

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL and MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

TO: Mid Suffolk Cabinet Babergh Cabinet	REPORT NUMBER: <big>MCa/18/61</big>
FROM: Cabinet Members for Finance	DATE OF MEETING: 4 February 2019 6 February 2019
OFFICER: Katherine Steel, Assistant Director, Corporate Resources	KEY DECISION REF NO. CAB103

**JOINT CAPITAL, INVESTMENT AND TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES
2019/20**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report presents the Joint Capital, Investment and Treasury Management Strategies for the financial year 2019/20.
- 1.2 These are in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Treasury Management Code, the CIPFA Prudential Code, which were both updated in 2017, and the 2018 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Investment Guidance, which introduced the requirement to prepare a Capital Strategy and an Investment Strategy. The Treasury Management Strategy remains largely unchanged.
- 1.3 The Prudential Indicators and Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement are linked to the Budget report that will be presented to this Cabinet and onto the Full Council meetings in February 2019.
- 1.4 The Codes of Practice recommend that these strategies are subject to scrutiny before being presented to Full Council, which falls within the remit of the Joint Audit and Standards Committee.

2. OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 2.1 This report fulfils the Councils legal obligations to have regard to the Code and MHCLG Guidance.
- 2.2 Individual strategies were considered but Joint Strategies have been prepared.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS TO BOTH COUNCILS

That the following be approved:

- 3.1 The Joint Capital Strategy for 2019/20, including the Prudential Indicators, as set out in Appendix A
- 3.2 The Joint Investment Strategy for 2019/20, as set out in Appendix B.
- 3.3 The Joint Treasury Management Strategy for 2019/20, including the Joint Annual Investment Strategy as set out in Appendix C.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 3.4 | The Joint Treasury Management Indicators as set out in Appendix D. |
| 3.5 | The Joint Treasury Management Policy Statement as set out in Appendix G. |
| 3.6 | The Joint Minimum Revenue Provision Statement as set out in Appendix H. |
| 3.7 | That the key factors and information relating to and affecting treasury management activities set out in Appendices E, F, and I be noted. |

REASON FOR DECISION

Local authorities are required to approve their Treasury Management Strategy (TMS), their Capital Strategy (including an overview of the TMS) and their Investment Strategy annually before the start of the financial year.

4. KEY INFORMATION

Introduction

- 4.1 The Joint Capital Strategy and the Joint Investment Strategy are new for 2019/20, as required by changes in CIPFA and MHCLG guidance. The Joint Treasury Management Strategy remains largely unchanged. This report now combines an overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing, treasury and other investment activity contribute to the provision of local public services along with an overview of how associated risk is managed and the implications for future financial sustainability.
- 4.2 The strategies set limits and indicators that embody the risk management approach that the Councils believe to be prudent. The strategies are set against the 2019/20 budget and the four-year outlook and the context of the UK economy and projected interest rates. The information included in Appendix A to H reflects the current plans for income, expenditure and investments of both councils.
- 4.3 One of the key changes to the Codes and Statutory Guidance is the definition of treasury management investments. This now includes non-financial assets that councils hold for financial return such as property portfolios, shares in council owned companies and loans, which are not managed as part of normal treasury management or under treasury management delegations. This is covered within the Joint Investment Strategy at Appendix B.

Strategic Context

- 4.4 In recent years the government policy frameworks have been reducing core funding for local government as part of its deficit reduction strategy. In response to this both Councils strategy over the medium term as set out in the 2019/20 budget reports is to become self-financing and to generate more funds than are required for core services, and to enable additional investment in the districts.
- 4.5 The three strategies within this report set out the Councils approach to capital spend, borrowing and investment in order to deliver this.

- 4.6 MHCLG and CIPFA are aware that most local authorities are taking a more commercial approach in order to bridge the gap they face as a result of diminishing funding from government. In response to this both bodies state that they do not seek to prescribe precisely how councils invest but they clearly have concerns that some councils are taking increasing commercial risks using borrowed money. As a result, this report provides a more extensive strategy so that more of the risks that the Codes and guidance highlight are apparent to Members.

