

To **Graham Johnston**
Head of Planning & Development
NHS Lanarkshire
Kirklands House
Fallside Road
Bothwell
G71 8BB

25 June 2020

Review of MRP appraisal documents 3 & 6

Dear Graham,

You requested, via Nicholas Duffin, an independent review of documents 3 and 6 of the MRP appraisal process, to ascertain whether either can be construed as biased or lacking objectivity towards or against either of the three options to be appraised, thereby casting undue influence over participants in the appraisal process.

Having considered the documents at length I have found only one concern that might imply bias. This relates to the information about cross boundary flow.

The information provided on cross-boundary flow includes the significant statement, "This can be disruptive as services can be overloaded." It is necessary to advise respondents of the degree of risk. What they will need to know is whether the different sites constitute a greater or lower likelihood of services being overloaded. It is probably not true to imply, as the Table on Page 15 of document 6 shows, that the greater figure for cross-boundary flows that affects the Gartcosh site will lead to greater disruption. That is because such disruption will only occur if there is insufficient staffing or facilities to accommodate the projected extra numbers. Because of the misleading impression that greater flows equals greater disruption, there is a possibility that this item constitutes a bias against Gartcosh because of the dramatically higher number of flows than the other two sites.

As I have been asked to consider just these two documents, I do not know whether any other supporting documents on your website might address this, but assuming that many participants in the appraisal process are likely to only consider these documents my advice is that you should address the point above.

Other than the above I could find nothing else that could be seen as bias or a lack of objectivity in the two documents towards any of the three options.

Aside from the issue of bias and objectivity, and though this is not part of the brief, you may wish to also consider the following with regards to enhancing the documents.

1. Explaining more about how the five criteria came to be selected would be helpful for participants. The statement that, “a group of people (that included hospital staff, residents and patients from across the area) helped agree the following criteria by which to judge which site might be best”, will encourage more questions than it offers answers.
2. Rather more important than providing a table showing differences from existing drive times for different locations for the three options – but without indicating the numbers of patients, staff and visitors to be impacted from each does not help respondents assess the relative balance of advantage. Far better would be to publish figures for each site in respect of *What % of existing car drivers (or driven passengers) would face a longer journey to the new site than they experience now?* In particular you should identify which residents or staff would face the most significant increase in journeys.
3. There seems to be no reference to the stated Scottish Government policy to seek a modal switch from car driving to walking, cycling and public transport. The data in the paper is good but is not placed in the context of this policy.
4. I found the table on page 12 of document 6 very difficult to understand. Are the recipients of this meant to know exactly what ‘*optimal cardiac reperfusion*’ means and then interpret what the implications of this being in Hairmyres might be for each of the three separate sites?
5. The information on site contamination shows what different sites will cost to be decontaminated (presumably to an equivalent standard). However, it does not present this data in the context of the overall project cost. This is especially significant when it comes to the weighting issue in Document 3. To illustrate the point, if the decontamination costs amounted to 60% of the whole project cost, I might be tempted to regard it as a more significant issue than if it is only 2%. Without context, the data provided is virtually meaningless. It’s just a lot of money.

It might be that other supporting information on your website provides greater clarity with regards to the above. In which case the documents would benefit from references to where people might find that information. Do consider that many participants will choose not to look beyond these documents.

Finally, with regards to the formatting of the documents, they would benefit from paragraph numbers and tables being numbered in order to make it easy for participants and support operatives to easily reference their queries when using the support service.

I wish you every success in the options assessment.

Rhion H Jones LL.B
Founder Director
The Consultation Institute

25 June 2020