test applied in the previous appraisal) awarding a $100 \%$ weighting to deliverability would therefore still result in C1 coming first, albeit by a reduced margin of $4.6 \%$.

## b) Scoring

i) The most significant difference in scoring between the leading options relates to the accessibility and quality criteria under which C1 scored $43.9 \%$ and $40.9 \%$, respectively, higher than B.
ii) Adding in scores for the Shropshire patient representative who had to leave early (using the average of other Shropshire patient representatives) very marginally increases C1's leading margin to 21.2\%.
iii) Adding in scores for the missing GP Federation representative (using the average of other GP panel members) very marginally reduces C1's leading margin to $21.0 \%$.
iv) C2 scored lowest across all groupings, followed by A (except in the case of Powys members where $A$ was ranked $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $B 3^{\text {rd }}$ ).
v) If the only scores counted are those of the CCG representatives, the outcome switches with B leading C1 by a margin of $5.2 \%$.
vi) If options are assessed in terms of the maximum scores awarded against each criterion, B and C 1 come equal $1^{\text {st }}$.
vii) If options are assessed in terms of the minimum scores awarded against each criterion, C1 comes $1^{\text {st }}$ by a very substantial margin, indicating that the panel regarded it as the 'least worst' option as well as the best.
viii) Finally, to test the impact of extreme scores, scores of zero and 1 were raised to 2 and scores of 7 were reduced to 6 . Again, no change of ranking resulted, although C1's margin reduced to $16.8 \%$
c) Change from 2015 Appraisal
i) Option A scored higher than before against all criteria (Access +2 , Quality +26 , Workforce +16 , Deliverability +2 );
ii) Option B scored lower on Access (-8), Quality ( -35 ) and Workforce ( -8 ) but higher on Deliverability (+22.5);
iii) Option C1 scored higher on all criteria (Access +12 , Quality +17 , Workforce +17 , Deliverability +34.5);
iv) Option C2 scored lower across the board (except from Powys scorers) and replaced Option A as the lowest scoring option;
v) The increased differential between Option C1 and Option B was most evident in the scores of representatives from provider organisations and those with no explicit geographical affiliation but -
a. Telford and Wrekin scorers also increased their scores for both B and C1 (and more so for C 1 than for B ),
b. Shropshire scorers decreased their scores for both B and C 1 (to a comparable degree), and
c. Powys scorers increased their scores for both B and C 1 (and more so for B than for C1).

The 2015 appraisal, in recording the same preference for C1 over other options, noted that the panel appeared to have a concern about increasing the disadvantage of those who already have to travel further, especially for emergency care.

In the present appraisal, it was further noted that some of the disadvantages of the change options ( $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C} 1$ and C 2 ) had been mitigated through the more balance site model offered in the revised delivery solutions.

The significant change in scoring for C 2 , resulting in it moving from $3^{\text {rd }}$ to $4^{\text {th }}$ ranking, reflects the new clinical evidence that had become available since last year, therefore precluding on clinical grounds the potential for women and children's services to remain at PRH under where the preferred site for EC is RSH.

### 4.0 FINANCIAL APPRAISAL

### 4.1 Introduction

The shortlisted options have been fully evaluated in line with the requirements of Department of Health Business Case Guidance and the HM Treasury Green Book to assess which option represents potentially the best value for money (VfM).

The economic analysis thus:

- Covers an appraisal period that ensures a full 60-year operational use of new facilities is reflected, using a discount rate of $3.5 \%$;
- Excludes VAT from all cash flows;
- Reflects capital cash flows at current cost levels calculated by discounting outturn cash flows by $2.5 \%$ GDP deflator;
- Makes provision where appropriate for a residual asset value to be included at the end of the appraisal period;
- No provision is made for any potential Opportunity Costs;
- Includes lifecycle costs for building and engineering elements based on standard NHS asset lives and replacement cycles, and lifecycle of equipment, with replacement occurring between 5-15 years depending upon the classification of the asset;
- Incorporates cash flows for all revenue costs;
- A quantified assessment of risk has not been undertaken;
- Assumes a price base of 2016/17.

All these cost inputs have been modelled to establish, for each option:

- The Net Present Cost (NPC) of the discounted annual cash flows over the whole appraisal period;
- The Equivalent Annual Cost (EAC), being an annualised equivalent of the NPC.


### 4.2 Cost Inputs

### 4.2.1 Capital

A capital cost assessment of the short listed options has been undertaken by Rider Hunt based on NHS Departmental Cost Allowances (DCAGs), applied to the proposed schedules of accommodation.

The costing has been undertaken in accordance with Department of Health guidance for the costing of capital schemes. Separate costs forms have been produced for the individual sites and options
with levels of optimism bias, VAT recovery and inflation assessed individually to provide more realistic costings.