Statutory Background

- 4.7 This report is part of the Councils legal obligation under the Local Government Act 2003 to have regard to both the CIPFA Code and the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Guidance. The Councils must;
- ensure priority is given to security and portfolio liquidity, when investing treasury management funds;
 - ensure the security of the principal sums invested through robust due diligent procedures for all external investments;
 - have regard to CIPFA's Prudential Code when determining how much money they can afford to borrow;
 - ensure, within a clear framework, that the capital investment plans of local authorities are affordable, prudent and sustainable, and that treasury management decisions are taken in accordance with good professional practice;
 - monitor against the Prudential Code indicators each year, these are included in the Joint Capital Strategy in Appendix A; and;
 - set, revise, and, if there are material changes to the strategies and prudential indicators, present to Full Council for approval.

Purpose of the Strategies

Joint Capital Strategy Appendix A

- 4.8 The new Joint Capital Strategy (Appendix A), under the requirements of the new Codes, gives a high-level overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing, and treasury management activities contribute to the provision of local public services along with an overview of how associated risk is managed and the implications for future financial sustainability.
- 4.9 In terms of investment, the Councils invest their money for three broad purposes:
- because there is surplus cash as a result of its day-to-day activities, for example when income is received in advance of expenditure (known as treasury management investments),
 - to support local public services by lending to or buying shares in other organisations (service investments), and

- to earn investment income (known as commercial investments where this is the main purpose).

4.10 The Joint Capital Investment Strategy covers all three of the above points.

Joint Investment Strategy Appendix B

4.11 The new Joint Investment Strategy (Appendix B) as required by the new statutory guidance issued by the MHCLG, covers all three of the points in 4.9 above and shows the proportionality of investments, total investment exposure, and rate of return.

Joint Treasury Management Strategy Appendix C

4.12 The Joint Treasury Management Strategy (TMS) (Appendix C) covers the first point in 4.9 above and details of borrowing including authorised limits, economic and interest rate forecasts and treasury management indicators are also shown in Appendix D to G.

4.13 These three strategies together show the impact of the Councils capital programme and Joint Investment Strategy in terms of risk, prudent levels of borrowing, associated interest costs and the net financial returns to the Councils to support core services in the medium term.

5. LINKS TO JOINT STRATEGIC PLAN

5.1 Ensuring that the Council makes best use of its resources is what underpins the ability to achieve the priorities set out in the Joint Strategic Plan. Specific links are to financially sustainable Councils, managing our corporate assets effectively, and property investment to generate income.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 As outlined in this report and appendices.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The legal status of the Treasury Management Code derives in England from regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 (the 2003 Act).

7.2 The Capital Finance and Accounting Regulations 2003 – SI 2003/3146, Regulation 24, explicitly require authorities to “have regard” to the Treasury Management Code.

7.3 Authorities are required by regulation to have regard to the Prudential Code when carrying out their duties under Part 1 of the 2003 Act.

7.4 The latest statutory guidance on local government investments was issued under section 15(1)(a) of the 2003 Act and effective for financial years commencing on or after 1 April 2018. Under that section local authorities are required to “have regard” to “such guidance as the Secretary of State may issue”.

8. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 8.1 This report is most closely linked with the Councils Significant Risk No. 5d – We may be unable to respond in a timely and effective way to financial demands and also Corporate Risk No. SE05 – if the Finance Strategy is not in place with a balanced position over the medium term the Councils will not be able to deliver the core objectives and service delivery may be at risk of not being delivered. The report also links to assets and investments section 4 of the Significant Risk register. Other key risks are set out below:

Risk Description	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation Measures
If the councils lose the investments this will impact on their ability to deliver services.	Highly Unlikely (1)	Bad (3)	Strict lending criteria for high credit rated institutions.
If the councils achieve a poor return on investments, there will be fewer resources available to deliver services.	Unlikely (2)	Noticeable (2)	Focus is on security and liquidity, and careful cash flow management in accordance with the Joint TM Strategy is undertaken throughout the year.
If the councils have liquidity problems, then they will be unable to meet their short-term liabilities.	Unlikely (2)	Noticeable (2)	As above.
If the councils incur higher than expected borrowing costs, there will be fewer resources available to deliver services.	Unlikely (2)	Noticeable (2)	Benchmark is to borrow from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB), whose rates are very low and can be on a fixed or variable basis. Research lowest rates available within borrowing boundaries and use other sources of funding and internal surplus funds temporarily.

9. CONSULTATIONS

- 9.1 Regular meetings have taken place with the Councils' Treasury advisors, Arlingclose, who also provide important updates on treasury management issues as they arise.

