

**Annex 1 Strategic Options Appraisal - Future Options Appraisal Workshop:
Summary of Findings: SCC Electric Vehicle Charging Programme July 2021**

Title	Future Options Appraisal Workshop: Summary of Findings
Service Area	SCC Electric Vehicle Charging Programme
Date	July 2021
Author	Lee Redmond – Head of Contract & Commercial Advisory - Orbis Procurement
Document Version	1.6
Distribution	Workshop Participants Only

Contents

1	Executive Summary	2
2	Background & Approach	4
3	Scope and Methodology.....	5
4	EV Programme – Strategic Drivers.....	6
5	Future Service Delivery Options – Ranking and Preferences.....	7
6	Next Steps.....	14
	Appendix A: Future Delivery Model Definitions	15
	Appendix B – Factor Definitions.....	16
	Appendix C – SCC EV Programme Scoring.....	22
	Appendix D – Workshop Participants	23

1 Executive Summary

The Electric Vehicle (EV) sector is evolving rapidly and the switch to and adoption of EVs for both private and public use is set to grow significantly over the next decade. This is being fuelled by ever increasing environmental pressures, the introduction of new regulations and the pace at which industries are innovating.

The KPMG report of July 2020 helped to highlight the challenges faced in Surrey and began to explore the business models that could underpin the future models of delivery. This report seeks to assess each of those business models against Surrey County Council's (SCC) strategic objectives and measure how well each model scores against both attractiveness and achievability factors such as affordability and capability.

Experience of existing service arrangements and political and cultural preferences can often influence perceptions of future service delivery models. To mitigate against undue bias, the EV Project Management Team along with other experienced stakeholders were asked to evaluate the potential future service models for the establishment of an EV charging network. At these workshops, participants were able to view potential arrangements more objectively.

Why we use the Proving Strategy Formulation Framework

Orbis Procurement and Proving Services (based at Cranfield University) are engaged in a collaborative relationship underpinned by a commercial agreement. Proving has researched, designed and developed a rigorous and comprehensive framework for the formulation of effective strategies which Orbis Procurement are now able to adapt and deliver for the benefit of the authority.

This report sets out some of the observations, conclusions and begins to rank the preferred future delivery models identified through the Strategic Options Appraisal workshops.

Initial Results

The top ranked models overall, **Part Funded Model (Business Model 2, BM2)** using either **single** or **multiple providers** achieved its position primarily through the ability to meet Strategic Drivers and Attractiveness measures. There was a consensus that this option would improve provide the flexibility of approach to best meet the changing needs and behaviours of residents whilst retaining the appropriate level of control and potential for income generation.

Achievability factors also scored well, indicating that this option is within the capability and capacity of the authority to deliver well. However, within BM2, it was felt that having

a single provider could potentially reduce the ability to offer a wider portfolio of charging options. In reality though, the difference between the scores for both these options is negligible and any weaknesses in either model could probably be addressed by designing mitigating measures into the contract specification.

With both options available under Business Model 2, the assumption was made that 'Part Funded' could mean obtaining a significant contribution through the On-Street Residential Chargepoint Scheme (ORCS) and so the authority may not be entirely committed to providing the capital funds itself. It is recognised though that the ongoing availability of this funding is in doubt and this could pose a future risk to delivery via this model.

The next most favoured model, **Fully Funded Model (Business Model 1)** using **multiple providers**, scored less well for Attractiveness (Value for Money) and Strategic Fit. The belief is that this approach, will reduce the level of control afforded to the authority due to all the funding being provided by the Private Sector Provider (PSP). This could also lead to a less equitable spread of charging points in areas that appear to be less financially viable to a private provider.

Generally, Business Models 3 and 4 did not score well against Achievability and Strategic factors as the consensus of opinion was that the authority does not have the capability or capacity to own and manage a network of this nature, at least not yet. They did however score well against Attractiveness measures that centred around control over location and tariffs and the ability to decide its own strategy for the layout of the infrastructure. It was recognised though that whilst this looks attractive, this level of control comes at a significant cost, both to the level of capital funding required and the internal resources required to successfully deliver the programme.

