

## Evaluation and assessment of Options

### Option 1 Geographic

	Criteria	Weighting	Assessment
1	<b>Fair work distribution</b> – is the option evenly distributing workload (20)	19	Uses current network to increase boundaries to more evenly distribute constituent sub-Branches
2	<b>Connectivity</b> – accessibility to modern communications – relative access to modern communications and ability to interconnect (10)	9	Uses current resources to build capability between sub-Branches and members
3	<b>Oversight and assistance</b> – can support and assistance be readily accessed to help optimal performance (20)	16	Combine face-to-face and technology support to manage increase in number of sub-Branches to meet reporting deadlines
4	<b>Affordability</b> – relative to RSL NSW budget (pooled fund) and sustaining District Support Officer (35)	35	Meets budget expectation to reduce number of DCs to 10
5	<b>Accessibility</b> – how accessible are the lines of communication for in-person access (5)	5	Builds on existing lines of communication to enhance and support meeting formats
6	<b>Risk</b> – Each option is to be assessed under the RSL NSW Risk Framework's five risk categories (10)	10	Services: within appetite People: within appetite Financial: within appetite Governance: within appetite Strategy: within appetite
Total weighting		94	

### Option 2 Member Numbers

	Criteria	Weighting	Assessment
1	<b>Fair work distribution</b> – is the option evenly distributing workload (20)	10	Distribution of membership workload but does not account for reporting requirements
2	<b>Connectivity</b> – accessibility to modern communications – relative access to modern communications and ability to interconnect (10)	6	Disjointed network will impact connectivity
3	<b>Oversight and assistance</b> – can support and assistance be readily accessed to help optimal performance (20)	12	Reliance on technology only to support this type of network as the DC may cover various locations
4	<b>Affordability</b> – relative to RSL NSW budget (pooled fund) and sustaining District Support Officer (35)	30	It may not be possible to keep the rationalisation down to 10 Districts with this option
5	<b>Accessibility</b> – how accessible are the lines of communication for in-person access (5)	2	Face-to-face meetings will be difficult to coordinate in a disjointed network

6	<b>Risk</b> – Each option is to be assessed under the RSL NSW Risk Framework’s five risk categories (10)	7	Services: within appetite People: not able to adequately support volunteers Financial: within appetite Governance: impact on reporting requirements Strategy: impact on ability to achieve goal
Total Weighting		67	

### Option 3 Assets

	Criteria	Weighting	Assessment
1	<b>Fair work distribution</b> – is the option evenly distributing workload (20)	5	Distribution on assets does nothing to impact workload at DC or sub-Branch
2	<b>Connectivity</b> – accessibility to modern communications – relative access to modern communications and ability to interconnect (10)	8	Disjointed network but could be mitigated by application of income of wealthy sub-Branches toward improving connectivity for others
3	<b>Oversight and assistance</b> – can support and assistance be readily accessed to help optimal performance (20)	12	A disjointed network makes providing tailored support difficult where face-to-face may be needed
4	<b>Affordability</b> – relative to RSL NSW budget (pooled fund) and sustaining District Support Officer (35)	30	It may not be possible to keep the rationalisation down to 10 Districts with this option
5	<b>Accessibility</b> – how accessible are the lines of communication for in-person access (5)	2	Face-to-face meetings will be difficult to coordinate in a disjointed network
6	<b>Risk</b> – Each option is to be assessed under the RSL NSW Risk Framework’s five risk categories (10)	7	Services: within appetite People: difficult to support volunteers Financial: within appetite Governance: difficulty in support could impact reporting Strategy: impacts ability to achieve DC rationalisation
Total Weighting:		64	

Option 4 Metro/Rural Link (wedge option)

	Criteria	Weighting	Assessment
1	<b>Fair work distribution</b> – is the option evenly distributing workload (20)	17	It would be possible to distribute metro and rural sub-Branches evenly
2	<b>Connectivity</b> – accessibility to modern communications – relative access to modern communications and ability to interconnect (10)	7	Connectivity would not be an issue for metro sub-Branches however lines of communication may be stretched and impact interconnection between metro and rural areas
3	<b>Oversight and assistance</b> – can support and assistance be readily accessed to help optimal performance (20)	15	The distances would inhibit face-to-face support for constituent sub-Branches thus creating total reliance on technology
4	<b>Affordability</b> – relative to RSL NSW budget (pooled fund) and sustaining District Support Officer (35)	25	Given the distances between metro and rural or remote sub-Branches and geographic boundaries it is unlikely the number of rationalised DCs will be reduced to 10 with this option
5	<b>Accessibility</b> – how accessible are the lines of communication for in-person access (5)	2	Distances could make face-to-face meetings and communications difficult
6	<b>Risk</b> – Each option is to be assessed under the RSL NSW Risk Framework's five risk categories (10)	7	Services: within appetite People: difficult to support volunteers Financial: within appetite Governance: difficult to support reporting requirements Strategy: unlikely to achieve rationalisation to 10 DCs

Total Weighting: 73

Option 5 Communication capability/reach

	Criteria	Weighting	Assessment
1	<b>Fair work distribution</b> – is the option evenly distributing workload (20)	14	Discounts workload associated with managing membership, reporting and access to services
2	<b>Connectivity</b> – accessibility to modern communications – relative access to modern communications and ability to interconnect (10)	8	Reliant on capable volunteers to connect across constituent sub-Branches and presupposes adequate technology
3	<b>Oversight and assistance</b> – can support and assistance be readily accessed to help optimal performance (20)	14	Capable sub-Branches able to operate at high efficiency but possibility of leaving less capable sub-Branches behind

4	<b>Affordability</b> – relative to RSL NSW budget (pooled fund) and sustaining District Support Officer (35)	30	Assessing capability is difficult however if achievable, rationalisation to 10 DCs could be possible
5	<b>Accessibility</b> – how accessible are the lines of communication for in-person access (5)	3	Less requirement to facilitate face-to-face meetings
6	<b>Risk</b> – Each option is to be assessed under the RSL NSW Risk Framework’s five risk categories (10)	8	Services: within appetite People: possibility of leaving some less capable sub-Branches behind Financial: within appetite Governance: within appetite Strategy: within appetite

Total weighting: 77