The following are the decisions taken by Cabinet at the above meeting.

Please note that these are not the full minutes, which will be published at a later date. In accordance with the Council’s Constitution, unless otherwise indicated all decisions listed below are subject to Call-In. The Call-In period will expire in 5 working days from the publication date of this notice.

Publication date: 7th March 2019

Date of decision: 5th March 2019

End of the call-in period is Midnight Thursday 14th March 2019

This decision can be implemented from: Friday 15th March 2019

If you have any queries about any matters referred to in this decision notice please contact Joy George, Principal Committees and Partnerships Officer, on 020 3373 1256 or at joy.george@newham.gov.uk

1. Adopting a corporate plan for Newham Council

Decision status: Recommendation Approved

Is this a Key decision?: Yes

Is subject to call in?: Yes

Decision

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE

i) To adopt the principles, priorities and deliverables in the Corporate Plan attached at Appendix 1 for the year 2019-20, with any agreed amendments; and

ii) To delegate the final drafting and publication of the Plan to the Assistant Chief Executive, in consultation with the Mayor.
Alternatives Considered

The Council could continue without a corporate plan. However, as outlined above, there is a need to provide direction and a clear strategy which defines priorities and related actions and measures to ensure the Mayoral priorities are delivered for the benefit of the local community.

2. Red Door Ventures - Updated Request for Funding

Decision status: Recommendations Approved

Is this a Key decision?: Yes

Is subject to call in?: Yes

Decision

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE

i) A change in sequencing of RDV's initial ‘Wave 1’ sites, previously approved by cabinet in October 2018, for the reasons set out in this report. The Didsbury Package of developments now including the former Didsbury Centre and Town Hall Annex along with six small sites shall proceed to start on site by end of March 2019 with the Brickyard and Grange Road schemes to be delivered as a separate package, subject to cabinet approval in due course;

ii) To delegate to the Director of Regeneration and Planning in consultation with the Mayor, the Interim Executive Director of Financial Sustainability and the Director of Legal and Governance authority to agree the draft RDV business plan as attached as Appendix 1 subject to the items set out in Para 8.1.8 being monitored and mitigated to their satisfaction. Any material changes would be reported back to cabinet;

iii) To fund the Didsbury Package of developments encompassing eight sites namely The Didsbury Centre, Town Hall Annex, Doherty Road, Wordsworth Avenue, Stacey Road, High Street South, Romford Road and Old Fire Station sites with GLA grant of up to £11,304,000 and Newham equity and loan funding up to £54,933,986 for the Development Phase and £58,816,013 for the Investment Phase and scheme specific working capital of £361,435

iv) To delegate to the Interim Executive Director of Financial Sustainability in consultation with the Mayor, the Director of Regeneration and Planning and the Director of Legal and Governance, authority to release the funding for the Didsbury Package subject to compliance with the financial and other
diligence requirements set out in exempt appendix 6. Any substantial variations to the project(s) would be brought back to Cabinet; and

v) The terms of the transfer of the land set out at exempt appendix 5 within the schemes outlined above and subject to funding for the relevant scheme being released, to delegate to the Director of Regeneration and Planning in consultation with the Mayor, the Executive Director of Financial Sustainability, the Director of Asset Management Services and the Director of Legal and Governance the agreement and finalisation of the terms of the transfers including the terms for the option to purchase of the affordable units within those schemes.

Alternatives Considered

1.1 The alternatives considered were as follows:-

- Council develops the sites directly;
- Council develops the affordable sites directly;
- Council sells the sites to a third party;
- Council transfers the land to RDV but does not fund the development;
- Council does nothing.

_Council develops the sites directly_ - As the land is owned by London Borough of Newham, the council could implement the planning permissions secured by RDV, with minor amendments. This approach however would result in the council losing out on significant future revenue from dividends and finance lending margin over the next 50 years. For this reason, this approach has been discounted.

_Council develops the affordable sites directly_ – This approach has been explored however there is a limit to the number of new homes that the HRA can deliver. For this reason, this approach has been discounted at this time pending further review of the HRA capacity to fund new affordable home delivery.