Business Model 0, named Laissez-Faire for this exercise is an interesting concept. This is an option that has been preferred by other authorities and did indeed score well against Achievability factors. This is not entirely surprising given that the authority would largely relinquish most of its control and would not be required to contribute towards funding. The issue with this model however is that it would not provide the level of control required or help the authority to meet its strategic objectives.

Regardless of how each option scored and where it was ultimately ranked, these positions are based on where we believe the authority stands today on its strategic objectives on its ability or willingness to contribute towards the capital costs involved.

The recommendation of this report is that before a final decision is made, the authority should formally recognise and address these constraints and agree a final position. Once the position has been determined, we recommend that we re-assess the scoring in line with any changes to understand whether or not the position of each business model has changed.

It should also be noted that a model's ranking does not necessarily signpost towards a preferred option. In this exercise we are merely seeking to highlight the strengths, weaknesses, benefits and disbenefits of each option against a backdrop of our current position. With time, our position may change, or it may be possible for us to introduce mitigating measures into the specification design and therefore some shortcomings of a particular model could be addressed and bring that model into play.

Table 2 in section 5 of this document shows the relative position of the scores of all other options assessed.

Definitions of each Service Option can be found in **Appendix A** and the complete scores from the workshops can be found in **Appendix C**.

2 Background & Approach

The report commissioned by SCC and delivered by KPMG in July 2020 provides a detailed backdrop to this work and some of the specific challenges and risks associated with EV charging in Surrey from that report are highlighted below for reference and context;

- Cost**
- Deployment of EV charging can come at significant cost
 - Long term programmes are required to deliver a return on investment

-
- Risk of obsolescence**
- The long-term nature of the project could mean technology is superseded before paying for itself
 - Changing needs of users can make replacement of equipment costly

-
- Uncertainty of charging behaviours**
- The market is currently immature and future behaviours will evolve over time
 - The portfolio of chargers (slow to rapid) may need to change over time to meet demand
 - The influence of other commercial activities such as chargers in supermarkets will affect future strategies
 - SCC will need to take a view now on future needs and design the network it thinks it will need
-

Orbis Procurement have been commissioned to support the EV Project Team to assess the benefits or otherwise of potential future delivery models. The findings will be used to inform, shape and accelerate plans for the new arrangements in readiness for the next step.

A clear understanding of the desired strategic outcomes and strategic constraints (prevailing policies and the overarching political programme) are essential in planning a future services' delivery model. This document describes the process undertaken and shares the outcomes, which can then be used to explore and develop a future strategy.

3 Scope and Methodology

The scope of each future service delivery options review is captured in boxes 1 to 3 in Figure 1 below:

Figure 1: Future Service Delivery Options – Scope of Review



The review was undertaken through a series of two workshops which considered the following:

- What are the strategic objectives the Service is seeking to deliver through its future service delivery model? (Before we can consider which service delivery option will best serve us in the future, we needed to have a clear understanding of what we will be trying to achieve).

- How might each potential delivery option contribute to the delivery of these strategic objectives?
- How attractive and achievable is each potential delivery option. See Appendix C for full definitions of Attractiveness and Achievability. (Using an options analysis toolkit to weight each factor under consideration and facilitate scoring and ranking.

The outcome of the above process was a provisional, ranked shortlist of potential future service delivery options which:

- Can be evolved as the procurement process develops and the scope and breadth of services to be encompassed becomes clearer.
- Helps to formulate a short list of options for full business case development.

The future service delivery options initially proposed for consideration are set out in **Table 1** below.

Table 1: Future Services Delivery Options Identified and Assessed

Option Family	#	In-Scope	Option Name
Unfunded	BM0	Proposed	Laissez-faire
PSP Fully Funded	BM1	Proposed	Single Provider
	BM1	Proposed	Multiple Providers
PSP Part Funded	BM2	Proposed	Single Provider
	BM2	Proposed	Multiple Providers
Council Owned / PSP Operated	BM3	Proposed	Outsourced Contract
Council Owned & Operated	BM4	Proposed	Insourced Service

On completion of the scoring exercise, the EV Project Team, via this report, are provided with a provisional ranking of potential service delivery options which will help form a short list of options for further investigation. These rankings can be found in **Table 3** and the detailed methodology, toolset, option definitions and scoring guidance underpinning each review are set out in **Appendices B to C**.