Table 6: Capital Costs of Options

| Costs | Option A £000s | Option B £000s | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Option C1 } \\ & \text { £000s } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Option C2 } \\ & \text { £000s } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Works |  | 123,554 | 153,837 | 145,450 |
| Fees |  | 16,062 | 19,999 | 18,908 |
| Non-Works |  | 400 | 400 | 400 |
| Equipment |  | 12,867 | 14,797 | 13,862 |
| Contingencies |  | 12,355 | 15,384 | 14,545 |
| Optimism Bias |  | 28,090 | 36,795 | 34,770 |
| VAT |  | 34,048 | 42,668 | 40,335 |
| Total at PUBSEC <br> 195 Reporting <br> Level |  | 227,376 | 283,878 | 268,270 |
| Total at Outturn (at PUBSEC 214) |  | 249,613 | 311,636 | 294,497 |

Key assumptions are:

- The completion on site of each option has been separately identified;
- The Cost Index at Reporting Level is defined by the Department of Health to provide a consistent means of comparison between different projects: the current PUBSEC Index level is 195 with the costs being updated to the latest index, PUBSEC 214;
- Formal indices are no longer published in respect of equipment costs therefore, the costs are based on relative percentage requirements within new build, refurbishments and backlog areas;
- Professional fees have been included at $13 \%$ across all options;
- Planning Contingencies have been incorporated at $10 \%$ across all options;
- Optimism Bias has been calculated utilising HM Treasury's and Department of Health standard template and the percentage additions reflect the relative nature of each project. For each option the optimism bias has been assessed for each site separately to make it more appropriate to the works within each site;

VAT is potentially recoverable on all construction projects and is generally related to the amount of refurbishment work but can also be recoverable against some elements of new build. For all options, recovery has been included at $100 \%$ against all fees and this is shown in the cost forms as zero VAT in accordance with the standard NHS forms.

### 4.2.2 Revenue

Baseline 2016/17 revenue costs and forecasts for each option have been provided by SaTH as part of the analysis supporting the affordability assessment. The economic appraisal uses these figures, with the exception of the provision for inflation, in order to provide a consistent 2016/17 price base. Capital charges are also excluded from the VfM analysis.

Baseline revenue costs for 2016/17 are shown below.

Table 7: Baseline Revenue Costs 2016/17

| Expenditure | Revenue <br> Expenditure <br> $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Pay | 233,691 |
| Non Pay | 102,699 |
| Total VfM | $\mathbf{3 3 6 , 3 9 0}$ |

Table 8 below provides a summary of the assessed cost changes expected by 2020/21 under each of the options.

Sustainable services project changes represent:

- Additional staffing ( $£ 4.6 \mathrm{~m}$ under Option A only);
- Workforce reductions comprise of three separate elements, new ways of working and new roles, efficiencies and savings directly related to service change and pathway redesign
- Further reductions in workforce relate to activity changes, duplicate costs and IT;
- Savings are site and option specific;
- Within the development options, there is a net savings range of some $£ 3.2 \mathrm{~m}$, between Option C2 (lowest) at $£ 11.4 \mathrm{~m}$ and Option B (highest) at $£ 14.6 \mathrm{~m}$.

Table 8: Revenue Cost (Savings) - in 2020/21 at 2016/17 price base

| (Savings)/Costs | Option A <br> $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ | Option B <br> $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ | Option C1 <br> $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ | Option C2 <br> $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sustainable Services Project Savings | 4,600 | $(14,589)$ | $(14,203)$ | $(11,377)$ |

### 4.2.3 Opportunity Costs and Residual Values

No specific provision has been made for Opportunity Costs since:

- Full lifecycle provision has been made for all facilities including elements refurbished on a light touch basis and those simply retained as they are, as well as New Build and Major Refurbished facilities.

In respect of Residual Values, provision reflects the assumption that New Build and Major refurbished elements will be maintained to their as built standard and therefore the residual value remains.

### 4.3 Financial Analysis Outputs

### 4.3.1 Summary of VfM analysis - 60 Year Appraisal Period

Details of the economic model are attached at Appendix $C$, but the economic impact of the cash flows described in Section Financial Appraisal 4.0 is summarised in Table 9.

Table 9: Economic Costs of Options - 60 year appraisal period

|  | Do nothing | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ | $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ | $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ | $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ |
| Net Present Cost | $9,356,590$ | $8,555,517$ | $8,659,431$ | $8,705,510$ |
| Equivalent Annual Cost | 351,473 | 321,381 | 324,070 | 325,794 |
| Economic Value | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Marginal EAC over 1st |  |  |  |  |
| Ranked | 30,092 | 0 | 2,689 | 4,413 |
| $\%$ over Option First Ranked | $9.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |

Table 10 below provides a summary of the marginal EAC of each option, over that for Option B, split between Capital and Revenue elements:

Table 10: Summary of EAC Variance over Option B

| Option | Rank | Capital EAC <br> Variance <br> £000s | Revenue EAC <br> Variance <br> £000s | Total EAC <br> Variance <br> £000s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Option C1 | 2 | 2,374 | 315 | 2,689 |
| Option C2 | 3 | 1,674 | 2,739 | 4,413 |
| Option A | 0 | $(10,413)$ | 40,505 | 30,092 |

From the analysis that has been undertaken it is evident that, in economic terms:

- The cost of each of the development options (excluding Option A) falls within a relatively tight band range of just 1.4\%;
- Option B is preferred by a margin of $0.8 \%$ (EAC $£ 2.689 \mathrm{~m}$ ) over Option C1;
- The Do Nothing (Option A) is least preferred, by a margin of 9.4\% (EAC $£ 30.092 \mathrm{~m}$ ).