10. EQUALITY ANALYSIS

- 10.1 There are no equality and diversity implications, as the contents and recommendations of this report do not impact on those with protected characteristics.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

11.1 There are no environmental implications related to this report.

APPENDICES

Title	Location
(a) Joint Capital Strategy 2019/20	Attached
(b) Joint Investment Strategy 2019/20	Attached
(c) Joint Treasury Management Strategy 2019/20	Attached
(d) Treasury Management Indicators	Attached
(e) Economic Outlook and Interest Rate Forecast	Attached
(f) Existing Borrowing and Investments	Attached
(g) Treasury Management Policy Statement	Attached
(h) Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement	Attached
(i) Credit Ratings Criteria	Attached
(j) Glossary of Terms	Attached

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

2017 CIPFA Treasury Management in the Public Services

2017 The Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities

2018 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Investment Guidance

JOINT CAPITAL STRATEGY 2019/20**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This Joint Capital Strategy is a new report for 2019/20, giving a high-level overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contribute to the provision of local public services along with an overview of how associated risk is managed and the implications for future financial sustainability. It has been written in an accessible style to enhance members' understanding of these often-technical areas.
- 1.2 The strategy demonstrates that the Councils take capital expenditure and investment decisions in line with service objectives and properly take account of stewardship, value for money, prudence, sustainability and affordability.

2. Capital Expenditure and Financing

- 2.1 Capital expenditure is where the Councils spend money on assets, such as property or vehicles, that will be used for more than one year. In local government this includes spending on assets owned by other bodies, and loans and grants to other bodies enabling them to buy or enhance assets.
- 2.2 The Councils have some limited discretion on what counts as capital expenditure; for example, individual assets costing below £10k are not capitalised and are charged to revenue in the year.
- 2.3 Table 1 below shows the actual spend for 2017/18, the forecast for 2018/19 and the budget from 2019/20 to 2022/23, for the General Fund and the HRA as per the 2019/20 budget report.

Table 1: Prudential Indicator: Estimated Capital Expenditure

Capital Expenditure						
Babergh District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
General Fund	1.36	2.69	9.04	1.77	1.29	3.30
Capital Investments	12.53	13.77	19.58	17.10	0.00	0.00
Total General Fund	13.89	16.46	28.62	18.87	1.29	3.30
Council Housing (HRA)	8.53	13.86	23.26	14.94	10.06	11.04
Total Capital Expenditure	22.42	30.32	51.88	33.81	11.34	14.33

Capital Expenditure						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
General Fund	1.98	3.46	6.81	3.37	1.53	3.42
Capital Investments	12.85	33.42	24.20	15.74	1.02	0.00
Total General Fund	14.83	36.88	31.01	19.10	2.55	3.42
Council Housing (HRA)	6.92	11.65	12.26	18.20	9.85	9.70
Total Capital Expenditure	21.75	48.53	43.27	37.30	12.40	13.12

General Fund Capital Expenditure

- 2.4 The main General Fund projects included in the Capital Programme for Babergh over the period 2019/20 to 2022/23 are, Kingfisher Leisure Centre Refurbishment (£2.5m), Hadleigh Pool and Leisure Centre Refurbishment (£2.4m), Babergh Regeneration Investment Fund (£3m), Housing grants (£2.4m), and Replacement Vehicles (£2.9m).
- 2.5 The main General Fund projects included in the Capital Programme for Mid Suffolk over the period 2019/20 to 2022/23 are Mid Suffolk Regeneration Investment Fund (£3m), replacement vehicles (£2.9m), Housing grants (£2.3m), leisure contracts (£1.3m) and Various Public Access schemes (£2m).

Capital Investments Capital Expenditure

- 2.6 There are two types of Capital investment. They are made:
- to support local public services by lending to or buying shares in other organisations (service investments), and
 - to earn investment income (known as commercial investments where this is the main purpose).

These will relate to non-financial assets that the councils hold primarily or partially to generate a rate of return and will contribute towards service delivery objectives.

- 2.7 Details of the Councils Capital investments can be found in section 3 and 4 of the Joint Investment Strategy in Appendix B.

The Housing Revenue Account Capital Expenditure

- 2.8 The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) is a ring-fenced account which ensures that council housing does not subsidise, or is itself subsidised, by other local services. HRA capital expenditure is therefore recorded separately and includes purchasing houses from the private sector to increase the housing stock as well as new build schemes over the forecast period.

