

Education And Debate

Private finance and “value for money” in NHS hospitals: a policy in search of a rationale?

BMJ 2002; 324 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.324.7347.1205> (Published 18 May 2002) Cite this as: BMJ 2002;324:1205

- [Article](#)
- [Related content](#)
- [Metrics](#)
- [Responses](#)
- [Peer review](#)
- 

Allyson M Pollock, professor (allyson.pollock@ucl.ac.uk)^a, **Jean Shaoul**, senior lecturer^b, **Neil Vickers**, senior research fellow^a

[Author affiliations](#)

Correspondence to: Professor Pollock

Allyson Pollock and her colleagues have long argued that using the private finance initiative to build NHS hospitals is an expensive way of building new capacity that constrains services and limits future options. Here they provide evidence that the justification for using private finance—that it offers value for money through lowering costs over the life of the project and by removing risk from NHS trusts—is a sleight of hand

Since 1992 the British government has favoured paying for capital works in the public service through the private finance initiative (PFI)—that is, through loans raised by the private sector. For hospitals this means that a private sector consortium designs, builds, finances, and operates the hospital. In return the NHS trust pays an annual fee to cover both the capital cost, including the cost of borrowing, and maintenance of the hospital and any non-clinical services provided over the 25-35 year life of the contract. The policy has been controversial because of its high cost and impact on clinical budgets.^{1 2 3 4 5 6}

When first introduced in 1992 proponents claimed that PFI would lead to more investment without increasing the public sector borrowing requirement. However, the UK budget surpluses of recent years (£23bn for 2000-1 alone) have been much greater than the total of £14bn private investment deals signed in 1997-2001. The present generation of taxpayers could have funded considerably more capital investment out of existing revenue instead of displacing the cost on to future generations.^{7 8}

Furthermore, there is no evidence that PFI has increased overall levels of service. On the contrary, its use in the NHS has had two main effects. Firstly, it has displaced the burden of debt from central government to NHS trusts and with it the responsibility for managing spending controls and planning services, ...

[View Full Text](#)

Log in

Log in using your username and password

[BMA Member Log In](#)

If you have a subscription to The BMJ, log in:

Username *

Password *

[Forgot your log in details?](#)

Login

- [Need to activate](#)
- [Log in via institution](#)
- [Log in via OpenAthens](#)

Log in through your institution

Subscribe from £173 *

Subscribe and get access to all BMJ articles, and much more.

[Subscribe](#)

* For online subscription

Access this article for 1 day for:

£38 / \$45 / €42 ([excludes VAT](#))





You can download a PDF version for your personal record.

[Buy this article](#)

-  Post
-

Article tools

 [PDF](#)  [11 responses](#)

-  [Respond to this article](#)
-  [Data supplement](#)
-  [Print](#)
-  [Alerts & updates](#)

Article alerts



Please note: your email address is provided to the journal, which may use this information for marketing purposes.

Log in or register:

Username *

Password *

[Register for alerts](#)

-  If you have registered for alerts, you should use your registered email address as your username
-  [Citation tools](#)

Download this article to citation manager

Pollock A M, Shaoul J, Vickers N. Private finance and “value for money” in NHS hospitals: a policy in search of a rationale? BMJ 2002; 324 :1205 doi:10.1136/bmj.324.7347.1205

- BibTeX (win & mac)
- EndNote (tagged)

[Download](#)
[Download](#)

- EndNote 8 (xml)
- RefWorks Tagged (win & mac)
- RIS (win only)
- Medlars

[Download](#)
[Download](#)
[Download](#)
[Download](#)

Help

If you are unable to import citations, please contact technical support for your product directly (links go to external sites):

- [EndNote](#)
- [ProCite](#)
- [Reference Manager](#)
- [RefWorks](#)
- [Zotero](#)
- [Request permissions](#)
- [Author citation](#)
- [Articles by Allyson M Pollock](#)
- [Add article to BMJ Portfolio](#)
- [Articles by Neil Vickers](#)

[Email to a friend](#)

Forward this page

Thank you for your interest in spreading the word about The BMJ.

NOTE: We only request your email address so that the person you are recommending the page to knows that you wanted them to see it, and that it is not junk mail. We do not capture any email address.

Username *


Your Email *

Send To *

You are going to email the following [Private finance and "value for money" in NHS hospitals: a policy in search of a rationale?](#)
 Your Personal Message

CAPTCHA

This question is for testing whether or not you are a human visitor and to prevent automated spam submissions.





☐


Send



Who is talking about this article?



-  Picked up by **2** news outlets
-  Referenced in **2** policy sources
-  Posted by **11** X users
-  **57** readers on Mendeley

[See more details](#)



This week's poll

What would be the most appropriate replacement for the term junior doctors in the UK?

- ☐ Postgraduate doctors
- ☐ Doctors
- ☐ Doctors in training
- ☐ The specific phase/year F1, CT1, ST3...
- ☐ Non-consultant doctor
- ☐ Attending/Resident
- ☐ None -- junior doctors is the correct term
- ☐ Other:

[View Results](#)

[Read](#) related article

[See](#) previous polls

[Back to top](#)