4 EV Programme – Strategic Drivers

A common problem when formulating a new strategy, is trying to address too many issues simultaneously or setting unrealistic targets in context of the strategic constraints (including finances, capacity and competence and technology constraints). Strategies that are undeliverable quickly lose credibility.

To avoid strategic hallucination, it is important to focus on drivers and goals where a pragmatic and affordable solution can be implemented.

Strategic drivers for the EV Project Team proposed for this review are designed to address range of challenges including meeting the future needs of residents, protection from financial risk or technological obsolescence, striking the right balance of control and alignment with existing organisational strategies. The need for collaboration between public and private sector partners and the imperative of capitalising on new technologies and the interest of potential new market entrants is also a key consideration.

The agreed strategic objectives and drivers for the purposes of this review are below.

Strategic Objectives

- Meet the council's target of 10,000 charge points county wide
- Flexibility to meet wider charging location objectives by attracting other contracting authorities to participate
- Meet the need for full range of charging options to meet demand (e.g. Slow to rapid chargers)
- Alignment with Climate Change Strategy
- Does this model present the authority with a higher or lower investment risk?
- Does this model help to protect against technology and infrastructure obsolescence?
- Does this model ensure consistency of equipment and software operating systems?
- Does this model meet the current ambitions for the authority to retain control relative to the investment?

5 Future Service Delivery Options – Ranking and Preferences

The EV Project Team along with a variety of key stakeholders completed a comprehensive evaluation of the relative benefits of each service delivery model with a fully documented rationale, using the tools and approach described in Section 3 of this report.

The aggregated, summary outcomes, are illustrated in **Table 2** and **Table 3** below.

Table 2: Ranking: Overall, Strategic Fit, Attractiveness, Achievability

Service Delivery Option	Overall	Strategic Fit	Attractiveness	Achievability
Unfunded - Laissez-faire	6	5	6	1
PSP Fully Funded - Single Provider	4	2	5	2
PSP Fully Funded - Multiple Providers	3	1	6	4
PSP Part Funded - Single Provider	2	2	3	3
PSP Part Funded - Multiple Providers	1	1	4	5
Council Owned / PSP Operated - Outsourced Contract	5	3	1	6
Council Owned & Operated - Insourced Service	7	4	2	7

Table 3: Overall Ranking

Option Family	#	Option Name	Strategic Performance	Weight-Adjusted Score	Weight-Adjusted Score	Position Analysis	
						Attractiveness & Achievability	Rank
Unfunded	BM0	Laissez-faire	37.3	56	81	58.2	6
PSP Fully Funded	BM1	Single Provider	49.8	57	77	61.1	4
	BM1	Multiple Providers	62.0	53	70	61.8	3
PSP Part Funded	BM2	Single Provider	49.8	70	71	63.7	2
	BM2	Multiple Providers	62.0	66	63	63.8	1
Council Owned / PSP Operated	BM3	Outsourced Contract	45.5	89	42	58.8	5
Council Owned & Operated	BM4	Insourced Service	41.5	77	25	47.9	7

More detailed observations gathered on each of the models is set out in Table 4 below.