Governance - General Fund Capital Expenditure:

- 2.9 Proposed capital projects are appraised by the Senior Leadership Team based on a comparison of service priorities against financing (even if the project is fully financed from external funds) before being included in the Councils capital programmes. The final capital programmes are then presented to Cabinet in January and onto Full Council in February each year.
- 2.10 For full details of the Councils capital programmes, these are included initially in the Budget report that will be presented to Cabinet in January 2019, and then this Cabinet and onto the Full Council meetings in February 2019 following review by Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Capital Financing

- 2.11 All capital expenditure must be financed, either from external sources (government grants and other contributions), the Councils own resources (revenue, reserves and capital receipts) or debt (borrowing and leasing). The planned financing of the above expenditure is as follows:

Table 2: Capital financing

Capital Financing - General Fund						
Babergh District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Capital Receipts	0.12	0.00	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00
Revenue Contributions	0.00	0.83	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.00
Revenue Reserves	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grants	0.33	0.40	0.56	0.41	0.41	0.41
External Contributions	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Borrowing	13.39	15.18	27.04	18.46	0.88	2.89
Total GF Capital Financing	13.89	16.46	28.62	18.87	1.29	3.30

Capital Financing - HRA						
Babergh District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Capital Receipts	0.78	1.22	6.99	3.15	2.44	1.95
Revenue Contributions	4.30	3.92	3.92	2.70	3.95	4.28
Revenue Reserves	3.23	8.72	3.31	3.45	3.31	3.56
Grants	0.13	0.00	2.70	0.34	0.35	0.00
External Contributions	0.09	0.00	1.12	0.00	0.00	0.00
Borrowing	0.00	0.00	5.22	5.32	0.00	1.25
Total HRA Capital Financing	8.53	13.86	23.26	14.94	10.06	11.04
Total ALL Capital Financing	22.42	30.32	51.88	33.81	11.34	14.33

Capital Financing - General Fund						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Capital Receipts	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Revenue Reserves	0.02	3.33	0.95	0.73	0.99	0.00
Grants	0.44	0.77	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38
External Contributions	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Borrowing	14.23	32.78	29.68	18.00	1.18	3.05
Total GF Capital Financing	14.83	36.88	31.01	19.10	2.55	3.42

Capital Financing - HRA						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Capital Receipts	1.06	3.44	1.72	5.25	4.41	5.13
Revenue Contributions	2.19	3.26	2.83	3.60	3.82	3.17
Revenue Reserves	3.44	3.40	3.71	3.71	0.72	1.39
Grants	0.22	0.00	0.33	1.83	0.90	0.00
External Contributions	0.00	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Borrowing	0.00	1.32	3.67	3.81	0.00	0.00
Total HRA Capital Financing	6.92	11.65	12.26	18.20	9.85	9.70
Total ALL Capital Financing	21.75	48.53	43.27	37.30	12.40	13.12

Repayment of Debt

- 2.12 Debt is only a temporary source of finance, since loans must be repaid, usually from revenue, which is known as minimum revenue provision (MRP).
- 2.13 Alternatively, proceeds from selling capital assets or principal repayment of loans (known as capital receipts) may be used to repay debt finance. Planned MRP, repayment of borrowing and use of capital receipts are shown in Table 3 as follows:

Table 3: Repayment of debt

Repayment of Debt Finance						
Babergh District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Capital Receipts (Loan Repayments)	0.00	0.08	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.24
Repayment of Borrowing	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.40	0.15	0.00
Minimum Revenue Provision	0.83	0.93	1.05	1.22	1.34	1.57
Total Repayment of Debt Finance	1.33	1.51	1.68	1.82	1.72	1.82

Repayment of Debt Finance						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Capital Receipts (Loan Repayments)	0.00	0.08	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.24
Minimum Revenue Provision	0.66	0.84	1.04	1.35	1.62	1.63
Total Repayment of Debt Finance	0.66	0.93	1.17	1.54	1.85	1.87

- 2.14 The Councils full minimum revenue provision statement is shown in Appendix H.

