



Insight | Change | Management



Service Delivery Review Programme: Formal Hurdle Criteria Workshop

Report

18 February 2025

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Methodology	1
1.3	Scenarios Considered	2
1.4	Report Structure	2
2	SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS	3
2.1	Introduction	3
2.2	Workshop Introduction	3
2.2.1	Asset Management Overview	3
2.2.2	Options Review & Decision-Making Process	4
2.2.3	General Questions & Discussions	4
2.3	Morning Session	5
2.4	Afternoon Session	5
2.5	Summary of Comments for Each Option	6
2.5.1	Option A1 (Perth).....	6
2.5.2	Option B1 (Crianlarich)	6
2.5.3	Option B2 (Fetlar)	6
2.5.4	Option B3 (Nethy Bridge).....	6
2.5.5	Option B4 (Ratagan).....	7
2.5.6	Option B5 (Muck).....	7
2.5.7	Option B6 (Colintraive)	7
2.5.8	Option B7 (Corriecravie).....	7
2.5.9	Option B8 (Kerrera)	7
2.5.10	Option C1 & C2 (Fife)	7
2.5.11	Option D1 & D2 (Lanarkshire).....	7
2.5.12	Option E1 & E2 (Western Aberdeenshire)	8
2.5.13	Option F1 & F2 (Moray)	8
2.5.14	Option G1 & G2 (Inverclyde).....	8
2.5.15	Option H1, H2 & H3 (Dundee City & Monifieth)	8
2.5.16	Option I1 & I2 (Edinburgh & East Lothian).....	8

2.5.17 Option J1 (Scottish Borders).....	8
2.5.18 Option K1 (Argyll & Bute).....	8
2.5.19 Option L1 & L2 (North Aberdeenshire)	9
2.5.20 Option M1, M2 & M3 (Glasgow & East Dunbartonshire).....	9
2.5.21 Key Takeaways	9
3 SCORING OUTCOMES.....	12
3.1 Introduction	12
3.2 Overall Scores	12
3.3 Suggested scenarios.	13
4 APPENDIX ONE: RESULTS OF THE OUTCOMES OF THE HURDLE CRITERIA SCORING EXERCISE	14
4.1 Mean Average of Scores	14
4.2 Median of Scores.....	15
4.3 Mode of Scores.....	16
5 APPENDIX TWO: DETAILED RESULTS.....	17

Status:	Final
Circulation:	Sensitive: Commercial in Confidence
Date:	27 February 2025
Version:	V3

1 INTRODUCTION

Background and context

1.1 Introduction

This report summarises the outcomes of an appraisal of the scenarios under consideration for the Service Delivery Review Programme currently being investigated for viability, desirability and feasibility by the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS.)

The event took place on the 29th of January, at Carnegie Conference Centre, Dunfermline.

1.2 Methodology

Scenarios were scored using a range of 1 to 5 against four so-called 'hurdle criteria' which are the minimum essential requirements that a scenario must meet to be considered viable to go forward in the appraisal process. They are used to help decision-makers filter out options that fail to meet critical objectives before conducting a more detailed evaluation.

In this case the hurdle criteria used were based around viability, feasibility, and desirability, and were:

Viability: does the scenario contribute to long-term financial sustainability.

Feasibility: is the scenario meeting a strategic priority (e.g. RAAC)

Desirability: measured around 2 factors: (i) communities and (ii) service and staff

Against these participants in the workshop applied their judgement to provide a score of the extent to which each scenario did or did not meet the criteria.

1-2 Do not meet the requirements of the hurdle.

3 Neutral

4-5 Meet or fully meet the requirements of the hurdle.

This was conducted in a workshop environment, with members of the ASV team acting as independent facilitators to the process.