Table 4: General Observations by Dimension

Strategic Objectives

Factor	Observation
Meet the council's target of 10,000 charge points county wide	<p>There was low confidence expressed in the market fulfilling the objective of the council. Depending on the degree of capital investment and therefore control over locations, the contractor would place the chargers in the most advantageous areas where the profit margin is greatest. Therefore the EV charging points in the more rural areas would not necessarily be as attractive. There could be a plethora of suppliers with differing charge point designs and differing software interfaces if uncontrolled.</p>
Flexibility to meet wider charging location objectives by attracting other contracting authorities to participate	<p>This could work, depending on the way the contract or framework was designed and market maturity. The less funding from the council will reduce the degree of influence over locations and numbers, but the lack of upfront investment would be attractive to other contracting authorities.</p>
Meet the need for full range of charging options to meet demand (e.g. Slow to rapid chargers)	<p>There is little confidence in this model delivering the mix of charging sites and equipment offerings.</p>
Alignment with Climate Change Strategy	<p>This is directly linked to ability to meet the target for the number of charging points and the right spread of coverage to encourage the take up of electric vehicles. As with many of the other factors, the level of investment from the authority will have a direct impact on this element.</p> <p>Therefore, as the investment by the council increases, the greater the ability of the project to meet the strategy.</p>
Does this model present the authority with a higher or lower investment risk	<p>This is really a simple assessment that measures the level of investment required by the council which would in turn increase the financial.</p>
Does this model help to protect against technology and infrastructure obsolescence?	<p>This option is entirely regulated by the market and the incentive to upgrade and maintain the infrastructure up to date is wholly a commercial one. Therefore, models that put the onus on the provider to upgrade their infrastructure over time in order to return a greater return would appear to offer greater protection against obsolescence.</p>

<p>Does this model ensure consistency of equipment and software operating systems</p>	<p>A single provider would look to minimise costs and therefore would tend to standardise their equipment, the more providers there are, then there is less assurance that the equipment would be standard which could affect resident's behaviours.</p>
<p>Does this model meet the current ambitions for the authority to retain control relative to the investment.</p>	<p>The balance of control appears to be directly related to the level of investment. Laissez-faire and fully funded models will favour the provider and reduce our control. Part funded should provide a balanced position and the council owned models will provide total control but at more expense.</p>

Attractiveness	
Factor	Observation
Financial Benefit to SCC	<p>The less we contribute towards the costs, the lower the opportunity to generate revenue for SCC</p> <p>Some models retain the ability to charge for Licence fees, site rental etc whereas other models provide a greater share of the income but come at the expense of capital costs.</p> <p>It is anticipated that revenues would increase as we progress through the list of Business Models, from BM 2 to BM4</p>
Future Proofing	<p>A significant variation of uncertainty over this factor.</p> <p>It is felt that the Laissez-faire would be market driven, so may well be upgraded as necessary. However, we have little or no control over if or when this happens.</p> <p>The more ownership we have over the asset, the more control we would have over future proofing but this is coupled with the cost of doing so.</p>
Capacity for Portfolio Approach	<p>Not too much of a variation between BMs but single provider options appear to be less effective at delivering a portfolio of charging options.</p>
Location Selection	<p>With the Laissez-Faire option, we could have the right of identifying the locations through the planning process.</p> <p>The degree of control over site selections appears to be directly linked to the contribution towards capital funding. As we go through the options, with a reduced involvement of the Council comes a greater degree of compromise on all site selection.</p>
Control Over Tariffs	<p>Under Laissez-faire operation and fully funded models, the tariffs would be largely controlled by the market. The more involvement of the Council, the more influence there would be over Tariffs</p>
Market	<p>The feeling is that there would be suppliers that would be attracted to one or more of the models and so agreement was that all should be scored the same.</p>
Relationship with CPOs	<p>Effort is involved in all of them, but the more involvement that the Council has, the more resource would be required by the council and therefore more "cost" involved.</p>
Relationship with DNOs	<p>As above, effort is involved in all of them, but the more involvement that the Council has, the more resource would be required by the council and therefore more "cost" involved.</p>