### 4.3.2 Sensitivity Analysis - Appraisal Period

In order to test the robustness of the economic analysis, an appraisal has also been undertaken to assess the VfM position over a 30-year appraisal period.

Cost inputs and assumptions mirror those detailed above with the exception of Residual Value, where it is assumed that $50 \%$ of the value of new/major refurbished facilities would be retained at the end of the 30-year period.

A summary of the outcome of this sensitivity is shown in Table 11:
Table 11: Economic Costs of Options - 30 Year Appraisal Period

|  | Do nothing | Option B1 | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | £000s | $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ | $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ | $£ 000 \mathrm{~s}$ |
| Net Present Cost | $7,478,605$ | $6,889,470$ | $7,039,144$ | $7,072,871$ |
| Equivalent Annual Cost | 351,265 | 323,594 | 326,332 | 327,895 |
| Economic Value | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Marginal EAC over 1st |  |  |  |  |
| Ranked | 27,671 | 0 | 2,738 | 4,301 |
| \% over Option First Ranked | $8.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |

This analysis confirms that under a shorter appraisal period:

- Whilst there is less net annual revenue cost impact under Option A, it remains least preferred by a margin of $8.6 \%$;
- Option B again remains preferred by a margin of 0.8\%;


### 4.3.3 Sensitivity Analysis - Income and Expenditure

A sensitivity analysis has been undertaken relating to demography, QIPP, CIP, repatriation and sustainable services workforce reductions. It has compared initial assumptions and the percentage move required for there to be an impact on affordability on each option, this is detailed in table 13.

Table 12: Sensitivity analysis

| Element of <br> Sensitivity | Assumptions within Model | Option B1 | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Demography | 2\% pa | $58 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| QIPP | Net QIPP Loss $£ 10.5 \mathrm{~m}$ over 4 years | $168 \%$ | $125 \%$ | $118 \%$ |
| CIP | £31.Om over 4 years (2.1\%) | $77 \%$ | $92 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| Repatriation | Net gain of $£ 6.0 \mathrm{~m}$ over 4 years | $-19 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Option B1 Saving of $£ 14.4 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |  |  |
|  | OSP Workforce | Option C1 Saving of $£ 14.2 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |  |
|  | Option C1 Saving of $£ 11.4 \mathrm{~m}$ | $66 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $89 \%$ |

### 4.4 Financial Conclusions

On the basis of the analysis undertaken:

- Option $B$ is preferred from a financial perspective on the basis of the figures provided;
- The Value for Money margin between all the development options is relatively close with the exception of Option A. This is the case even though there are substantial differences in the initial capital requirements of each of the change option. Once viewed from the perspective of whole life costs (as required by guidance), however, these differences become minimal. For example, although Option B has a capital requirement of $£ 250 \mathrm{~m}$ and Option C1 of $£ 312 \mathrm{~m}$ (c.25\% more), the final difference in terms of equivalent annual cost is just $£ 2.7 \mathrm{~m}(0.8 \%)$


### 5.0 OVERALL CONCLUSION

As noted in Section 2.1, two alternative methods have been used to combine the results of the NonFinancial and Financial Appraisals in order to test for robustness:

- Cost per Benefit Point;
- Weighted for Financial / Non-Financial Factors.

Based on the results of the analysis in Sections 3.5 and 4.3 , the results are as follows:
Table 13: Overall Economic Results

|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Weighted Non-Financial Score | 144.38 | 217.6 | 275.79 | 120.83 |
| Benefits Margin below 1st | $-47.7 \%$ | $-21.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $-56.2 \%$ |
| Benefits Rank | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Total EAC (£m) | 351,473 | 321,381 | 324,070 | 325,794 |
| Financial Margin above 1st | $9.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Financial Rank | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| Cost per Benefit Point (£) | $2,434.40$ | $1,476.92$ | $1,175.04$ | 2696.20 |
| Overall Margin below 1st | $107.2 \%$ | $25.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $129.5 \%$ |
| Overall Rank | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Combined Scores (50:50) | 71.9 | 89.5 | 99.6 | 71.2 |
| Overall Margin below 1st | $-27.8 \%$ | $-10.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $-28.5 \%$ |
| Overall Rank | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |

No material change in the results is caused by the application of the variant weightings from the non-financial appraisal.