1.3 Scenarios Considered

In total 31 scenarios were considered against the hurdle criteria. These were:

A1	Perth
B1-B8	Crianlarich, Fetlar, Nethy Bridge, Ratagan, Muck, Colintrave, Corriecravie and Kerrera
C1, C2	Fife: Dunfermline: Lochgelly, Methil, Glenrothes
D1, D2	Lanarkshire: Cumbernauld, Hamilton, Bellshill, Lanark, Carluke and Lesmahagow
E1 & E3	Westen Aberdeenshire: Balmoral, Strathdon, Ballater
F1, F2	Moray: Cullen, Buckie, Portsoy
G1, G2	Inverclyde: Greenock, Port Glasgow, Gourock
H1 – H3	Dundee City: Balmossie and Kingsway
I1, I2	Edinburgh and East Lothian: Marionville, Newcraighall, Musselburgh and Tranent
J1	Scottish Borders, Hawick, Galashiels
K1	Argyll and Bute: Helensburgh
L1, L2	North Aberdeenshire: Peterhead, Huntly, Turriff
M1– M3	Glasgow and East Dumbartonshire: Cowcaddens, Maryhill, Govan, Springburn, Yorkhill, Milngavie

1.4 Report Structure

Following this brief introduction section the remainder of the report is set out as follows:

Section Two:	Provides a narrative description of the options considered and the summary of process used to score the each.
Section Three:	Sets out the outcomes of the scoring exercise and the recommendations of options for consideration to go forward to the next stage (balanced room) of the process.
Appendix One:	Sets out results of the outcomes of the hurdle criteria scoring exercise.
Appendix Two:	Provides a summary overview of average, mean, median and mode scores per option.

2 SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

High level notes of the discussions surrounding the scoring exercise.

2.1 Introduction

This section provides a high-level summary of the discussions and scoring exercises conducted during the Hurdle Criteria Workshop. It includes feedback from both the morning and afternoon sessions, highlighting key points, concerns, and suggestions for improvement.

The section also outlines the general information and key questions raised for each option considered in the hurdle criteria scoring exercise.

2.2 Workshop Introduction

Participants were welcomed, and the roles of observers, decision-makers, and subject matter experts were clarified. The Hurdle Criteria Workshop was described as a filtration event to assess various options systematically.

Rules of engagement, venue logistics, and confidentiality requirements were highlighted, and attendees were encouraged to approach the appraisal process with an open mind.

It was noted that **full impact assessments** are ongoing for all options under review.

2.2.1 Asset Management Overview

A brief presentation was provided which highlighted the following:

- **Funding Context:** The current year's capital funding from the Scottish Government is £47 million, though previous allocations have been lower.
- **Potential Capital Receipts:** The possible sale of Cowcaddens Fire Station could generate £14 million in capital.
- **Key Considerations:** Property, ICT, Fleet, and various projects play a critical role in the Service Delivery Review Programme.
 - Fleet Investment Backlog: Currently at £100 million.
 - Budget Constraints: The ICT capital budget is reducing year on year up until 2029/30 by 7 to 8% with the exception of year 2029/30 where there is a requirement of an injection of capital.
 - Fleet and other projects:
 - New Mobilising System (£13 million)
 - Breathing Apparatus Upgrade (£12+ million)
- **Fire Station Costs & Market Uncertainty:**
 - The last fire station was built 12-14 years ago, and costs have risen significantly post-COVID.
 - Land costs remain uncertain, and site purchases will be necessary.

- Upcoming refurbishments:
 - Dalkeith (£9 million)
 - Liberton (£10 million)
- **Strategic Priorities:**
 - Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC) Station Removals: Aiming to eliminate all RAAC-affected stations within five years.
 - Dignified Facilities & Contamination Control: Requires decision-making to advance improvements in these areas.