_Council sells the sites to a third party_ - Delivery through an external third party developer or Registered Provider would result in the Council having no control over the sites. The council would not benefit directly from any of the financial upside in respect of development profit, margin on lending, dividends. The Council would not benefit from any capital appreciation in the value of the completed investment assets. Many local authorities have set up Local Housing Companies to control delivery quality and gain the financial upside of the profit margin and the lending rate. For this reason, this option has been discounted.
Council transfers the land to RDV but does not fund the development - This investment has been shown to finance the cost of the loan and provide a lending margin and dividend back to the council in excess of target hurdle rates. For this reason it is considered a prudent investment and therefore the option of not funding the development has been discounted.

Council does nothing - As the land is owned by London Borough of Newham, it is important that options be developed that enable sites to come forward with the most preferred tenure. Doing nothing would be detrimental to the Council by creating a blight in the local area and failing to meet the housing needs of local residents. It would also result in a loss of GLA grant and loss of confidence in the council as delivery partner for the GLA. For this reason this option has been discounted.

3. Newham Council Performance

Decision status: Recommendations Approved

Is this a Key decision?: No

Is subject to call in?: No

Decision

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE

i) To note the work in progress to implement the new performance management framework; and

ii) That Lead Members should work with Directors in 2019/20 to understand better and to address emerging trends and areas for improvement.

Alternatives Considered

The alternative to not publishing current data would be a continuing lack of transparency about the Council’s performance. That would undermine the ability of members and residents to understand how well the organisation is performing, and whether resources are being used effectively.


Decision status: Recommendations Approved

Is this a Key decision?: Yes

Is subject to call in?: Yes
Decision

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE

i) To approve the Digital Presence and Web Access programme and to earmark total funding of £4.2m overall for Financial Years 19/20 and 20/21 to deliver this programme;

ii) To note that the programme team would work with ICT to present detailed project business cases for this investment for the Digital Experience, Digital Customer Access, Digital Workplace, and Visibility & Accountability projects with savings projections specific to the procurement and implementation of these. Individual project Business Cases will be subject to the required council governance process; and

iii) To note that the Digital Customer Access project is likely to involve procurement of systems and services over £500,000 so will be presented to Cabinet again for final approval.

Alternatives Considered

Alternative 1 – Close the Programme

Close down the programme and attempt to deliver the benefits through service driven initiatives.

This option was not considered due to the following:

• In a cross-cutting digital landscape it requires coordination to deliver benefits consistently across the council and service-driven initiatives traditionally work best when focused within a service.

• The costs of delivering the solutions may be increased, so reducing the benefits.

• Management of the financial and reputational risk would be better managed at a cross-council level.

• The realisation of the benefits of channel shift and self-service is best coordinated at the cross-council level.

Alternative 2 - Do nothing and maintain the status-quo

Do not replace the existing systems going out of support and build the new solutions with them.

This option was not considered due to the following:

• The existing technology is increasingly no longer fit for purpose
The old systems cannot provide the modern, personal, responsive web experience the residents now expect so the poor experience would remain.

- Residents are not involved in the design process.
- The cost of any small change in the current system is prohibitive.
- The systems are due to become unsupported in 2020 and so will become less and less secure over time, with all the associated financial, reputational and security risks.
- The current CRM is a corporate risk as it lacks a sustainable financial support model.
- The situation around Freedom of Information requests, Complaints and Members and MPs enquiries would not be improved.
- There would still be no effective internal communication and engagement tool to replace the intranet, and information would remain hard to find and share.

5. **Microsoft Cloud Enrolment Agreement**

Decision status: Recommendations Approved

Is this a Key decision?: Yes

Is subject to call in?: Yes

Decision

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE

i) To award the Microsoft Cloud Enrolment License contract under a direct call off procedure available via the KCS Software Products and Associated Services Y17038 (Lot 1 Microsoft) framework agreement to Bytes Software Services Ltd for the value of £1.287m for a period of 3 years.

ii) To delegate authority to the Director of Technology and Innovation, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance to approve the final forms of contracts and entering into such agreements necessary to give effect to the recommendations detailed in this report.