A further sensitivity analysis has been undertaken to examine what weighting would need to be applied to the Non-Financial / Financial Results in order for Option B (the second ranked Option overall) to be preferred in Overall Terms to Option C1. This shows that, in order for the combined scores of Options B and C1 to be the same, the relative weightings for financial and non-financial analyses would need to be set at $96.2 \%$ and $3.8 \%$, respectively.
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## APPENDIX A - NON-FINANCIAL PANEL

| ORGANISATION | REPRESENTATIVE |
| :---: | :---: |
| Shropshire Clinical Commissioning Group | Dr Jessica Sokolov, GP Board Member |
|  | Dr Steve James, GP Board Member |
|  | Julie Davies, Director of Strategy \& Redesign |
| Telford \& Wrekin Clinical Commissioning Group | Dr Mike Innes |
|  | Anna Hammond, Deputy Executive for Commissioning and Planning |
|  | Alison Smith, Director of Governance |
| Powys Teaching Health Board | Victoria Deakins, Lead Therapist |
|  | Andrew Cresswell, Interim North Locality General Manager |
|  | Lesley Sanders |
| Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital NHS Trust | Dr Kevin Eardley, Care Group Director - Unscheduled Care |
|  | Mr Mark Cheetham, Care Group Director - Scheduled Care |
|  | Ms Louise Sykes, Consultant Anaesthetist - Scheduled Care |
|  | Dr Subramanian Kumaran, Consultant in Emergency Medicine |
|  | Mr Andrew Tapp, Care Group Director - Women \& Children |
|  | Julia Clarke, Director of Corporate Governance |
|  | Sarah Bloomfield, Chief Nursing Officer |
|  | Dr Edwin Borman, Medical Director |
|  | Neil Nisbet, Director of Finance |
|  | Victoria Maher, Director of HR |
|  | Debbie Jones, Radiology Care Group Manager |
|  | Robin Hooper, Non-Executive Director |
| Shropshire Community Health NHS Trust | Dr Ganesh, Medical Director |
|  | Andrew Thomas, Head of Nursing \& Quality for Adults |
|  | Tricia Finch, Head of Business \& Development |
| Shropshire Patient Group | Jane Niblock |
|  | Richard Chanter |
|  | Graham Shepherd |
| Telford \& Wrekin Health Round Table | Derek Hall |
|  | Janet O'Loughlin |
|  | Jane Pickavance |
| Healthwatch Shropshire | Angela Saganowska - Healthwatch Shropshire Board member |
|  | Daphne Lewis - Healthwatch Shropshire Chair |
|  | Vanessa Barratt- Healthwatch Shropshire Board member |
| Healthwatch Telford \& Wrekin | Kate Ballinger - Manager |
|  | David Bell - Healthwatch Telford \& Wrekin Member |
|  | Janet O'Loughlin - Member |
| Powys Patients (via PtHB) | Joy Jones |
|  | Frances Hunt |
|  | Robert Wright |
| Shropshire Council | Carole Croxford, Team Leader |
|  | Lee Chapman, Portfolio Holder for Adult Services |
| Telford and Wrekin Council | Julie Smith |
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| ORGANISATION | REPRESENTATIVE |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Clive Jones |
| Powys County Council | Jen Jeffreys, Senior Manager - Older People |
| West Midlands Ambulance <br> Service NHSFT | Mark Docherty, Director of Nursing, Quality \& Clinical Commissioning |
| Welsh Ambulance Services NHS <br> Trust | David Watkins |
| Robert Jones \& Agnes Hunt <br> Hospital NHS FT | David Ford, Consultant Orthopaedic Surgeon |
| South Staffs \& Shropshire <br> Healthcare NHS FT | Alison Blofield, Consultant Nurse and Clinical Director |
| LMC/GP Federation | (not provided) |
| Shropshire Doctors' Cooperative <br> Ltd | Emmanuel Le Goff, Operations Director |
| NHS England | Richard Woosley, Assurance \& Delivery Manager |

## futurefit

Shaping healthcare together

## APPENDIX B - NON-FINANCIAL SCORING

| TOTALS | Agreed <br>  Weighting | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |  |
| ACCESSIBILITY |  | 59.8 | 45.2 | 65.1 | 47.7 |
| QUALITY |  | 39.0 | 65.0 | 91.5 | 24.7 |
| WORKFORCE | $27.3 \%$ | 26.0 | 67.0 | 76.8 | 26.2 |
| DELIVERABILITY | $16.3 \%$ | 19.6 | 40.5 | 42.4 | 22.2 |
|  | $100.0 \%$ | 144.4 | 217.6 | 275.8 | 120.8 |
|  | RANK | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
|  | DIFFERENCE | $47.7 \%$ | $21.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.2 \%$ |


| TOTALS | Equal | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weighting | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | $25.0 \%$ | 59.5 | 45.0 | 64.8 | 47.5 |
| QUALITY | $25.0 \%$ | 31.3 | 52.0 | 73.3 | 19.8 |
| WORKFORCE | $25.0 \%$ | 23.8 | 61.3 | 70.3 | 24.0 |
| DELIVERABILITY | $25.0 \%$ | 30.0 | 62.0 | 65.0 | 34.0 |
|  | $100.0 \%$ | 144.5 | $\mathbf{2 2 0 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 3 . 3}$ | 125.3 |
|  | RANK | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | 4 |
|  | DIFFERENCE | $47.1 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $54.2 \%$ |


| TOTALS | Public Survey | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weighting | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | $25.8 \%$ | 61.4 | 46.4 | 66.8 | 49.0 |
| QUALITY | $27.1 \%$ | 33.9 | 56.4 | 79.4 | 21.4 |
| WORKFORCE | $27.0 \%$ | 25.7 | 66.2 | 75.9 | 25.9 |
| DELIVERABILITY | $20.1 \%$ | 24.1 | 49.8 | 52.3 | 27.3 |
|  | $100.0 \%$ | 145.0 | $\mathbf{2 1 8 . 8}$ | 274.4 | 123.7 |
|  | RANK | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
|  | DIFFERENCE | $47.1 \%$ | $20.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $54.9 \%$ |