2.2.2 Options Review & Decision-Making Process

- **External Consultancy Support:** A consultant provided an overview of the options appraisal process and will continue to advise throughout the review.
- **Hurdle Criteria Explanation:** Each option must meet the established criteria before advancing.
- **Scoring & Deliberation:**
 - Decision-makers were encouraged to take personal notes to support scoring.
 - All contributions should be relevant and aid decision-making.
 - Time constraints were noted, limiting the review period.
 - Options may reemerge during consultation and could be reconsidered at later stages.
 - **Scoring Mechanism:** a Likert scale (1-5) was used:
 - 1 = Option rejected (fails criteria)
 - 2 = Somewhat negative, still a rejection
 - 3 = Neutral, no significant impact
 - 4 & 5 = Positive scores, option accepted
- **Mentimeter** (an online tool) was used to provide a scoring system in the workshop to allow for structured evaluation.

2.2.3 General Questions & Discussions

- **Scoring Impact:**

It was clarified that numerical values do not inherently influence scoring; the Likert scale is used as a structured evaluation method.
- **Response Time Modelling:**
 - ORH modelling was used to assess response times.
 - Queries were raised regarding overprovision and how often second pumps are mobilised.

2.3 Morning Session

The observer's notes for the morning session can be summarised as follows.

Overall, the feedback provided highlights the importance of clear communication, effective use of visuals, and engaging discussions in presenting service change proposals to the public.

- **Feedback**
Observers generally found the language clear and the images helpful, though some noted issues with room layout and presentation clarity.
- **Suggestions**
Improvements suggested included better use of microphones, clearer images, and more interactive discussions.
- **Clarity and understanding of the changes options.**
When asked to evaluate the clarity of the discussions and the language used, most found the language simple and the information understandable.
- **Use of Visuals**
The balance between images and text was generally well-received, but some observers suggested improvements in the visibility and clarity of the visuals.
- **Structure and Purpose**
The structure of the morning session was considered good, with clear introductory information. However, some felt that the purpose and overall process could have been clearer.
- **Feedback on the Session**
Observers appreciated the information provided but felt that open communication and discussions were lacking.

Suggestions for improvement included better room layout, clearer explanations, and more engaging visuals, better use of microphones, and more interactive discussions.
- **Concerns**
Some concerns were raised about the reliance on part-time staff and the impact of service changes on public.

2.4 Afternoon Session

Again, using the observer's notes as the source of this summary of the afternoon overall, the session was informative, but there were areas identified for improvement to enhance clarity and engagement.

- **Clarity of Presentation**
While some participants found the language clear, others felt that the options were complex and not always explained correctly, leading to confusion.

- **Overall Purpose:**
The purpose of the session and the overall process were clear to most participants.
- **Use of Visual Aids**
There was a mixed response regarding the balance of images and text. Some felt there was a good balance, but others found the information overwhelming and hard to read on screens.
- **Voting Process**
The voting stage was found to be slightly complex by some participants, with issues related to the explanation of voting sheets and the Mentimeter too.
- **General Feedback:**
Participants appreciated the friendly atmosphere and the helpfulness of the staff. However, there were suggestions for improvements, such as better room layout and clearer graphics.

2.5 Summary of Comments for Each Option

Set out below is a brief summary of the general information provided, and key questions raised against each option considered in the hurdle criteria scoring exercise.

2.5.1 Option A1 (Perth)

General Information: Map rendering issues on PowerPoint. The option addresses temporary appliance withdrawals and strategic priorities (e.g., finding permanent solutions for 10-pump withdrawals).

- Q** Is the option aligned with the High Reach Appliance Strategy?
A Yes, it fits the strategy and benefits operations.

2.5.2 Option B1 (Crianlarich)

General Information: Dormant station, £2.5M reduction in capital backlog.

- Q** No questions raised.

2.5.3 Option B2 (Fetlar)

General Information: Map quality issues. Station has one appliance, closing it would save £13K in operational staff costs.

- Q** What is the population of Fetlar?
A Less than 50 people.

2.5.4 Option B3 (Nethy Bridge)

General Information: No immediate impact on response times; no property or appliance at the station.

- Q** Are there any staff or On-Call contracts at the station?
A No permanent staff, though contracts exist.

