- Optimism Bias template developed by Curry & Brown with HFS
- Mid 40% and 80% pre set and should not be changed
- Contributory Factor to Upper Bound pre set and should not be changed
- % Factor Contributes pre set and should not be changed
- Only input required = selection of category for each criteria % Factor Contribution after mitigation Explanation for rate of mitigation

PROJECT NAME National Treatment Centre NHS Ayrshire and Arran - Option 2

Optimism Bias - Upper Bound Calculation for Build

Lowest % Upper Bound	13%
Mid %	40%
Upper %	80%
Actual % Upper Bound for this project	22%

Build complexity			
Choose 1 category	•	Х	0.500/
Length of Build	< 2 years	X	0.50%
	2 to 4 years	\vdash	2.00%
	Over 4 years		5.00%
Choose 1 category			
Number of phases	1 or 2 Phases	Х	0.50%
	3 or 4 Phases		2.00%
	More than 4 Phases		5.00%
Choose 1 Category			
Number of sites involved	Single site*		2.00%
(i.e. before and after	2 Site	х	2.00%
change)	More than 2 site		5.00%
* Single site means new bu	uild is on same site as existino	g facilities	
Location			
Location			
Choose 1 Category			
New site - Green field	New build		3%
New site - Brown Field	New Build		8%
Existing site	New Build		5%
Existing site	or Less than 15% refurb		6%
	15% - 50% refurb	x	10%
			1070
Existing site Existing site	Over 50% refurb	 	16%

Scope of scheme			
Choose 1 category		x	
Facilities Management	Hard FM only or no FM	х	0.00%
· ·	Hard and soft FM		2.00%
Choose 1 category			
Equipment	Group 1 & 2 only		0.50%
	major Medical equipment	Х	1.50%
	All equipment included		5.00%
Choose 1 category			
IT Choose realegory	No IT implications		0.00%
	Infrastructure	х	1.50%
	Infrastructure & systems		5.00%
Change mare than 1 as	stagon, if applicable		
Choose more than 1 ca External Stakeholders		l x	1.00%
External Glaneriologis	3 or more NHS organisations		4.00%
	Universities/Private/Voluntary	-	4.0070
	sector/Local government		8.00%
		•	
Service changes - rela	ates to service delivery e.g NSF's		
_			
Choose 1 category			
Choose 1 category Stable environment, i.e.	no change to service	х	5%
		х	5% 10%

Choose 1 category	/		
RPA Score	Low	Х	0.009
	Medium		2% 0
	High		5% <mark>0</mark>

Upper Bound	22%
Mitigation	42
UB x M =	9.28
(UB x M)/100 =	9.28%

Contributory Factor to Upper	% Factor	% Factor	Explanation for rate of mitigation
Bound	% Factor Contributes	% Factor Contributes after mitigation	Explanation for rate of mitigation
Progress with Planning Approval	4	3.8	Limited engagement with Local Authority
Other Regulatory	4	3.8	Limited engagement with regulatory bodies
Depth of surveying of site/ground information	3	1.8	Some survey work undertaken
Detail of design	4	2.4	Limited development (initial 1:200) and user engagement
Innovative project/design (i.e. has this type of project/design been undertaken before)	3	1.5	Peri-operative model
Design complexity	4	1.6	Relatively simple design
Likely variations from Standard Contract	2	0.6	Expected to be limited (use of NEC4)
Design Team capabilities	3	0.6	Experienced Design Team have worked on other NTC projects
Contractors' capabilities (excluding design team covered above)	2	0.4	Experienced contractor with extensive NHS track record
Contractor Involvement	2	0.8	PSCP onn board at commencement of OBC
Client capability and capacity (NB do not double count with design team capabilities)	6	1.8	Experienced client team with capital planning, project management and clinical inputs
Robustness of Output Specification	25	7.5	COS document developed with input from wide range of stakeholders
Involvement of Stakeholders, including Public and Patient Involvement	5	3	Limited involvement to date
Agreement to output specification by stakeholders	5	2.5	Input from range of stakeholders but requires to be expanded
New service or traditional	3	1.5	Existing service but elements of service model are new
Local community consent	3	2.4	No input to date
Stable policy environment	20	6	Clear direction of travel around National Programme
Likely competition in the market for the project	2	0.2	PSCP already appointed
TOTAL	100	42.2	

Note: Across all contributory factors, mitigation would be expected to be greater the greater the extent of risk quantification and risk management.