Capital Financing Requirement

- 2.15 The underlying need to borrow for capital purposes is measured by the capital financing requirement (CFR). The CFR, together with usable reserves, is one of the core drivers of both Councils treasury management activities.
- 2.16 The cumulative outstanding amount of debt finance for both Councils is measured by the CFR. This increases with new debt-financed (borrowing) capital expenditure and reduces with MRP and capital receipts used to repay debt.
- 2.17 Babergh's CFR is expected to increase by £30.71m and Mid Suffolk's by £32.32m during 2019/20. Based on the above figures for expenditure (Table 1) and financing (Table 2), the Councils estimate that their CFR will be as shown in Table 4 that follows:

Table 4: Prudential Indicator: Estimates of Capital Financing Requirement

Cumulative Capital Financing Requirement (CFR)						
Babergh District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
General Fund	18.66	19.64	26.05	26.19	25.73	27.04
Capital Investments	12.51	25.77	45.36	62.45	62.45	62.45
Total General Fund	31.17	45.42	71.41	88.64	88.18	89.49
Council Housing (HRA)	86.85	86.35	91.07	95.98	95.83	97.09
Total CFR	118.02	131.76	162.47	184.63	184.01	186.58

Cumulative Capital Financing Requirement (CFR)						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
General Fund	23.15	24.24	29.64	33.79	30.83	32.21
Capital Investments	12.67	43.51	66.77	79.27	81.78	81.82
Total General Fund	35.82	67.75	96.40	113.05	112.61	114.03
Council Housing (HRA)	86.76	88.08	91.75	95.56	95.56	95.56
Total CFR	122.58	155.83	188.15	208.62	208.17	209.59

Asset management:

2.18 The Councils emerging Joint Assets and Investment Strategy is available here:

https://baberghmidsuffolk.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s3181/C-98-16%2021116-CIF_Committee_Report_09Nov2016.Final.pdf

Asset disposals:

2.19 When a capital asset is no longer needed, it may be sold so that the proceeds, known as capital receipts, can be spent on new assets or to repay debt. Repayments of capital grants, loans and investments also generate capital receipts. The expected profile of capital receipts is shown in Table 5 that follows.

Capital Receipts:

2.20 Capital Receipts are used to finance capital expenditure either in the year the asset is sold or put into a capital reserve and used for later capital expenditure or used to repay debt. Table 5 that follows shows the year in which the receipts will be used.

Table 5: Capital receipts used

Capital Receipts						
Babergh District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
General Fund	0.12	0.00	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00
General Fund Capital Loan Repayments	0.00	0.08	0.13	0.19	0.24	0.24
Council Housing (HRA) 1-4-1 Receipts	0.73	1.22	1.68	1.30	1.30	1.56
Council Housing (HRA) Other	0.05	0.00	5.31	1.85	1.13	0.39
Total Capital Receipts	0.89	1.30	7.81	3.34	2.68	2.19

Capital Receipts						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
General Fund	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
General Fund Capital Loan Repayments	0.00	0.08	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.24
Council Housing (HRA) 1-4-1 Receipts	1.06	1.59	0.97	1.93	0.29	1.69
Council Housing (HRA) Other	0.00	1.85	0.75	3.32	4.12	3.45
Total Capital Receipts	1.13	3.52	1.86	5.44	4.64	5.38

3. The Prudential Code

- 3.1 The framework established by the Prudential Code should support local strategic planning, local asset management planning and proper option appraisal.
- 3.2 The objectives of the Prudential Code are to ensure, within a clear framework, that the capital investment plans of local authorities are affordable, prudent and sustainable, and that treasury management decisions are taken in accordance with good professional practice and in full understanding of the risks involved and how these risks will be managed to levels that are acceptable to the Councils.
- 3.3 The Prudential Code requires both Councils to look at capital expenditure and investment plans in the light of overall organisational strategy and resources and ensure that decisions are being made with sufficient regard to the long run financing implications and potential risks to the Councils. Effective financial planning, option appraisal, risk management and governance processes are essential in achieving a prudential approach to capital expenditure, investment and debt.
- 3.4 The Prudential Indicators included in the Joint Capital Strategy, (Appendix A Tables 1, 4, 6, 8 and 9) illustrate the affordability and impact of capital expenditure decisions and set out both Councils overall capital and treasury framework.
- 3.5 Effective management and decisions on funding ensure both Councils comply with the provisions of Section 32 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to set a balanced budget. Using borrowing powers to undertake investment in line with the Joint Strategic Plan priority outcomes and generate a rate of return to produce additional income in order to address the funding pressures that both Councils face over the next 4 years.