2.5.5 Option B4 (Ratagan)

General Information: Structurally unsafe station; lease considerations.

Q No questions raised.

2.5.6 Option B5 (Muck)

General Information: One volunteer firefighter, who cannot respond alone. No fire station just rented land for a trailer.

Q No questions raised.

2.5.7 Option B6 (Colintraive)

General Information: No fire station, just a shed. One volunteer Crew Commander requires external station support.

Q No questions raised.

2.5.8 Option B7 (Corriecravie)

General Information: Struggling to maintain crew since 2022, currently has 3 volunteer firefighters.

Q Is the neighbouring volunteer station sufficiently crewed?

A Yes, it has three members.

2.5.9 Option B8 (Kerrera)

General Information: No fire station, just a wooden shed with equipment. Response provided from Oban.

Q No questions raised.

2.5.10 Option C1 & C2 (Fife)

General Information: Temporary withdrawal changes in place; response time modelling compared.

Q Would this involve reinstating the temporary withdrawal at Glenrothes?

A Yes.

Q What is the community impact of these changes?

A Temporary Pump Withdrawal Evaluation report pending.

Q Are savings the same for C1 & C2?

A C2 provides more savings.

2.5.11 Option D1 & D2 (Lanarkshire)

General Information: RAAC concerns at Cumbernauld; rebalancing response resources.

Q How feasible is land acquisition at Carluke?

A Easier than in urban areas but uncertain before 2031.

Q Will new duty systems impact timeline feasibility?

A Will be analysed in post-Balanced Room stage.

2.5.12 Option E1 & E2 (Western Aberdeenshire)

General Information: Modelling suggests overprovision at Ballater, £5M capital backlog.

Q Will response time changes be significant?

A Minimal impact expected.

Q Is £2.5M for carbon-neutral upgrades justified?

A Can be reduced by cutting facilities.

2.5.13 Option F1 & F2 (Moray)

General Information: Buckie overprovision, recruitment challenges.

Q What are the recruitment challenges in Cullen?

A Hard to maintain crew of six.

2.5.14 Option G1 & G2 (Inverclyde)

General Information: Greenock is under-provisioned; Port Glasgow is over-provisioned.

Q Will the new station at Gourock impact Kilmacolm?

A Yes, slight response delay.

2.5.15 Option H1, H2 & H3 (Dundee City & Monifieth)

General Information: Overprovision at Balmossie; socio-economic context considered.

Q Will closing Balmossie increase response times to Angus?

A Yes, significantly.

Q What is the financial impact?

A £4M cost avoidance and £600K savings.

2.5.16 Option I1 & I2 (Edinburgh & East Lothian)

General Information: New stations needed; Marionville water rescue specialist needs relocation.

Q Why is Musselburgh's rebuild costlier than Tranent?

A Musselburgh is a wholetime station, requiring more infrastructure.

2.5.17 Option J1 (Scottish Borders)

General Information: RAAC remediation at Galashiels proceeding as usual.

Q Has On-Call recruitment been an issue?

A No, recruitment is good.

2.5.18 Option K1 (Argyll & Bute)

• **General Information:** RAAC station, potential nucleus crew.

Q Does cost calculation include nucleus crew impact?

A No.

Q What is the additional cost of On-Call recruitment?

A £780K.

2.5.19 Option L1 & L2 (North Aberdeenshire)

General Information: Peterhead changes, redeployment of 18 wholetime posts.

Q Is £747K reduction mainly from staff redeployment?

A Yes.

2.5.20 Option M1, M2 & M3 (Glasgow & East Dunbartonshire)

General Information: One pump overprovision; On-Call recruitment challenges.

Q What is the impact on Yorkhill/Govan risk?

A Minimal, based on modelling.

Q What is the capital receipt for Yorkhill?

A £2M+.