| TOTALS | Other | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weightings | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | $0.0 \%$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| QUALITY | $0.0 \%$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| WORKFORCE | $0.0 \%$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| DELIVERABILITY | $100.0 \%$ | 120.0 | 248.0 | 260.0 | 136.0 |
|  | $100.0 \%$ | 120.0 | $\mathbf{2 4 8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 0 . 0}$ | 136.0 |
|  | RANK | 4 | $\mathbf{2}$ | 1 | 3 |
|  | DIFFERENCE | $53.8 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $47.7 \%$ |
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| MAXIMUM <br> SCORES | Agreed <br> Weighting | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |  |
| ACCESSIBILITY |  | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| QUALITY |  | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.9 |
| WORKFORCE | $27.3 \%$ | 1.6 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.6 |
| DELIVERABILITY | $16.3 \%$ | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
|  | $100.0 \%$ | 6.4 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.4 |
|  | RANK | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |


| MINIMUM SCORES | Agreed Weighting | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | 25.1\% | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| QUALITY | 31.2\% | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| WORKFORCE | 27.3\% | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| DELIVERABILITY | 16.3\% | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
|  | 100.0\% | 0.6 | 0.7 | 2.6 | 0.4 |
|  | RANK | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
|  | DIFFERENCE | 78.0\% | 70.8\% | 0.0\% | 83.8\% |


| CLINICIANS |  | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weighting | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ACCESSIBILITY | $25.1 \%$ | 29.4 | 20.9 | 32.7 | 23.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| QUALITY | $31.2 \%$ | 18.1 | 31.2 | 45.9 | 10.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKFORCE | $27.3 \%$ | 11.8 | 32.5 | 38.8 | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DELIVERABILITY | $16.3 \%$ | 10.0 | 18.8 | 21.2 | 12.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $100.0 \%$ | 69.2 | 103.4 | 138.6 | 59.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RANK |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |


| NON-CLINICIANS |  | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weighting | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | $25.1 \%$ | 30.4 | 24.4 | 32.4 | 23.9 |
| QUALITY | $31.2 \%$ | 20.9 | 33.7 | 45.6 | 13.7 |
| WORKFORCE | $27.3 \%$ | 14.2 | 34.4 | 38.0 | 14.2 |
| DELIVERABILITY | $16.3 \%$ | 9.6 | 21.7 | 21.2 | 9.6 |
|  | $100.0 \%$ | 75.2 | 114.2 | 137.2 | 61.4 |
|  | RANK |  | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |
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| Geographic Summary | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| Shropshire | 26.1 | 41.2 | 57.8 | 22.4 |
| Telford \& Wrekin | 33.5 | 67.8 | 49.1 | 31.6 |
| Powys | 28.9 | 24.1 | 48.6 | 18.1 |
| Non-geographic | 55.9 | 84.5 | 120.2 | 48.8 |


| SHROPSHIRE | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | 11.6 | 7.3 | 13.8 | 9.8 |
| QUALITY | 6.6 | 11.9 | 19.4 | 4.4 |
| WORKFORCE | 4.4 | 13.4 | 15.8 | 4.6 |
| DELIVERABILITY | 3.6 | 8.6 | 8.8 | 3.6 |
|  | $\mathbf{2 6 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 2}$ | 57.8 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 4}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |


| TELFORD \& WREKIN | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | 11.8 | 16.3 | 12.1 | 9.8 |
| QUALITY | 10.0 | 20.6 | 16.2 | 8.1 |
| WORKFORCE | 7.1 | 19.4 | 13.7 | 8.7 |
| DELIVERABILITY | 4.6 | 11.4 | 7.2 | 4.9 |
|  | 33.5 | 67.8 | 49.1 | 31.6 |
|  | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| POWYS | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | 10.1 | 3.5 | 11.8 | 6.5 |
| QUALITY | 8.4 | 7.2 | 15.6 | 4.1 |
| WORKFORCE | 6.0 | 9.0 | 13.4 | 4.4 |
| DELIVERABILITY | 4.4 | 4.4 | 7.8 | 3.1 |
|  | $\mathbf{2 8 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 1}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |


| NON-GEOGRAPHICAL | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | 26.4 | 18.1 | 27.4 | 21.6 |
| QUALITY | 14.1 | 25.3 | 40.3 | 8.1 |
| WORKFORCE | 8.5 | 25.1 | 33.9 | 8.5 |
| DELIVERABILITY | 7.0 | 16.0 | 18.6 | 10.6 |
|  | 55.9 | $\mathbf{8 4 . 5}$ | 120.2 | 48.8 |
|  | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |
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| Group Summary | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |  |  |  |  |
| Commissioner | 32.5 | 46.6 | 51.9 | 25.7 |  |  |  |  |
| SaTH | 33.6 | 49.2 | 72.4 | 26.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Other Provider | 36.2 | 59.7 | 73.7 | 32.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Patient/Public | 42.1 | 62.1 | 77.8 | 35.7 |  |  |  |  |
| CCGs | 19.0 | 29.8 | 28.2 | 17.4 |  |  |  |  |
| COMMISSIONER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |  |  |  |  |
| ACCESSIBILITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| QUALITY | 12.3 | 9.5 | 12.1 | 9.8 |  |  |  |  |
| WORKFORCE | 8.1 | 14.1 | 17.5 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| DELIVERABILITY | 6.0 | 15.0 | 14.5 | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |
| 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.0 | 7.8 | 5.2 |