Achievability	
Factor	Observation
Complexity (Inherent Risk)	The risk to the council increases the more involvement we have with the project.
Capability & Capacity	Generally, it was felt that we do not have the capacity within the council at the moment to support the Council owned and operated model (BM3 & 4). The funded models are more easily executable at the moment.
Affordability	Laissez-faire has minimal draw on council funds, council investment increases as we progress through the business models. There will be nuances within each model depending on the level of funding from ORCS. The authority needs to determine its ability and willingness to contribute towards the capital costs before a final assessment can be made.
Authority Readiness	This is a new venture for the authority and so all business models represent some risk. The unknown nature of the future complexity though suggested that the council owned models were less favourable.
Provider Readiness	Laissez faire, we would be offering up sites/locations. This is a buoyant market with a number of operators, but we are not confident in how ready the market is for some of the options. More work would be needed to fully understand the provider readiness to adopt each approach.
Sector Success Stories	Laissez faire - there is no awareness of this being used as a way of providing EVCP. The examples that we have are from Manchester CC and feedback from the previous unsuccessful procurement activity at WSCC helps to inform this area
Competitiveness of EVCP offer	Less appetite for fully funded. More experience in the market for part-funded, so more attractive to the market. Concerns about the breadth of the offer under the various business models
Supports SCC's Optimum Contract Term	Only long-term contract would be under fully funded. There is a nervousness politically about long contract terms and ability to change may be restricted. Optimal contract term for the authority would be in the region of 3-5yrs but this is unlikely to meet the needs of the providers of many business models.
Ongoing Cost of Review (inc Chargepoint management,CM)	In all cases, we need to decide how we manage the installation points but we envisage some involvement regardless of the model adopted. We would be looking for a partnership when working with providers.

Preparing ORCS bids	<p>If we are not applying for funding, then there is no bid preparation costs involved.</p> <p>Working in partnership with suppliers, the bid process could be managed by the provider(s) and so could reduce the burden on the authority.</p>
Costs of Contract Management	<p>Again, the level of involvement and control adopted by the council will directly determine the resource and therefore cost implications.</p>
Ongoing Maintenance Costs	<p>As predictable as it sounds, this will be determined by who owns the asset.</p>
Ongoing Operational Costs	<p>As above. The more direct control the council has, the greater the cost implications.</p>
Cost of Back Office Systems	<p>Where we have suppliers operating the systems, they will carry the back office costs. Vice versa, if the council owns the system, it carries the cost of implementing the appropriate systems.</p>
Ongoing Cost of Back Office Systems	<p>Determined by who owns the back office systems.</p>
Transparency of Data/Access to Systems	<p>This can be incorporated within the requirements of the contract. The Laissez faire option would be more problematic as we may not be entitled to the full suite of data produced which would make it harder to make intelligent decisions over future strategies.</p>
Influence over upgrade decisions	<p>Where we have more control, we would expect to have more influence over upgrade decisions.</p>
SCC's Exposer to Financial Risk	<p>The more involvement we have, the greater the financial risk we would be exposed to.</p>
SCC's Exposer to Operational Risk	<p>Greater exposure to operational risk the more involvement we have. The risk also increases based on our level of expertise and confidence to manage the network.</p>
SCC's Exposer to Reputational Risk	<p>If we have a supplier operating the charging points, they carry much of the risk to reputational damage. If we own and operate, then we are more exposed.</p>

6 Next Steps

The proposed next steps are:

- Refine the authority's strategic objectives for this programme, following consultation with key stakeholders.
- As the final scope of services to be procured crystallises and both the strategic objectives have been agreed and all operational and financial constraints have been confirmed:
 - Fully define and document the options under consideration.
 - Test and refine the options under consideration in the context of the final scope of the service to be procured and the benefits of each option for individual functions.
- More fully understand if barriers to success exist and if these barriers are within the authority's ability to address and overcome.

Appendix A: Future Delivery Model Definitions

Service delivery model	Definition
PSP Part Funded - Multiple Providers	Part-funded concession model – 2 or more PSPs sharing ownership of CP with SCC, some grant funding or subsidy will be necessary. Above-ground hardware ownership may belong to council at the end of tender or it may still belong to PSP, depending on agreement.
PSP Part Funded - Single Provider	Part-funded concession model – single PSP sharing ownership of CP with SCC, some grant funding or subsidy will be necessary. Above-ground hardware ownership may belong to council at the end of tender or it may still belong to PSP, depending on agreement.
Council Owned / PSP Operated - Outsourced Contract	Council wholly owns (either outright or by end of tender through periodic payback/operational fees/rental fees to PSP), PSP operates.
Unfunded - Laissez-faire	No direct involvement from council. EV network left to market forces, authority may offer up desired locations for private sector bids or be involved via planning system
Council Owned & Operated - Insourced Service	Own and operate model. From year one, the council funds all aspects of ChargePoint installation and operation and would act as Chargepoint Operator (CPO). Would require significant grant and internal funding