**Alternatives Considered**

Switching to alternative software vendor products has been considered. Due to the heavy reliance on Microsoft products for use in the IT infrastructure the only realistic mainstream option would be Oracle databases instead of the Microsoft SQL equivalent. However, the cost point for these is significantly higher and would also require additional
staff being trained in this technology. A wholesale move would prove cost prohibitive for the organisation.

The number of applications within Newham using the Microsoft technology is circa 100, therefore, the costs to change and the respective planning involved would make this option to expensive. This would also assume that the applications are compatible with other technologies providing the same service.

Open source was also considered for the equivalent database technology but due to the limited number of applications that can run on this technology and substantially higher cost of ownership and sustainability this was ruled out.

Therefore this, along with certain applications not supporting non Microsoft technology would mean that significant expenditure on Microsoft Licenses will still be required, removing any potential cost savings.

For the CRM system it would not be possible to move to an alternative solution at this point. The migration and transition costs to another platform would be significant and not viable at this stage.


Decision status: Recommendations Approved

Is this a Key decision?: Yes

Is subject to call in?: Yes

Decision

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE

i) That the Grounds Maintenance & Associated Services contract with the incumbent supplier, Serco PLC (“Serco”) be extended for a further six month period to January 11th 2020;

ii) That the grounds maintenance & associated repairs and maintenance services forming part of the current Grounds Maintenance & Associated Services contract are brought in house (in-sourced) at the end of the contract on January 11th 2020;

iii) That as detailed in section 4 of the report approval is granted for the procurement of the vehicles, plant and equipment necessary for the delivery of the grounds maintenance and associated services
contract through an existing framework using TPPL (The Procurement Partnership). To include;

a) procuring an estimated 42 vehicles through a 5 year operating lease at an estimated total cost of £950,000 over a 5 year period.

b) procuring an estimated 35 specialist large plant units through a 4 year operating lease at an estimated total cost of £450,000 over a 4 year period.

c) procuring small plant at an estimated total cost of £90,000 through competitive quotes.

iv) To delegate authority to the Director of Community & Environment, in consultation with the Lead Member for Environment, and the Directors of Finance and Law & Governance, to agree the award of contracts for vehicles, plant and equipment as set out in (iii) above, noting that each contract would be less than £1million value.

v) That the arboricultural services forming part of the current Grounds Maintenance & Associated Services contract are procured on the open market (out-sourced) through an EU-compliant open tender procurement process as detailed in section 4 of the report.

vi) To delegate authority to the Director of Community & Environment in consultation with the Lead Member for Environment, and the Directors of Finance and Law & Governance, to agree the award of a 5 year contract (with optional 2 year extension) for arboricultural services noting that any significant variation to the anticipated costs set out in Section 8 must be referred back to Cabinet.

Alternatives Considered

Cease to provide the services - Ceasing to provide the services at the end of the current contract is not a practical option for the Council due to the legal obligations and associated risks outlined in the cabinet report of 5th November 2018.

Out-source all services in one or more lots - The Council could opt to procure a new contract for all current services when the current one ends on 12th July 2019. The council could re-procure all services on the open market. If this were to be done it is recommended they be let in a single lot for Grounds Maintenance and Arboricultural Services as the larger contract value would generate more market interest, in turn driving competition and ultimately delivering better value for money. Combining these services would reduce client management requirements as there would only be one contract to manage. Benefits of this would be:

- Risks shared with the contractor
- Reduced pension costs
• Onus on contractor to deliver to cost
• Contractor manages staffing, technological and legislative requirements

However, the benefits of in-sourcing that are set out in Section 4.3 of this report would not be delivered. Furthermore, there would be significantly reduced opportunity to integrate the service with other public realm services and the contract / performance management costs to the Council would be more expensive than an in-sourced service.

**In-source all services** - This option is not recommended due to the reasons set out in Section 4 of this report with specific regard to the arboricultural service.

**Out-source grounds maintenance services to the established street cleansing & estate cleaning small businesses**

The Council could award grounds maintenance and arboriculture services contracts to one or all three of the established street cleansing businesses. This is an option that could be further considered after the grounds services have been in-sourced but is not recommended at this time as there is a review underway (Cabinet - December 2018) to assess options for the future delivery of the three street cleansing & estates businesses. This review needs to be concluded prior to further decisions being made.