| SaTH | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option $\mathbf{A}$ | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | 17.1 | 10.3 | 17.3 | 12.6 |
| QUALITY | 7.5 | 14.1 | 24.0 | 4.4 |
| WORKFORCE | 4.9 | 14.8 | 19.9 | 4.9 |
| DELIVERABILITY | 4.1 | 10.1 | 11.1 | 4.9 |
|  | 33.6 | 49.2 | 72.4 | 26.7 |
|  | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |


| OTHER PROVIDER | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | 15.8 | 12.8 | 16.6 | 13.3 |
| QUALITY | 10.0 | 18.4 | 24.7 | 6.6 |
| WORKFORCE | 6.3 | 18.3 | 21.0 | 6.3 |
| DELIVERABILITY | 4.1 | 10.1 | 11.4 | 6.5 |
|  | 36.2 | 59.7 | 73.7 | 32.7 |
|  | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |


| PATIENT/PUBLIC | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | 14.6 | 12.6 | 19.1 | 12.1 |
| QUALITY | 13.4 | 18.4 | 25.3 | 9.4 |
| WORKFORCE | 8.7 | 18.9 | 21.3 | 8.7 |
| DELIVERABILITY | 5.4 | 12.2 | 12.1 | 5.5 |
|  | $\mathbf{4 2 . 1}$ | 62.1 | 77.8 | 35.7 |
|  | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |


| CCGs | Total Weighted Scores |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C1 | Option C2 |
| ACCESSIBILITY | 7.0 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
| QUALITY | 4.4 | 8.7 | 9.7 | 3.1 |
| WORKFORCE | 3.6 | 9.3 | 8.2 | 4.4 |
| DELIVERABILITY | 4.1 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 3.6 |
|  | $\mathbf{1 9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 4}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |
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## APPENDIX C - ECONOMIC MODEL

| Option A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | New Capital at Current - Land \& Works | Land Sales | Opportunity Costs | Residual Value | Lifecycle <br> New Works | Lifecycle <br> New <br> Equipment | Lifecycle <br> Existing | TOTAL CAPITAL | Pay | Non Pay | Other | Total <br> Revenue | Total costs | Discount <br> Factor | Net Present Cost |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 233,691 | 104,683 | -1,984 | 336,390 | 346,158 | 1.0000 | 346,158 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 233,881 | 104,983 | -2,725 | 336,139 | 345,907 | 0.9662 | 334,209 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 234,581 | 105,283 | -2,765 | 337,098 | 346,866 | 0.9335 | 323,804 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 235,281 | 105,260 | -3,193 | 337,348 | 347,116 | 0.9019 | 313,079 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.8714 | 307,011 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.8420 | 296,629 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | * 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.8135 | 286,598 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | * 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.7860 | 276,906 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | - 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.7594 | 267,542 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768" | - 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.7337 | 258,495 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768' | - 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.7089 | 249,753 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | ' 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.6849 | 241,308 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.6618 | 233,147 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.6394 | 225,263 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.6178 | 217,646 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.5969 | 210,286 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.5767 | 203,175 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.5572 | 196,304 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.5384 | 189,666 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.5202 | 183,252 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.5026 | 177,055 |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.4856 | 171,067 |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.4692 | 165,283 |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.4533 | 159,693 |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.4380 | 154,293 |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.4231 | 149,075 |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.4088 | 144,034 |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.3950 | 139,164 |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.3817 | 134,457 |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.3687 | 129,911 |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.3563 | 125,518 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.3442 | 121,273 |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.3326 | 117,172 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.3213 | 113,210 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.3105 | 109,381 |
| 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.3000 | 105,682 |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2898 | 102,109 |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2800 | 98,656 |
| 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2706 | 95,319 |
| 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2614 | 92,096 |
| 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2526 | 88,982 |
| 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2440 | 85,973 |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2358 | 83,065 |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2278 | 80,256 |
| 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2201 | 77,542 |
| 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2127 | 74,920 |
| 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.2055 | 72,387 |
| 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1985 | 69,939 |
| 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1918 | 67,574 |
| 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1853 | 65,289 |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1791 | 63,081 |
| 51 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1730 | 60,948 |
| 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1671 | 58,887 |
| 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1615 | 56,895 |
| 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1560 | 54,971 |
| 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1508 | 53,112 |
| 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1457 | 51,316 |
| 57 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1407 | 49,581 |
| 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768" | * 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1360 | 47,904 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768" | * 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1314 | 46,284 |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768" | * 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1269 | 44,719 |
| 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | * 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1226 | 43,207 |
| 62 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768" | - 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1185 | 41,746 |
| 63 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | - 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1145 | 40,334 |
| 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768" | * 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1106 | 38,970 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768" | * 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1069 | 37,652 |
| 66 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,768" | 9,768 | 240,581 | 105,560 | -3,607 | 342,534 | 352,302 | 0.1033 | 36,379 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 00 |  | 0 654,456 | 654,456 | 16,094,028 | 7,070,507 | -237,932 | 22,926,602 | 23,581,058 | 27 | 9,356,590 |
| Equivalent | t Annual Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 351,473 |