Appendix B – Factor Definitions

Table 5: Factor Definition

Attractiveness		
Factor	Weighting	Definition
Financial Benefit to SCC	50	What is the scale of potential financial benefit to the authority?
Future Proofing	100	Capacity to allow for future variations to allow for changes in contract scope and scale.
Capacity for Portfolio Approach	75	Capacity for 'portfolio approach' (mixing charging speeds and kit)
Location Selection	100	From the perspective of county wide locations such as districts, boroughs, towns and parishes etc. Not individual location.
Control Over Tariffs	75	How far will this delivery model allow SCC to retain control over tariffs?
Market	75	How would stakeholders (primarily service users, members and the client team) view this option relative to the current delivery model?
Relationship with CPOs	75	How much effort and resource will be required to manage the appropriate level of relationship of this model?

Relationship with DNOs	75	How much effort and resource will be required to manage the appropriate level of relationship of this model?
-----------------------------------	-----------	--

Achievability		
Factor	Weighting	Definition
Complexity (Inherent Risk)	75	What is the scale of inherent risk posed by the complexity of this delivery model?
Capability & Capacity	100	Does the authority possess the skills and capacity to successfully undertake and manage a programme of this nature?
Affordability	100	This relates to the capital cost of the below ground infrastructure
Authority Readiness	100	Is the authority in a position of readiness that would enable the successful adoptions of this model of delivery?
Provider Readiness	100	Is the provider market in a position of readiness that would enable the successful adoptions of this model of delivery?
Sector Success Stories	75	What have we learnt from the experience of others?
Competitiveness of EVCP offer	25	Degree to which this model creates competition to the benefit of SCC i.e. could a more competitive environment such as multiple suppliers drive lower costs, better customer service or greater Social Value etc.
Supports SCC's Optimum Contract Term	50	How well does this delivery model support the authority's preferred contract length?

Ongoing Cost of Review (inc CM)	75	<p>Is the ongoing financial or resource cost for reviewing the model High, Medium or Low</p> <p>To include costs for; site & service review, demand mapping etc</p>
Preparing ORCS bids	50	<p>Expectation on SCC to prepare and submit bids for funds.</p>
Costs of Contract Management	75	<p>Is the ongoing cost of contract management related to this model High, Medium or Low?</p>
Ongoing Maintenance Costs	50	<p>In each model, who assumes responsibility for the maintenance costs?</p>
Ongoing Operational Costs	50	<p>In each model, who assumes responsibility for the operational costs?</p>
Cost of Back Office Systems	50	<p>Is the cost of acquiring and training in new back office systems High, Medium or Low?</p>
Ongoing Cost of Back Office Systems	50	<p>Is the cost of maintaining and upgrading back office systems High, Medium or Low?</p>
Transparency of Data/Access to Systems	100	<p>Does this model allow for access and transparency of data such as usage?</p>

Influence over upgrade decisions	25	How much influence/power will SCC have over hardware and software upgrades?
SCC's Exposer to Financial Risk	100	What is the exposure of financial risk for SCC?
SCC's Exposer to Operational Risk	75	What is the exposure of operational risk for SCC?
SCC's Exposer to Reputational Risk	75	What is the exposure of reputational risk for SCC?