2.6 Key Takeaways

Overall, the following key takeaways can be identified from the questions and information provided:

- **Financial Considerations:** Many options aim to reduce capital investment backlog and repurpose funds.
- **Operational Feasibility:** Several options require land acquisition and structural investments, some uncertain before 2031.
- **Staffing & Recruitment:** On-Call recruitment challenges identified in multiple regions.
- **Community Impact:** Response times and station closures discussed extensively.
- **Strategic Priorities:** Addressing RAAC and dignified facilities remains crucial.

The discussions, questions and answers leading to these key takeaways are summarised in Table 2.1 on the following page.

Table 2.1: Summary of Questions Raised and Answers Provided by Option

Option	Key Considerations	Key Questions Raised	Answers Provided
A1 (Perth)	Strategic priority - temporary appliance withdrawals	Alignment with High Reach Appliance Strategy?	Yes, aligns with High Reach Appliance Strategy.
B1 (Crianlarich)	Dormant station, Â£2.5M reduction in capital backlog	No questions raised	No questions raised.
B2 (Fetlar)	Single appliance, Â£13K savings, low population	Population data required for decision-making	Population estimated at less than 50 people.
B3 (Nethy Bridge)	No property/appliance, minimal impact	Are there any staff or On-Call contracts?	No permanent staff, but contracts exist.
B4 (Ratagan)	Structurally unsafe, lease termination needed	No questions raised	No questions raised.
B5 (Muck)	Single firefighter, no fire station	No questions raised	No questions raised.
B6 (Colintraive)	No station, volunteer-based, external support required	No questions raised	No questions raised.
B7 (Corriecravie)	Struggling to maintain crew, alternative stations available	Neighbouring volunteer station crewed sufficiently?	Yes, neighbouring station has three volunteers.
B8 (Kerrera)	No station, relies on Oban response	No questions raised	No questions raised.
C1 (Fife)	Temporary withdrawal, response time assessment	Impact of temporary withdrawal?	Temporary Pump Withdrawal Evaluation report pending.
C2 (Fife)	Alternative duty system, On-Call recruitment needed	Impact on community safety activity?	Community safety activity will be maintained.
D1 (Lanarkshire)	RAAC at Cumbernauld, redeployment required	Feasibility of Cumbernauld work?	Yes, feasible within five-year timescale.
D2 (Lanarkshire)	Land acquisition challenge, RAAC issue	Feasibility of Carluke land acquisition?	Land acquisition possible but uncertain before 2031.
E1 (Western Aberdeenshire)	Overprovision at Ballater, Â£5M capital backlog	Response time comparison with actual incidents?	Reviewed availability and low demand in rural areas.
E2 (Western Aberdeenshire)	Minimal impact, investment in Balmoral	High investment cost justification?	Investment can be reduced by limiting facilities.
F1 (Moray)	Overprovision in Buckie, recruitment issues	Recruitment challenges in Cullen?	Recruitment stable in Buckie, difficult in Cullen.