Shaping healthcare together


Shaping healthcare together

| Option C1-Capital $£ 311 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | New Capital at Current - Land \& Works | Land Sales | Opportunity Costs | Residual Value | Lifecycle New Works | Lifecycle <br> New <br> Equipment | Lifecycle <br> Existing $8,500$ | TOTAL CAPITAL | Pay | Non Pay | Other | Total <br> Revenue | Total costs | Discount Factor | Net Present Cost |
| 0 | 7,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15,500 | 233,691 | 104,683 | -1,984 | 336,390 | 351,890 | 1.0000 | 351,890 |
| 1 | 50,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 58,500 | 233,881 | 104,983 | -8,767 | 330,097 | 388,597 | 0.9662 | 375,456 |
| 2 | 76,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 84,500 | 234,581 | 105,283 | -15,481 | 324,382 | 408,883 | 0.9335 | 381,696 |
| 3 | 138,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 146,500 | 235,281 | 105,260 | -22,733 | 317,808 | 464,308 | 0.9019 | 418,779 |
| 4 | 20,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 28,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 325,715 | 0.8714 | 283,842 |
| 5 | 20,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 28,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 325,715 | 0.8420 | 274,244 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.8135 | 248,700 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | -52,933 |  | 8,500 | -44,433 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 252,782 | 0.7860 | 198,685 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.7594 | 232,164 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.7337 | 224,313 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.7089 | 216,727 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.6849 | 209,398 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 7,432 | 8,500 | 15,933 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 313,148 | 0.6618 | 207,236 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.6394 | 195,476 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.6178 | 188,865 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.5969 | 182,479 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.5767 | 176,308 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  | 34,189 | 8,500 | 42,689 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 339,904 | 0.5572 | 189,396 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.5384 | 164,585 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.5202 | 159,020 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.5026 | 153,642 |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.4856 | 148,446 |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  | 46,631 | 8,500 | 55,131 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 352,346 | 0.4692 | 165,303 |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.4533 | 138,576 |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.4380 | 133,890 |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.4231 | 129,363 |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.4088 | 124,988 |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  | 34,189 | 8,500 | 42,689 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 339,904 | 0.3950 | 134,266 |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.3817 | 116,678 |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500' | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.3687 | 112,732 |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.3563 | 108,920 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | " 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.3442 | 105,236 |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  | 81,756 | 8,500 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | - 90,256 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 387,471 | 0.3326 | 128,869 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.3213 | 98,239 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | -8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.3105 | 94,917 |
| 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | - 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.3000 | 91,708 |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | '8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.2898 | 88,606 |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |  | 73,387 | 8,500 | 7 81,887 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 379,103 | 0.2800 | 106,161 |
| 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | " 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.2706 | 82,715 |
| 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | " 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.2614 | 79,918 |
| 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.2526 | 77,215 |
| 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | - 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.2440 | 74,604 |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  | 7,432 | 8,500 | - 15,933 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 313,148 | 0.2358 | 73,834 |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | -8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.2278 | 69,644 |
| 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 ${ }^{\circ}$ | - 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.2201 | 67,289 |
| 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | -8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.2127 | 65,013 |
| 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | F 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.2055 | 62,815 |
| 47 |  |  |  |  |  | 34,189 | 8,500 | - 42,689 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 339,904 | 0.1985 | 67,478 |
| 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | - 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1918 | 58,638 |
| 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | " 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1853 | 56,655 |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | -8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1791 | 54,739 |
| 51 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | -8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1730 | 52,888 |
| 52 |  |  |  |  |  | 46,631 | 8,500 | 55,131 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 352,346 | 0.1671 | 58,894 |
| 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | -8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1615 | 49,372 |
| 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | " 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1560 | 47,702 |
| 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | -8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1508 | 46,089 |
| 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | -8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1457 | 44,531 |
| 57 |  |  |  |  |  | 108,513 | 8,500 | 117,013 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 414,228 | 0.1407 | 58,296 |
| 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | - 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1360 | 41,570 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | - 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1314 | 40,164 |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | " 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1269 | 38,806 |
| 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | " 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1226 | 37,493 |
| 62 |  |  |  |  |  | 7,432 | 8,500 | 15,933 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 313,148 | 0.1185 | 37,106 |
| 63 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | -8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1145 | 35,001 |
| 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | " 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1106 | 33,817 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | - 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1069 | 32,673 |
| 66 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500 | - 8,500 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 305,715 | 0.1033 | 31,569 |
| 67 |  |  |  | -177,242 |  | 103,117 | 8,500 | -65,625 | 221,778 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 297,215 | 231,590 | 0.0998 | 23,106 |
| Total | 311,000 |  | 0 | -177,242 | -52,933 | 584,898 | 578,012 | 1,243,735 | 15,131,217 | 7,176,067 | -1,976,839 | 20,330,445 | 21,574,180 | 27 | 8,659,431 |
| Equivalen | t Annual Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 324,070 |