PROJECT NAME National Treatment Centre NHS Ayrshire and Arran - Option 3

Optimism Bias - Upper Bound Calculation for Build

Lowest % Upper Bound	13%
Mid %	40%
Upper %	80%
Actual % Upper Bound for this project	17%

Build complexity			
Choose 1 category		х	
Length of Build	< 2 years	х	0.50%
	2 to 4 years		2.00%
	Over 4 years		5.00%
Choose 1 category			
Number of phases	1 or 2 Phases	х	0.50%
	3 or 4 Phases		2.00%
	More than 4 Phases		5.00%
	·		
Choose 1 Category			
Number of sites involved	Single site*	x	2.00%
(i.e. before and after	2 Site		2.00%
change)	More than 2 site		5.00%
- Single site means new bi	uild is on same site as existing	racilities	
Location			
Location			
Choose 1 Category			
New site - Green field	New build		3%
New site - Brown Field	New Build		8%
ivew site - brown Field			
Existing site	New Build	х	5%
Existing site	or	х	
Existing site Existing site	or Less than 15% refurb	х	6%
Existing site	or	х	

Scope of scheme			
Choose 1 category		х	
Facilities Management	Hard FM only or no FM	х	0.00%
	Hard and soft FM		2.00%
Choose 1 category			0
Equipment	Group 1 & 2 only		0.50% 0
	major Medical equipment	Х	1.50%
	All equipment included		5.00% 0
Choose 1 category			
IT Chicago y datagory	No IT implications		0.00% 0
	Infrastructure	х	1.50%
	Infrastructure & systems		5.00% 0
Choose more than 1 ca	4 # E		
External Stakeholders	1 or 2 local NHS organisations	х	1.00%
External Starteriologis	3 or more NHS organisations	_^	4.00% 0
	Universities/Private/Voluntary	_	4.0070
	sector/Local government		8.00% 0
	-		
Service changes - rela	ites to service delivery e.g NSF's		
Choose 1 category			
Stable environment, i.e.	no change to service	х	5%
Identified changes not o			10% 0
Longer time frame servi			20% 0

Choose more than 1 category if applicable External Stakeholders 1 or 2 local NHS organisations 3 or more NHS organisations Universities/Private/Voluntary sector/Local government Service changes - relates to service delivery e.g NSF Choose 1 category Stable environment, i.e. no change to service identified changes not quantified Longer time frame service changes Gateway Choose 1 category RPA Score Low Medium		x 1	
External Stakeholders 1 or 2 local NHS organisations 3 or more NHS organisations 3 or more NHS organisations 9 organisations 10 inversities/Private/Voluntary sector/Local government Service changes - relates to service delivery e.g. NSP: **Choose 1 category** Stable environment, i.e. no change to service dentified conger time frame service changes **Gateway** **Gateway** **Choose 1 category** RPA Score Low		<u> </u>	
3 or more NHS organisations Universities Private Noturiary sector/Local government Service changes - relates to service delivery e.g NSF Choose 1 category Stable environment, i.e. no change to service dediffied changes not quantified Longer time frame service changes Gateway Choose 1 category RPA Score Low	_		1.00%
Universities/Private/Voluntary sector/Local government Service changes - relates to service delivery e.g. NSP: Choose 1 category Stable environment, i.e. no change to service dentified changes not quantified conger time frame service changes Gateway Choose 1 category RPA Score Low			
sector/Local government Service changes - relates to service delivery e.g. NSF Choose 1 category Stable environment, i.e. no change to service dentified changes not quantified Longer time frame service changes Gateway Choose 1 category RPA Score Low		- 4	4.00%
Service changes - relates to service delivery e.g NSF Choose 1 category Stable environment, i.e. no change to service dentified changes not quantified Longer time frame service changes Gateway Choose 1 category RPA Score Low			
Choose 1 category Stable environment, i.e. no change to service identified changes not quantified conger time frame service changes Gateway Choose 1 category RPA Score Low			8.00%
Choose 1 category Stable environment, i.e. no change to service identified changes not quantified conger time frame service changes Gateway Choose 1 category RPA Score Low			
Stable environment, i.e. no change to service disentified changes not quantified Longer time frame service changes Gateway Choose 1 caregory RPA Score Low	š		
Stable environment, i.e. no change to service disentified changes not quantified Longer time frame service changes Gateway Choose 1 caregory RPA Score Low			
identified changes not quantified Longer time frame service changes Gateway Choose 1 category RPA Score Low		х	5%
Gateway Choose 1 category RPA Score Low	_		10% 0
Gateway Choose 1 category RPA Score Low	_	-	20% 0
Choose 1 category RPA Score Low			2070
Choose 1 category RPA Score Low			
RPA Score Low			
RPA Score Low			
		х	0%
	-		2% 0
Wiedlalli		-	
High			5% 0