Option	Key Considerations	Key Questions Raised	Answers Provided
F2 (Moray)	Replacing ten-crew cab, Cullen staffing issues	Capital cost impact at Cullen?	Routine capital costs would be involved.
G1 (Inverclyde)	Rebalancing resources, overprovision in Port Glasgow	Changing risk profiles in community?	Greenock & Port Glasgow risk profile remains unchanged.
G2 (Inverclyde)	Impact on Kilmacolm, Â£9M investment required	Land acquisition feasibility for new station?	Yes, but planning and funding risks exist.
H1 (Dundee City & Monifieth)	Overprovision at Balmossie, redeployment options	Response time impact to Angus?	Yes, significant increase in response times to Angus.
H2 (Dundee City & Monifieth)	Balmossie closure, response delay to Angus	Socioeconomic context of Balmossie?	Affluent area, risk lower than other regions.
H3 (Dundee City & Monifieth)	Minimal discussion, no major concerns raised	No questions raised	No questions raised.
I1 (Edinburgh & East Lothian)	New stations required; property acquisition needed	Why is Musselburgh rebuild costlier than Tranent?	Musselburgh is wholetime, Tranent is On-Call, affecting cost.
I2 (Edinburgh & East Lothian)	Avoids Musselburgh rebuild, capital backlog reduced	Will this option reduce capital backlog?	Yes, reduces capital backlog.
J1 (Scottish Borders)	RAAC work in progress, recruitment stable	On-Call recruitment feasibility?	On-Call recruitment has been stable in the area.
K1 (Argyll & Bute)	RAAC station, potential nucleus crew option	Impact of nucleus crew recruitment?	Nucleus crew recruitment impact is unknown.
L1 (North Aberdeenshire)	Refurbishment as one-pump station, redeployment planned	Context of redeployment of resources?	Redeployment likely to Prevention or Training teams.
L2 (North Aberdeenshire)	Minimal discussion, no major concerns raised	No questions raised	No questions raised.
M1 (Glasgow & East Dunbartonshire)	One-pump overprovision, On-Call recruitment required	Impact on risk profile around Yorkhill/Govan?	Minimal impact: Govan removal preferred over Pollock.
M2 (Glasgow & East Dunbartonshire)	Solution to temporary withdrawal, 19 roles redeployed	Feasibility of 18-month On-Call recruitment?	Recruitment timeline feasible but presents challenges.
M3 (Glasgow & East Dunbartonshire)	Minimal discussion, no major concerns raised	No questions raised	No questions raised.

3 SCORING OUTCOMES

Details of the outcomes of the hurdle criteria scoring exercise

3.1 Introduction

This section provides an overview of the outcomes of the Service Delivery Review Programme formal hurdle criteria workshop.

The workshop aimed to evaluate various scenarios based on their viability, feasibility, and desirability, using a scoring system to determine which scenarios meet the essential requirements to proceed further in the appraisal.

The outcomes of this evaluation are summarised in the following sections¹.

3.2 Overall Scores

Provided below is an overview of the scoring outcomes from the Service Delivery Review Programme's formal hurdle criteria workshop. The tables detail the average and mean scores assigned to various scenarios, reflecting the extent to which each meets the essential requirements of viability, feasibility, and desirability.

The scores are presented in a structured format, offering insights into the decision-making process and provide the basis on which the scenarios are to proceed further in the appraisal process.

	Scenarios										
Score	A1	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	C1	C2
Mean Average	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.3
Median	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0
Mode	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0

	Scenarios							
Score	D1	D2	E1	E2	F1	F2	G1	G2
Mean Average	4.1	3.6	3.6	3.0	3.9	3.3	3.8	3.3
Median	4.5	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0
Mode	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.0

	Scenarios											
Score	H1	H2	H3	I1	I2	J1	K1	L1	L2	M1	M2	M3
Mean Average	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.0	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.6	4.0
Median	4.0	4.5	3.5	3.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.5
Mode	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0

¹ Please note these may vary from previously issued summary due to rounding.

3.3 Suggested scenarios.

The application of average and mean scores provides a uniform and generalised view of the overall extent to which each scenario meets the hurdle criteria as scored by the participants in the workshop.

Score (Range)	Associated Judgement
1-2	Do not meet the requirements of the hurdle.
3	Neutral
4-5	Meet or fully meet the requirements of the hurdle.

Using the "meet" scores (those scoring either 4 or 5), fourteen (14) scenarios meet the hurdle criteria and should be considered to proceed to further evaluation in the balanced room, where additional criteria will be set.

These recommendations are set out in the table below.

Scenarios	Mean Average	
	I2	4.16
	B3	4.14
	A1	4.14
	B2	4.14
	J1	4.14
	B4	4.12
	B1	4.11
	B6	4.08
	B8	4.08
	B7	4.07
	D1	4.05
	L2	4.04
	K1	4.00
	M1	4.00

From this table we can see that, based on the scores provided in the technical assessment scenarios meet or fully meet the hurdle criteria:

- A1
- B1
- B2
- B3
- B4
- B6
- B7
- B8
- D1
- I2
- J1
- K1
- L2
- M1

It should be noted that there may be the need for further consideration of additional information and circumstances once the implications of this exercise are fully absorbed and understood against wider operational parameters and priorities.

