

Each option should be assessed against fit with priorities and the risk matrix.

The fit with priorities has a weighting as shown in the table and the risk matrix marked from 1-4.

Formula : $f \div r = \text{result demonstrating best balance of fit and risk}$

f – fit with priorities

r - risk

The threshold for options going forward as viable for consultation purposes would be all options which achieve a threshold of 100% or more.

Fit with Priorities (if successfully implemented)

Criteria	Range	Weighting	Total Achievable
Supports the Council's aim of a healthy and successful Rossendale and reflects the equality impact assessment	0-5	4	20
Supports the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy	0-5	6	30
Total			50

Risk matrix

Score (in considering probability or severity of negative outcome)

Low	1
Medium	2
High	3
Very High	4

Dimensions

Timescale – probability of it not being possible to complete by March 2014 and the relative severity of this

Deliverability – considering the complexity of the option and the resources for delivery (management, staff capacity etc) the probability of delivery failure and the relative severity of this

Market – considering external market issues (those not under our control) the likelihood of these negatively affecting the option and the relative severity of this

Sustainability – considering operational issues that are under operators control and the financial model of the option the likelihood of it not proving sustainable and the relative severity of this.

Funding – considering the capital needs of the options (including any sunk revenue subsidy) the probability that these funds can be accessed and the relative severity if they cannot.

Option 1 – Do nothing

Criteria	Score 0-5	Weighting	Total 100
Supports the Council's aim of a healthy and successful Rossendale and reflects the equality consideration	3	4	12
Supports the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy	0	6	0
Total			12

OPTION		Timescale	Deliverability	Market	Sustainability	Funding	TOTAL SCORE
Option 1	PROBABILITY	1	2	4	4	4	
	SEVERITY	1	2	4	4	4	
	SCORE	2	4	8	8	8	30

Option 2 Reduce Costs, increase revenue and identify capital programme

Criteria	Score 0-5	Weighting	Total 100
Supports the Council's aim of a healthy and successful Rossendale and reflects the equality consideration	4	4	16
Supports the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy	1	6	6
Total			22

OPTION		Timescale	Deliverability	Market	Sustainability	Funding	TOTAL SCORE
Option 2	PROBABILITY	1	2	3	3	4	
	SEVERITY	1	2	3	3	4	
	SCORE	2	4	6	6	8	26

Option 3 Build An Alternative Pool

Criteria	Score 0-5	Weighting	Total 100
Supports the Council's aim of a healthy and successful Rossendale and reflects the equality consideration	5	4	20
Supports the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy	0	6	0
Total			20

OPTION		Timescale	Deliverability	Market	Sustainability	Funding	TOTAL SCORE
Option 3	PROBABILITY	4	2	2	3	4	
	SEVERITY	1	4	3	4	4	
	SCORE	5	6	5	7	8	31

Option 4 Close the Pool and consider site disposal options

Criteria	Score 0-5	Weighting	Total 100
Supports the Council's aim of a healthy and successful Rossendale and reflects the equality consideration	0	4	0
Supports the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy	5	6	30
Total			30

OPTION		Timescale	Deliverability	Market	Sustainability	Funding	TOTAL SCORE
Option 4	PROBABILITY	2	1	1	1	1	
	SEVERITY	4	1	1	1	1	
	SCORE	6	2	2	2	2	14

Option 5 Transfer to a Third Party

Criteria	Score 0-5	Weighting	Total 100
Supports the Council's aim of a healthy and successful Rossendale and reflects the equality consideration	3	4	12
Supports the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy	4	6	24
Total			36

OPTION		Timescale	Deliverability	Market	Sustainability	Funding	TOTAL SCORE
Option 5	PROBABILITY	3	1	4	1	1	
	SEVERITY	2	2	2	1	1	
	SCORE	5	3	6	2	2	18