4. Treasury Management

- 4.1 Treasury management is concerned with keeping sufficient but not excessive cash available to meet the Councils spending needs, while managing the risks involved. Surplus cash is invested until required, while a shortage of cash will be met by borrowing, to avoid excessive credit balances or overdrafts in the bank current account. The Council is typically cash rich in the short-term as revenue income is received before it is spent, but cash poor in the long-term as capital expenditure is incurred before being financed. The revenue cash surpluses are offset against capital cash shortfalls to reduce overall borrowing. Appendix F shows the current position.

4.2 As at 30 November 2018;

- Babergh has £95.047m borrowing at an average interest rate of 2.79% and £14.723m of treasury investments at an average rate of 4.09%.
- Mid Suffolk has £115.937m borrowing at an average interest rate of 2.99% and £12.759m treasury investments at an average interest rate of 3.68%.

Borrowing strategy:

- 4.3 The Councils' main objective when borrowing is to achieve a low cost of finance while retaining flexibility if plans should change in the future. These objectives are often conflicting, and the Councils therefore seek to strike a balance between cheap short-term loans (currently available at around 0.80%) and long-term fixed rate loans where the future cost is known but higher (currently 2.5% to 3.0%).
- 4.4 The forecast movement in the CFR in coming years is one of the Prudential Indicators. The movement in actual external debt and usable reserves combine to identify the Councils' borrowing requirement and potential treasury management investment strategy in the current and future years.
- 4.5 Projected levels of the Councils' total outstanding debt (borrowing) are shown in Table 6 that follows, compared with the capital financing requirement (in paragraph 2.18, Table 4 above).

Table 6: Prudential Indicator: Gross Debt and Capital Financing Requirement

Gross Debt and Capital Financing Requirement						
Babergh District Council	31.3.2018 Actual £m	31.3.2019 Forecast £m	31.3.2020 Budget £m	31.3.2021 Budget £m	31.3.2022 Budget £m	31.3.2023 Budget £m
Outstanding Borrowing (Debt)	(98.30)	(113.88)	(147.68)	(169.70)	(166.92)	(167.19)
Capital Financing Requirement	118.02	131.76	162.47	184.63	184.01	186.58
Headroom	19.72	17.88	14.79	14.93	17.10	19.39

Gross Debt and Capital Financing Requirement						
Mid Suffolk District Council	31.3.2018 Actual £m	31.3.2019 Forecast £m	31.3.2020 Budget £m	31.3.2021 Budget £m	31.3.2022 Budget £m	31.3.2023 Budget £m
Outstanding Borrowing (Debt)	(103.09)	(133.83)	(166.12)	(187.58)	(187.72)	(186.36)
Capital Financing Requirement	122.58	155.83	188.15	208.62	208.17	209.59
Headroom	19.49	22.00	22.03	21.04	20.45	23.23

- 4.6 Statutory guidance says that debt should remain below the capital financing requirement, except in the short-term. As can be seen from Table 6 above, both Councils expect to comply with this in the medium-term.

Liability benchmark:

- 4.7 To compare the Councils' actual borrowing against an alternative strategy, a liability benchmark has been calculated showing the lowest risk level of borrowing (see Appendix C Table 2 for detailed calculation). This looks at the level of the CFR which could be reduced by use of reserves, working capital and investments. It assumes that cash and investment balances are kept to a minimum level of £12m Treasury Investments for each Council at each year-end. This benchmark is currently £119.19m for Babergh and £144m for Mid Suffolk for 2018/19 and is forecast to increase to £180.12m and £199.63m respectively over the next three years.

4.8 **Table 7: Borrowing and the Liability Benchmark**

Borrowing and Liability Benchmark						
Babergh District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Outstanding Borrowing (Debt)	(98.30)	(113.88)	(147.68)	(169.70)	(166.92)	(167.19)
Liability Benchmark	99.59	119.45	156.14	176.66	174.35	180.36
	1.29	5.57	8.46	6.97	7.43	13.17

Borrowing and Liability Benchmark						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Outstanding Borrowing (Debt)	(103.09)	(133.83)	(166.12)	(187.58)	(187.72)	(186.36)
Liability Benchmark	104.62	144.00	177.21	199.55	196.25	197.83
	1.54	10.17	11.08	11.97	8.53	11.46

The detailed calculation of the Liability Benchmark is shown in Appendix C Table 2.

- 4.9 Table 7 shows that the Councils expect to remain borrowed below their liability benchmark. This is due to the Councils' ability to internally borrow, as borrowing does not link directly to capital spend.