Jpper Bound	17%	
/litigation	42	
JB x M =	7.17	
UB x M)/100 =	7.17%	

(UB x M)/100 =	7.17%		
Scheme name:			
Contributory Factor to Upper Bound	% Factor Contributes	% Factor Contributes after mitigation	Explanation for rate of mitigation
Progress with Planning Approval	4	3.8	Limited engagement with Local Authority
Other Regulatory	4	3.8	Limited engagement with regulatory bodies
Depth of surveying of site/ground information	3	1.8	Some survey work undertaken
Detail of design	4	2.4	Limited development (initial 1:200) and user engagement
Innovative project/design (i.e. has this type of project/design been undertaken before)	3	1.5	Peri-operative model
Design complexity	4	1.6	Relatively simple design
Likely variations from Standard Contract	2	0.6	Expected to be limited (use of NEC4)
Design Team capabilities	3	0.6	Experienced Design Team have worked on other NTC projects
Contractors' capabilities (excluding design team covered above)	2	0.4	Experienced contractor with extensive NHS track record
Contractor Involvement	2	0.8	PSCP onn board at commencement of OBC
Client capability and capacity (NB do not double count with design team capabilities)	6	1.8	Experienced client team with capital planning, project management and clinical inputs
Robustness of Output Specification	25	7.5	COS document developed with input from wide range of stakeholders
Involvement of Stakeholders, including Public and Patient Involvement	5	3	Limited involvement to date
Agreement to output specification by stakeholders	5	2.5	Input from range of stakeholders but requires to be expanded
New service or traditional	3	1.5	Existing service but elements of service model are new
Local community consent	3	2.4	No input to date

Note: Across all contributory factors, mitigation would be expected to be greater the greater the extent of risk quantification and risk management.

100 42.2

Likely competition in the market for the project

Clear direction of travel around National Programme

PSCP already appointed

PROJECT NAME National Treatment Centre NHS Ayrshire and Arran - Option 4

Optimism Bias - Upper Bound Calculation for Build

Lowest % Upper Bound	13%
Mid %	40%
Upper %	80%
Actual % Upper Bound for this project	17%

Build complexity			
Choose 1 category		х	
Length of Build	< 2 years	х	0.50%
	2 to 4 years		2.00%
	Over 4 years		5.00%
Choose 1 category			
Number of phases	1 or 2 Phases	x	0.50%
	3 or 4 Phases		2.00%
	More than 4 Phases		5.00%
Choose 1 Category	01 1 2 4		0.000/
Number of sites involved	Single site*	x	2.00%
(i.e. before and after	2 Site		2.00%
change)	More than 2 site		5.00%
Single site means new bu	ild is on same site as existing	racilities	
Location			
Location			
Choose 1 Category			
New site - Green field	New build		3%
New site - Brown Field	New Build		8%
Existing site	New Build	X	5%
	or		
Evicting cite	Lees than 15% refurb		6%
Existing site	Less than 15% refurb		
Existing site Existing site Existing site	Less than 15% refurb 15% - 50% refurb Over 50% refurb		6% 10% 16%

Scope of scheme			
Choose 1 category		х	
Facilities Management	Hard FM only or no FM	X	0.00%
	Hard and soft FM		2.00%
			(
Choose 1 category Equipment	Group 1 & 2 only	1	0.50%
Equipmont	major Medical equipment	x	1.50%
	All equipment included		5.00%
Choose 1 category	No IT implications	1	0.00%
	Infrastructure	x	1.50%
	Infrastructure & systems		5.00%
-			
Choose more than 1 ca			
External Stakeholders	1 or 2 local NHS organisations 3 or more NHS organisations	X	1.00% 4.00%
	Universities/Private/Voluntary		4.00%
	sector/Local government		8.00%
	3	-	0.00.0
Service changes - rela	ites to service delivery e.g NSF's		
Choose 1 category			
Stable environment, i.e.	no change to service	х	5%
Identified changes not of		10%	
		20%	
C-t			
Gateway			

Low Medium

RPA Score

Upper Bound	17%	
Mitigation	42	
UB x M =	7.17	
(UB x M)/100 =	7.17%	

OB X IVI =	7.17		
(UB x M)/100 =	7.17%		
Scheme name:			
Contributory Factor to Upper Bound	% Factor Contributes	% Factor Contributes after mitigation	Explanation for rate of mitigation
Progress with Planning Approval	4	3.8	Limited engagement with Local Authority
Other Regulatory	4	3.8	Limited engagement with regulatory bodies
Depth of surveying of site/ground information	3	1.8	Some survey work undertaken
Detail of design	4	2.4	Limited development (initial 1:200) and user engagement
Innovative project/design (i.e. has this type of project/design been undertaken before)	3	1.5	Peri-operative model
Design complexity	4	1.6	Relatively simple design
Likely variations from Standard Contract	2	0.6	Expected to be limited (use of NEC4)
Design Team capabilities	3	0.6	Experienced Design Team have worked on other NTC projects
Contractors' capabilities (excluding design team covered above)	2	0.4	Experienced contractor with extensive NHS track record
Contractor Involvement	2	0.8	PSCP onn board at commencement of OBC
Client capability and capacity (NB do not double count with design team capabilities)	6	1.8	Experienced client team with capital planning, project management and clinical inputs
Robustness of Output Specification	25	7.5	COS document developed with input from wide range of stakeholders
Involvement of Stakeholders, including Public and Patient Involvement	5	3	Limited involvement to date
Agreement to output specification by stakeholders	5	2.5	input from range of stakeholders but requires to be expanded
New service or traditional	3	1.5	Existing service but elements of service model are new
Local community consent	3	2.4	No input to date
Stable policy environment	20	6	Clear direction of travel around National Programme
Likely competition in the market for the project	2	0.2	PSCP already appointed

Note: Across all contributory factors, mitigation would be expected to be greater the greater the extent of risk quantification and risk management.