4 APPENDIX ONE: RESULTS OF THE OUTCOMES OF THE HURDLE CRITERIA SCORING EXERCISE

4.1 Mean Average of Scores

Set out below in score order are the mean average scores for Scenarios A1 to M3 in rank order.

This clearly shows the demarcation between those fully meeting the criteria, those neutral and those that fail to meet them.

Score Range	Scenario	Mean Average
Meet or Fully Meet (4 or 5)	I2	4.16
	B3	4.14
	A1	4.14
	B2	4.14
	J1	4.14
	B4	4.12
	B1	4.11
	B6	4.08
	B8	4.08
	B7	4.07
	D1	4.05
	L2	4.04
	K1	4.00
	M1	4.00
Neutral (3)	M3	3.99
	B5	3.99
	C1	3.89
	F1	3.86
	L1	3.86
	G1	3.78
	H2	3.68
	E1	3.64
	M2	3.61
	D2	3.57
	H1	3.57
	H3	3.42
	C2	3.30
	G2	3.29
	F2	3.28
	E2	3.00
Do not meet. (1 or 2)	I1	2.97

4.2 Median of Scores

Considering the scenarios by Median it can be seen that using the median score increases the options that meet or fully meet the hurdle criteria to twenty-four (24).

Score Range	Scenario	Median
Meet or Fully Meet (4 or 5)	H2	4.5
	C1	4.5
	B5	4.5
	M3	4.5
	L2	4.5
	D1	4.5
	B7	4.5
	B8	4.5
	B6	4.5
	B1	4.5
	B4	4.5
	A1	4.5
	B2	4.5
	B3	4.5
	I2	4.5
	C2	4.0
	H1	4.0
	M2	4.0
	G1	4.0
	L1	4.0
	F1	4.0
	K1	4.0
	M1	4.0
	J1	4.0
Neutral (3)	H3	3.5
	D2	3.5
	E1	3.5
	I1	3.0
	E2	3.0
	F2	3.0
	G2	3.0

4.3 Mode of Scores

Considering the scenarios by Mode it can be seen that using the mode score increases the options that meet or fully meet the hurdle criteria to twenty-three (23).

Score Range	Scenario	Mode
Meet or Fully Meet (4 or 5)	H2	5
	B5	5
	M3	5
	D1	5
	B7	5
	B8	5
	B6	5
	B4	5
	A1	5
	B2	5
	B3	5
	F1	5
	D2	5
	I2	4
	C2	4
	H1	4
	M2	4
	G1	4
	L1	4
	K1	4
	M1	4
	J1	4
	E1	4
Neutral (3)	C1	3
	L2	3
	B1	3
	H3	3
	I1	3
	E2	3
	F2	3
	G2	3

5 APPENDIX TWO: DETAILED RESULTS

Set out below are the summary **unweighted scores**² provided in the hurdle appraisal session of 29 January 2025.

OPTION A1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.26	3.00	3.00
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	4.11	4.00	5.00
Viability	4.47	5.00	5.00
Feasibility	4.74	5.00	5.00
TOTAL	4.14	4.50	5.00

OPTION B1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.89	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	4.00	4.0	3.0
Viability	4.84	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.68	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.11	4.50	3.00

OPTION B2	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.84	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	4.05	4.0	5.0
Viability	4.89	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.79	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.14	4.5	5.0

OPTION B3	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.89	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	4.05	4.0	5.0
Viability	4.84	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.79	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.14	4.5	5.0

OPTION B4	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.89	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	4.05	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.89	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.63	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.12	4.5	5.0

² Please note these may vary from previously issued summary due to rounding.