Affordable borrowing limit:

- 4.10 The Councils' are legally obliged to set an affordable borrowing limit (also termed the authorised limit for external debt) each year and to keep it under review. The Councils have set a limit of £15m above the operational boundary for each year. In line with statutory guidance, a lower "operational boundary" is also set as a warning level should debt approach this limit. This equals the Councils' CFR.
- 4.11 Both Councils outstanding debt over the medium term are below the liability benchmark, operational boundary and authorised limits.

Table 8: Prudential Indicators: Authorised limit and operational boundary for external debt

Operational Boundary for External Debt	2018/19 Limit £m	2019/20 Limit £m	2020/21 Limit £m	2021/22 Limit £m	2022/23 Limit £m
Babergh District Council	133.00	164.00	186.00	185.00	188.00
Mid Suffolk District Council	156.00	189.00	209.00	209.00	210.00

Authorised Limit for External Debt	2018/19 Limit £m	2019/20 Limit £m	2020/21 Limit £m	2021/22 Limit £m	2022/23 Limit £m
Babergh District Council	148.00	179.00	201.00	200.00	203.00
Mid Suffolk District Council	171.00	204.00	224.00	224.00	225.00
% Proportion of Debt to Authorised Limit	%	%	%	%	%
Babergh District Council	66.42	63.62	73.47	84.85	82.22
Mid Suffolk District Council	60.29	68.55	76.84	86.42	86.10

- 4.12 Further details on borrowing are shown in Appendix C section 4 of the Joint Treasury Management Strategy.

Joint Treasury Investment Strategy:

- 4.13 Treasury investments arise from receiving cash before it is paid out again. The Councils hold a number of long-term investments as a result of this, as set out in paragraph 5.5, Table 3 of the Joint Treasury Management Strategy in Appendix C. The Councils planned spend on the capital programme has an impact on the amount of surplus cash available for treasury investments and, as explained in paragraph 4.4 above, this results in the Councils need to borrow.
- 4.14 Investments made for service reasons or for pure financial gain are not generally considered to be part of treasury management. These are explained further in the Joint Investment Strategy in Appendix B.

5. Investments for Service Purposes

- 5.1 Service investments are where the councils can support the provision of local public services by lending to or buying shares in other organisations.
- 5.2 The Councils do not have, nor currently have any plans to make, any investments in organisations to assist in the provision of local public services over the medium-term.

6. Liabilities

- 6.1 In addition to debt of £113.88m for Babergh and £139.83m for Mid Suffolk, as detailed in Table 6 above for 2018/19, the Councils are committed to making future payments to cover their pension fund deficits. At 31 March 2018 Babergh's was valued at £0.493m and Mid Suffolk's was £0.771m.

Governance – Liabilities:

- 6.2 Additional items are reported to Cabinet as part of the monitoring process.

7. Revenue Budget Implications

- 7.1 Although capital expenditure is not charged directly to the revenue budget, interest payable on loans and MRP are charged to revenue, offset by any investment income receivable. The net annual charge is known as financing costs; this is compared to the net revenue stream i.e. the amount funded from Council Tax, Business Rates and general government grants for the General Fund and housing rents for the HRA.

- 7.2 For Babergh the maximum return is 4.76% in 2019/20 and for Mid Suffolk is 7.83% in 2018/19 for the General Fund. For the HRA the levels are higher due to the link to the debt associated with the Councils housing stock.

8. Table 9: Prudential Indicator: Proportion of financing costs to net revenue stream

Proportion of Net Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream					
Babergh District Council	2018/19 Forecast	2019/20 Budget	2020/21 Budget	2021/22 Budget	2022/23 Budget
General Fund -					
Net Financing costs (£m)	(0.25)	(0.58)	(0.41)	(0.18)	(0.27)
Proportion of net revenue stream %	-2.33%	-4.76%	-3.33%	-1.45%	-2.06%
Council Housing (HRA) -					
Net Financing costs (£m)	2.83	3.11	3.43	3.55	3.55
Proportion of net revenue stream %	18.00%	19.24%	20.42%	20.17%	19.45%

Proportion of Net Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream					
Mid Suffolk District Council	2018/19 Forecast	2019/20 Budget	2020/21 Budget	2021/22 Budget	2022/23 Budget
General Fund -					
Net Financing costs (£m)	(0.90)	(0.77)	(0.54)	(0.06)	(0.07)
Proportion of net revenue stream %	-7.83%	-5.75%	-3.81%	-0.38%	-0.50%
Council Housing (HRA) -					
Net Financing costs (£m)	2.74	2.80	2.87	2.93	2.98
Proportion of net revenue stream %	19.59%	19.93%	20.22%	19.80%	19.10%

- 8.1 In addition to capital receipts, grants and borrowing the housing capital programme is partly financed by income received from housing rents. Table 10 that follows, shows these contributions and associated costs as an equivalent average weekly rent.