Shaping healthcare together

| Option C2-Capital £294m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | New Capital at Current - Land \& Works | Land Sales | Opportunity Costs | Residual Value | Lifecycle New Works | Lifecycle <br> New <br> Equipment | Lifecycle <br> Existing | TOTAL CAPITAL | Pay | Non Pay | Other | Total Revenue | Total costs | Discount Factor | Net Present Cost |
| 0 | 7,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 15,561 | 233,691 | 104,683 | -1,984 | 336,390 | 351,950 | 1.0000 | 351,950 |
| 1 | 50,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 58,561 | 233,881 | 104,983 | -8,767 | 330,097 | 388,657 | 0.9662 | 375,514 |
| 2 | 76,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 84,561 | 234,581 | 105,283 | -15,481 | 324,382 | 408,943 | 0.9335 | 381,753 |
| 3 | 121,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 129,561 | 235,281 | 105,260 | -22,733 | 317,808 | 447,368 | 0.9019 | 403,501 |
| 4 | 20,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 28,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 328,602 | 0.8714 | 286,358 |
| 5 | 20,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 28,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 328,602 | 0.8420 | 276,674 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.8135 | 251,048 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | -50,022 |  | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | -41,461 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 258,580 | 0.7860 | 203,242 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.7594 | 234,356 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.7337 | 226,431 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.7089 | 218,774 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | - 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.6849 | 211,376 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 7,024 | 8,561 | 15,584 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 315,626 | 0.6618 | 208,876 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.6394 | 197,321 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.6178 | 190,649 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | - 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.5969 | 184,202 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.5767 | 177,973 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  | 32,309 | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 40,869 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 340,911 | 0.5572 | 189,957 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.5384 | 166,139 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.5202 | 160,521 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.5026 | 155,093 |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561' | " 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.4856 | 149,848 |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  | 44,066 | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | -52,627 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 352,668 | 0.4692 | 165,455 |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | ' 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.4533 | 139,885 |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | " 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.4380 | 135,155 |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.4231 | 130,584 |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | - 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.4088 | 126,168 |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  | 32,309 | 8,561 | - 40,869 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 340,911 | 0.3950 | 134,664 |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561' | " 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.3817 | 117,779 |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.3687 | 113,796 |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.3563 | 109,948 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.3442 | 106,230 |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  | 77,260 | 8,561 | 85,820 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 385,862 | 0.3326 | 128,334 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.3213 | 99,167 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.3105 | 95,814 |
| 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.3000 | 92,573 |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.2898 | 89,443 |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |  | 69,351 | 8,561 | 77,912 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 377,953 | 0.2800 | 105,839 |
| 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.2706 | 83,496 |
| 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.2614 | 80,672 |
| 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.2526 | 77,944 |
| 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.2440 | 75,309 |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  | 7,024 | 8,561 | 15,584 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 315,626 | 0.2358 | 74,418 |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.2278 | 70,301 |
| 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.2201 | 67,924 |
| 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.2127 | 65,627 |
| 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.2055 | 63,408 |
| 47 |  |  |  |  |  | 32,309 | 8,561 | 40,869 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 340,911 | 0.1985 | 67,677 |
| 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1918 | 59,192 |
| 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1853 | 57,190 |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1791 | 55,256 |
| 51 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1730 | 53,388 |
| 52 |  |  |  |  |  | 44,066 | 8,561 | 52,627 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 352,668 | 0.1671 | 58,948 |
| 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | - 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1615 | 49,838 |
| 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1560 | 48,153 |
| 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1508 | 46,524 |
| 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | - 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1457 | 44,951 |
| 57 |  |  |  |  |  | 102,545 | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 111,105 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 411,147 | 0.1407 | 57,862 |
| 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1360 | 41,962 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | -8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1314 | 40,543 |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | \% 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1269 | 39,172 |
| 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | - 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1226 | 37,848 |
| 62 |  |  |  |  |  | 7,024 | 8,561 | 15,584 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 315,626 | 0.1185 | 37,400 |
| 63 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 | - 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1145 | 35,331 |
| 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561' | " 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1106 | 34,136 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | - 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1069 | 32,982 |
| 66 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,561" | - 8,561 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 308,602 | 0.1033 | 31,867 |
| 67 |  |  |  | -167,494 |  | 97,446 | 8,561 | -61,488 | 224,604 | 105,560 | -30,123 | 300,042 | 238,554 | 0.0998 | 23,800 |
| Total | 294,000 |  | 0 | -167,494 | -50,022 | 552,730 | 582,121 | 1,211,335 | 15,312,106 | 7,176,067 | -1,976,839 | 20,511,334 | 21,722,669 | 27 | 8,705,510 |
| Equivalent | t Annual Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 325,794 |

## APPENDIX D - OVERALL SENSITIVITY
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Further weightings have been tested as part of the sensitivity analysis but with no change in ranking (see Appendix D).