There are some services, such as litter picking in parks & open spaces and grass cutting on housing estates, where there is synergy between street cleansing and grounds maintenance services. In these areas there are potential opportunities to improve services or deliver efficiencies. Additional opportunities for revenue generation may also be generated from grounds maintenance services being incorporated into the existing businesses. These can be considered as part of the review of the three street cleansing and estates businesses being carried out by the Shareholder Function team.

7. **Beckton Community Centre Refurbishment and North Woolwich Renovation and Expansion**

**Decision status:** Recommendations Approved

**Is this a Key decision?:** Yes

**Is subject to call in?:** Yes

**Decision**

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE
i) To take all necessary steps to implement the capital works projects to upgrade Beckton Community Centre and North Woolwich Library, including the procurement of required works contracts;

ii) To fund the projects referred to above through the allocation of funds arising from the:

- London City Airport section 106 agreement dated 9 July 2009, being the sum of £988,430 towards the refurbishment of Beckton Community Centre; and

- Barrier Park East section 106 agreement dated 14 December 2009, being the sum of £702,000 towards the renovation and expansion of North Woolwich Library.

iii) That Officers should provide details of an alternative plan if the scoping exercise details significant works outside of the proposed budget;

iv) That in respect of North Woolwich Library, there should be a discussion with Regeneration Officers and the Cabinet Lead re the wider place making of the area;

v) To delegate authority to the Interim Director of Community & Environment after consultation with the Director of Finance to award the required works contracts following a compliant procurement process and to take all necessary steps to implement the projects to which the requested resolution at (i) above relates; and

vi) To note that the delegated authority of the Head of Planning and Development will be executed to allocate funds as above in resolution (ii)

Alternatives Considered

Do nothing

i) BCC would deteriorate further and become less cost effective due to increased repairs requirements.

ii) BCC would continue to not be fully accessible

iii) The opportunity to deliver a service that meets the needs of residents and increase income would be missed

iv) An alternative use for the section 106 funding would need to be identified urgently in order to have sufficient time for project planning and delivery and avoid the risk of funding clawback.
Other Community Neighbourhood options for allocation of the London City Airport section 106 funding were considered and evaluated using the following criteria:

i) Section 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations criteria
ii) Investment need
iii) Longevity of the capital works
iv) Level of impact on the service

The table below summarises the outcome of the evaluation (see Appendix 9 for full assessment):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Investment need</th>
<th>Longevity</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckton Community Centre</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton Globe</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Woolwich Library</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodman Community Centre</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An options assessment for the Barrier Park East section 106 funding was not required, as there are no other community facilities within the area that meets the funding allocation requirements in the agreement.

8. Developer Contributions Governance and Funding Allocation Strategy

Decision status: Recommendations Approved

Is this a Key decision?: Yes

Is subject to call in?: Yes

Decision

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE

i) The content of the Developer Contributions: Governance and Funding Allocation Strategy (the ‘Strategy’); and

ii) To recommend to full Council that Council:

   a) Agree the content of the Developer Contributions: Governance and Funding Allocation Strategy; and,
b) Adopt the Developer Contributions: Governance and Funding Allocation Strategy; and,

c) Publish the Developer Contributions: Governance and Funding Allocation Strategy on the Council’s website.

iii) To delegate authority to the Director of Regeneration and Planning in consultation with the Mayor as Lead Member for Regeneration, Planning and Strategic Housing Delivery, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services and the Director of Legal and Governance authority to make minor amendments and approve the final version suitable for publication on the Council’s website.

iv) To Note that the Strategy confirms the Council in its role as collecting authority’s approach to calculating the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) whereby a chargeable development includes flexible use floor space; namely that the highest rate in the LBN’s CIL charging Schedule will be used; and

v) To Note that the Council as collecting authority will universally apply surcharges to chargeable developments; if the Strategy is agreed, where there is an exceptional circumstance the surcharge may be waived by way of Officer delegated authority as set out in the Strategy; and

vi) To Note that the approach to the collection and allocation of the Council’s CIL in 2019/20 as outlined in the Strategy, funds accrued prior to 2019/20 will be managed and allocated in accordance with the scheme of delegation; and

vii) To Note that the Strategy confirms Officers with authority to allocate Developer Contributions; when key decision provisions apply and when Member approval will be required; and

viii) To Note that the Strategy confirms the delegation of the processing of claims for relief and exemption to more junior posts in the LBN for operational efficiency in accordance with the financial limitations in Part 3B of the Council’s Scheme of Delegations to Officers General Management Powers 1st November 2018.