Appendix C – SCC EV Programme Scoring

			Strategic Outcomes									
Option Family	#	Option Name	Meet the council's target of 10,000 charge points county wide	Flexibility to meet wider charging location objectives by attracting other contracting authorities to participate	Meet the need for full range of charging options to meet demand (e.g. Slow to rapid chargers)	Alignment With Climate Change Strategy	Does this model present the authority with a higher or lower investment risk.	Does this model help to protect against technology and infrastructure obsolescence?	Does this model ensure consistency of equipment and software operating systems.	Does this model meet the current ambitions for the authority to retain control relative to the investment.	Average	Overall Average
Unfunded	BM0	Laissez-faire	33	66	33	0	100	66	0	0	37	37
PSP Fully Funded	BM1	Single Provider	33	33	33	33	100	33	100	33	50	50
	BM1	Multiple Providers	66	66	66	66	100	66	33	33	62	62
PSP Part Funded	BM2	Single Provider	66	66	66	66	66	33	100	100	70	70
	BM2	Multiple Providers	66	66	100	100	66	33	33	100	71	71
Council Owned / PSP Operated	BM3	Outsourced Contract	33	33	33	100	33	33	66	33	46	46
Council Owned & Operated	BM4	Insourced Service	33	33	33	100	0	33	100	0	42	42

Page 48

			Attractiveness Analysis (VfM)														Achievability Analysis														Position Analysis							
Option Family	#	Option Name	Financial Benefit to SCC	Future Proofing	Capacity for Portfolio Approach	Location Selection	Control Over Tariffs	Market	Relationship with CPOs	Relationship with DNOs	Total	Weight-Adjusted Score	Complexity (Inherent Risk)	Capability & Capacity	Affordability	Authority Readiness	Provider Readiness	Sector Success Stories	Competitiveness of EVCP offer	Supports SCC's Optimum Contract	Ongoing Cost of Review (inc CM)	Preparing ORCS bids	Costs of Contract Management	Ongoing Maintenance Costs	Ongoing Operational Costs	Cost of Back Office Systems	Ongoing Cost of Back Office System	Transparency of Data/Access to S	Influence over upgrade decisions	SCC's Exposer to Financial Risk	SCC's Exposer to Operational Risk	SCC's Exposer to Reputational Risk	Total	Weight-Adjusted Score	Attractiveness & Achievability	Rank		
Unfunded	BM0	Laissez-faire	37.3	33	100	0	33	0	100	66	100	54	56	100	100	100	66	66	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	33	0	100	66	100	82	81	58.2	6
PSP Fully Funded	BM1	Single Provider	49.8	33	33	33	33	33	100	100	100	58	57	100	100	100	66	66	33	33	33	66	66	33	100	100	100	100	100	100	33	100	66	66	73	77	61.1	4
	BM1	Multiple Providers	62.0	33	33	66	33	33	100	66	66	54	53	66	66	100	33	100	33	66	33	66	66	33	100	100	100	100	66	33	100	66	66	70	70	61.8	3	
PSP Part Funded	BM2	Single Provider	49.8	66	66	33	66	66	66	100	100	70	70	66	66	100	33	66	100	66	66	33	33	100	100	100	100	100	66	66	66	66	33	73	71	63.7	2	
	BM2	Multiple Providers	62.0	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	33	33	100	33	100	33	100	66	66	33	100	100	100	100	66	66	66	66	33	66	63	63.8	1		
Council Owned / PSP Operated	BM3	Outsourced Contract	45.5	66	100	100	100	100	100	33	100	87	89	0	33	0	33	100	100	100	100	33	0	0	0	0	100	100	66	100	0	33	33	47	42	58.8	5	
Council Owned & Operated	BM4	Insourced Service	41.5	66	100	100	100	100	100	0	33	75	77	0	0	0	100	66	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	28	25	47.9	7		
			50	100	75	100	75	75	75	75	75			75	100	100	100	100	75	25	50	75	50	75	50	50	50	50	100	25	100	75	75					
			52	71	57	62	57	90	62	81	66	67		52	57	71	38	85	52	86	71	57	43	33	71	71	86	86	76	57	62	52	47	63	61			

Appendix D – Workshop Participants

Table 8: Workshop Participants and Roles

Workshop Attendees	Role
Jonathan James	Participant
Justine Seager	Participant
Amanda Richards	Participant
Iwan Wrigley	Participant
Matthew Jezzard	Participant
Steve Howard	Participant
Katie Brennan	Participant
Cherrie Mendoza	Participant
Patrick Tuite	Participant
Robert Gilmour	Participant
Jasweer Bhamra	Facilitator
Ian Gaitley	Facilitator
Lee Redmond	Facilitator

This page is intentionally left blank