

## Appendix A

### Regional Pathology Management Model Options Appraisal Scope/Framework

#### **Introduction**

The ARCH Regional Pathology Programme Board have developed a paper setting the scene for the Regional Pathology Programme re-design that includes bringing together two separate management structures into one management structure or network that enables a more efficient and effective delivery of Cellular Pathology and Immunology Services across both Hywel Dda University Health Board and Swansea Bay University Health Board.

Section 2.3 of the paper sets out three different management model options for consideration, however the options are not detailed or robust enough to:

- enable assessment/analysis against the scoring matrix
- inform stakeholders of the full scale of impacts and implications of implementing such models within NHS Wales
- make the appropriate recommendations

#### **Overview of Appraisal Framework**

The full scale options appraisal must allow the members of the ARCH Regional Pathology Board to make a recommendation to their respective health boards' executive management teams. The three management model options must be explored and detailed to include the key areas of assessment (see below Matrix) to enable the Board make sense of the information, evaluate against the agreed criteria and make a series of recommendations with a preferred option.

To evaluate the delivery model options, 3 main themes for investigation are recommended:

- **Desirability - the degree to which each option meets the strategic objectives and priorities of SBUHB/HDdUHB/PHW and other stakeholders**
- **Viability - the degree to which each option is financially viable and sustainable**
- **Feasibility - the degree to which each option can be implemented within NHS Wales**

These themes are mapped to specific criteria against which each option should be evaluated and scored to reach a final set of recommendations about the preferred delivery model which can be taken forward to the business case.

#### **Options Matrix**

<b>Design and scope:</b> How each option meets strategic objectives, vision and aspirations, ability to meet current and future needs, user views, effect of	<b>Option 1 Score /15</b>	<b>Option 2 Score /15</b>	<b>Option 3 Score /15</b>
--	---------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

creating/extending market mechanisms, scope for synergies and design/technical assessment?	Desirability / 5	Desirability / 5	Desirability / 5
	Viability / 5	Viability / 5	Viability / 5
	Feasibility / 5	Feasibility / 5	Feasibility / 5
<b>Accountability, governance and participation:</b> The risks/implications of each option for accountability, transparency and scrutiny and user/community and staff/trade union involvement in planning, policy and provision.			
<b>Financial assessment:</b> Assess whole life and transaction costs, investment requirements and funding, affordability, use and allocation of savings, value-based and risk assessed.			
<b>Quality of service:</b> The potential impact on/risk to performance, service integration, continuous improvement and innovation, flexibility and responsiveness, accessibility and connectivity.			
<b>Local/regional economy and community wellbeing:</b> Assess impact/risk on jobs, skills, labour market and local economy, contribution to regeneration and economic development strategies, community wellbeing and cohesion.			
<b>Quality of employment:</b> Application of employment models to each option, ability to retain terms and conditions, pensions and labour standards, impact on working practices, workplace training, access/provision of childcare and health and safety in workplace and community.			
<b>Resilience &amp; Sustainability:</b> Impact on local/regional production and supply chains, access to parks and recreational activities, services and facilities, environmental impacts and efficient use of resources, futureproof.			
<b>Ability to address social justice and inequalities:</b> The appraisal should identify how each option will reduce/eliminate health and other inequalities and discrimination for different equality groups. It should include a distributional analysis of the costs and benefits of each option and assess the contribution to building community capacity, power and participation.			
<b>Capability, management and intellectual knowledge:</b> Effect of each option on retention of key skills and intellectual knowledge, ability to manage change and regulatory frameworks and transferability of skills to rest of the authority			
<b>Organisational arrangements:</b> Impact on flexibility/work patterns, scope for collaboration and consortia, impact on staff transferring to this structure.			

<b>Value-Based &amp; Added value:</b> Cost vs patient outcome, proposals over and above core requirements and additional community benefits.			
<b>Corporate impact:</b> Impact on in-house provision, service integration and the financial and employment knock-on effects on centralising /regionalising the management structure.			