Alternatives Considered

1.2 Primarily the Strategy is the consolidation of the existing practices of the LBN as stated or implied in the Constitution, as such there is no alternative, save for the review of the Constitution.

1.3 Within the Strategy there are some matters which could be dealt with in an alternative manner as set out in paragraphs 6.3-6.10.
1.4 In relation to the provision in the Strategy at Paragraph 5.3 the collecting authority could continue to apply the approach without the ratification from Members, but this carries a marginal risk of the Council being successfully challenged. The challenge would likely be an appeal through the CIL Regulations or a judicial review by the High Court of the decision.

1.5 In relation to the provision of surcharges in the Strategy at Paragraph 5.5 the collecting authority could assess and make an active decision by way of delegated authority each time a surcharge may be applied in accordance with Regulations 80-86 of the CIL Regulations; this process is open to challenge and is time consuming. The universal application of surcharges means that the collecting authority only needs to consider exceptional circumstances, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Strategy.

1.6 As proposed by Table 3 of the draft Strategy; the delegation of approving claims for relief and exemption to more junior posts in the Council could not be progressed and the authority could remain with the officers fulfilling the role of the Head of Paid Service and the Chief Planning Officer. There is a risk however that the limited number of Officers with delegated authority to agree to the mandatory claims could inadvertently lead to delays in the delivery of developments across the Borough.

1.7 The draft Strategy considered some alternatives for the approach to the allocation of the neighbourhood element of CIL, as considered in Paragraphs 7.4-7.15 and Table 7 of the draft Strategy.

1.8 The LBN could maintain that all monies be managed as a strategic resource of the Council and this approach would be lawful, however this does not support the Mayoral pledge to encourage greater resident input into ‘planning’.

1.9 There are other alternative ways to designate the neighbourhood allocation of CIL including: (a) treating each ward or community neighbourhood as a CIL neighbourhood for collection purposes; and, (b) treating the entire borough or each ward as a CIL neighbourhood for collection purposes.

1.10 For (a) the option was discounted as in some instances there would be some wards that would have very limited CIL income and some community neighbourhood areas which may be capped to the amount of monies that could be spent in the area in accordance with R59(7) of the CIL Regulations.

1.11 For option (b) it was considered that the strategic CIL can deal with borough wide matters and the establishment of the Citizen Assemblies’ meant that there was a forum to deal with matters on a Community Neighbourhood basis and the administration associated with neighbourhood CIL would be disproportionate to the local community benefit.

9. Health & Care Space Newham

Decision status: Recommendations Approved

Is this a Key decision?: Yes
Is subject to call in?: Yes

Decision

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE

i) The governance arrangements for HCSN as set out in Appendix A of the report;

ii) To delegate authority to the Executive Director for Financial Sustainability in consultation with the Mayor and appropriate Cabinet members to approve all future HCSN business cases and required terms, and

iii) To delegate authority to the Executive Director for Financial Sustainability to approve that agreed funding amounts under approved HCSN business cases be transferred as debt finance to HCSN under appropriate contractual arrangements

Alternatives Considered

1. The proposed governance arrangements have been developed over a number of months via consultation with members, senior officers and partners. They set out a framework process to allow delegated decision-making relating to HCSN to take place in a robust, transparent and practical way. The process has been modified repeatedly in recent months to take into consideration comments from members, senior officers and partners.

2. The consultation session with Cllr Terry Paul suggested that the process be streamlined slightly – which is reflected in more detail in (Appendix A).

10. North Woolwich Corridor

Decision status: Recommendations Approved

Is this a Key decision?: Yes

Is subject to call in?: Yes

Decision

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE

i) To fund the North Woolwich corridor initial design, consultation and
implementation through the allocation of section 106 planning obligations fund, arising from neighbouring developments. The contribution amount being £748k.; and

ii) That a Project Board be re-constituted to approve project level decisions, as set out in paragraph 3.6. of the report

Alternatives Considered

There are no alternatives as not undertaking this design and approval work as one corridor project, would lead to delays in obtaining approvals for individual sections, if they were stand-alone projects.