OPTION B5	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.74	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.79	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.74	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.68	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	3.99	4.5	5.0

OPTION B6	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.84	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.74	4.0	5.0
Viability	4.84	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.89	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.08	4.5	5.0

OPTION B7	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.74	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.79	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.84	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.89	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.07	4.5	5.0

OPTION B8	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.79	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.79	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.84	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.89	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.08	4.5	5.0

OPTION C1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.68	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.58	4.0	3.0
Viability	4.68	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.63	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	3.89	4.5	3.0

OPTION C2	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.16	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.53	4.0	4.0
Viability	3.16	4.0	4.0
Feasibility	3.37	4.0	4.0
TOTAL	3.30	4.0	4.0

OPTION D1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.95	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.84	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.53	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.89	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.05	4.5	5.0

OPTION D2	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.58	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.84	4.0	5.0
Viability	3.00	3.0	4.0
Feasibility	3.84	4.0	5.0
TOTAL	3.57	3.5	5.0

OPTION E1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.37	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.32	3.0	4.0
Viability	4.53	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.37	4.0	4.0
TOTAL	3.64	3.5	4.0

OPTION E2	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.79	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.58	3.0	3.0
Viability	2.42	2.0	1.0
Feasibility	3.21	3.0	4.0
TOTAL	3.00	3.0	3.0

OPTION F1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.58	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.74	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.68	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.42	4.0	5.0
TOTAL	3.86	4.0	5.0

OPTION F2	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.79	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.16	3.0	3.0
Viability	3.42	3.0	4.0
Feasibility	3.74	4.0	4.0
TOTAL	3.28	3.0	3.0

OPTION G1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.21	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.74	4.0	4.0
Viability	3.89	4.0	4.0
Feasibility	4.26	4.0	5.0
TOTAL	3.78	4.0	4.0

OPTION G2	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.47	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.95	4.0	4.0
Viability	2.63	2.0	2.0
Feasibility	3.11	3.0	3.0
TOTAL	3.29	3.0	3.0

OPTION H1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.89	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.63	4.0	4.0
Viability	3.79	4.0	4.0
Feasibility	3.95	4.0	4.0
TOTAL	3.57	4.0	4.0

OPTION H2	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.47	2.0	2.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.37	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.42	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.47	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	3.68	4.5	5.0

OPTION H3	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	2.84	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.21	3.0	3.0
Viability	3.63	4.0	4.0
Feasibility	4.00	4.0	4.0
TOTAL	3.42	3.5	3.0

OPTION I1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.16	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.32	3.0	3.0
Viability	2.21	2.0	2.0
Feasibility	3.21	3.0	2.0
TOTAL	2.97	3.0	3.0

OPTION I2	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.58	4.0	4.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.89	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.42	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.74	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.16	4.5	4.0

OPTION J1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.63	4.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	4.00	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.11	4.0	4.0
Feasibility	4.84	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.14	4.0	4.0

OPTION K1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.42	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.58	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.16	4.0	4.0
Feasibility	4.84	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.00	4.0	4.0

OPTION L1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.26	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.84	4.0	4.0
Viability	3.95	4.0	4.0
Feasibility	4.37	4.0	5.0
TOTAL	3.86	4.0	4.0

OPTION L2	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.16	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.79	4.0	3.0
Viability	4.68	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.53	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.04	4.5	3.0

OPTION M1	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.21	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.84	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.21	4.0	4.0
Feasibility	4.74	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	4.00	4.0	4.0

OPTION M2	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.00	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.58	4.0	4.0
Viability	3.47	4.0	4.0
Feasibility	4.37	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	3.61	4.0	4.0

OPTION M3	Mean Average	Median	Mode
Desirability (1) Communities	3.05	3.0	3.0
Desirability (2) Service & Staff	3.68	4.0	4.0
Viability	4.42	5.0	5.0
Feasibility	4.79	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	3.99	4.5	5.0



Thank You

asv

Insight | Change | Management

| info@asv-online.co.uk |