11. Smarter Working Programme

Decision status: Recommendations Approved

Is this a Key decision?: Yes

Is subject to call in?: Yes

Decision

For the reasons set out in the report Cabinet RESOLVED to AGREE

i) To earmark £10.058m of funding over the period 2018/19 to 2021/22 for the delivery of the Smarter Working Programme in the following way:

a) £4.536m funded through the unallocated capital resources budget,

b) £0.528m funded through the HRA Capital Programme,

c) £3.675m funded through the General Fund Reserves,

d) £1.319m funded from the HRA revenue reserves.

ii) The release of an initial £5.442m of funding to support the delivery of the first year of the programme.

iii) Note that a further paper will be presented to Cabinet in March 2020 to outline lessons learned from the programme’s first year of delivery and requesting the release of the remaining funding to complete the programme, which is costed at £4.616m and reviewed by Finance.

iv) Note that a robust Communication Plan will be drawn up to keep staff fully informed, involved and engaged throughout the
programme’s lifecycle.

v) To note that this programme will be monitored / progressed and reviewed under the auspices of the Mayor’s ‘SMART Newham’ Board and links with the Corporate Change Board chaired by the CEO. This programme also aligns to the planned Mayor Strategic Board that oversees the interdependencies of Regeneration, Housing, Asset Management and investments. Reports will be produced by the Corporate PMO.

vi) To note that a full discussion to be undertaken on the council’s sites to ensure that the Smarter Working Programme is joined up with the emerging regeneration picture for the area.

Alternatives considered

Following the ‘Scoping and Requirements Workshops’ five options were considered for the implementation of the Smarter Working Programme:

- Option 1 - Must Do items only
- **Option 2 - Must and Should Do items (Recommended Option)**
- Option 3 - Must, Should and Could Do items
- Option 4 - Thin Client and Laptop Mixed Estate
- Option 5 - Do Nothing

The programme recommends the delivery of all 'Must Do' and 'Should Do' requirements (Option 2). This option delivers significant improvements for the organisation and delivers the outcomes required to meet all of the agreed Smarter Working Programme Principles.

A total of four alternative options were considered.

Do Nothing

This option was discounted, as without the delivery of the Smarter Working Programme, LBN will continue to:

- Have a technology offering that is out of date, slow and urgently requires replacement which is deemed as “Essential Works”
- Continue with out of date working practices and culture
- Retain much more office space than it requires at the expense of the public purse.

Must Do items only

This option was discounted as it only delivers the absolutely critical requirements identified from the User Engagement Workshops and excludes the delivery of a number of highly desirable requirements (‘Should Do’ and ‘Could Do’ MoSCoW categories).
This option will cost £10.183m to deliver.

**Must, Should and Could Do items**

This option was discounted as it’s more expensive than the recommended option and delivers items from the User Engagement Workshops that don’t add sufficient value.

This option will cost £12.150m to deliver.

**Thin Client and Laptop Mixed Estate**

A further option was assessed which considers an alternative technology solution. The option provides laptops to 50% of the workforce to provide them with flexibility and the provision of a thin client for the other 50% of the workforce providing them with a static solution.

With this option LBN will in effect be delivering two solutions. One solution for the more static workers (thin client) and one solution for more mobile workers (laptops).

Furthermore, most of the elements articulated within the recommended option of this paper, would still need to be delivered. This is to enable laptop users to work efficiently, albeit the cost of purchasing new laptops will decrease.

However, the investment to deliver an effective thin client solution is significant. LBN would need to replace the current virtual desktop and base units with a much more capable but expensive virtual desktop solution.

This option was discounted as its £2.658m more expensive to deliver than the recommended option and costs a total of £14.251m. It also provides a poorer user experience, does not meet a number of the Smarter Working Programme Principles and severely restricts the organisation ability to rationalise its office accommodation portfolio thus severely impacting the intended payback period and benefits realisation.
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