8.2 Table 10: Impact of Capital Decisions on HRA Rents

Impact of Capital Investment Decisions on Rents					
Increase in average weekly rents	2018/19 Forecast £	2019/20 Budget £	2020/21 Budget £	2021/22 Budget £	2022/23 Budget £
Babergh District Council	22.19	23.27	17.52	24.66	26.90
Mid Suffolk District Council	19.62	17.90	23.24	24.33	20.32

- 8.3 The setting of rent levels has been determined separately through the 30-year business model and any surplus or deficit on the HRA is transferred to or from Reserves.
- 8.4 Further details of the revenue implications of capital expenditure are included in the Budget Report that will be presented to this Cabinet and then onto the Full Council meetings in February 2019.

9. Sustainability

- 9.1 Due to the very long-term nature of capital expenditure and financing, the revenue budget implications of expenditure incurred in the next few years will extend for up to 50 years into the future. The Assistant Director – Corporate Resources is satisfied that the proposed capital programme is prudent, affordable and sustainable over the medium term. This is due to the fact that debt remains below the CFR, (see Table 6), below the liability benchmark (see Table 7) , and below the operational boundary and authorised limits (see Table 8), as well as an acceptable low level of financing costs proportionate to the net revenue stream (Table 9).

10. Knowledge and Skills

- 10.1 The Councils employ professionally qualified and experienced staff in senior positions with responsibility for making capital expenditure, borrowing and investment decisions. For example, the Assistant Director - Corporate Resources is a CIPFA qualified accountant with 28 years' experience and the Corporate Manager – Financial Services with 18 years' experience. The Council employs an Assistant Director – Assets and Investments, who is a qualified chartered surveyor (MRICS) of 20 years' experience in both the private and public sector. The Council pays for staff to study towards relevant professional qualifications in finance such as the ICAEW and AAT.
- 10.2 Where Council staff do not have the knowledge and skills required, use is made of external advisers and consultants that are specialists in their field. The Council currently employs Arlingclose Limited as treasury management advisers.

Other advisers include Jones Lang Lasalle (JLL) as property consultants, Carter Jonas for development appraisal and Browne Jacobson for legal support. For the development of the council offices Purcell Architects, Lawson Planning Partnership, Hoggarth Cooke and Morley Riches and Ablewhite were appointed. This approach is more cost effective than employing such staff directly and ensures that the Councils have access to knowledge and skills commensurate with its risk appetite.

- 10.3 The Councils have a Learning and Development programme for staff which includes access to internal and externally provided training including attaining full professional qualifications.

JOINT INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2019/20

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Councils invest their money for three broad purposes:
- because they have surplus cash as a result of their day-to-day activities, for example when income is received in advance of expenditure (known as treasury management investments),
 - to support local public services by lending to or buying shares in other organisations (service investments), and
 - to earn investment income (known as commercial investments where this is the main or partial purpose).
- 1.2 Neither Council has invested in third party or related organisations which provide public services (known as service investments).
- 1.3 This Joint Investment Strategy is a new report for 2019/20, meeting the requirements of statutory guidance issued by the government in January 2018, and focuses on the commercial investments which are or will be disclosed in the Councils annual accounts. The MHCLG defines property to be an investment (commercial) if it is held primarily or partially to generate a profit.
- 1.4 For each type of investment, the Councils are required to show the contribution the investments make to the Councils objectives.

2. Treasury Management Investments

- 2.1 The Councils typically receive their income in cash (e.g. from taxes and grants) before they pay for their expenditure in cash (e.g. through payroll and invoices). The Councils also hold reserves for future expenditure (and collect local taxes on behalf of other local authorities and central government). These activities, plus the timing of borrowing decisions, lead to a cash surplus which is invested in accordance with guidance from the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA).
- 2.2 For details of the Councils treasury management investments, see section 5 of the Joint Treasury Management Strategy in Appendix C.

Contribution:

- 2.3 The contribution that these investments make to the objectives of both Councils is to support effective treasury management activities.

3. Commercial Investments: Property

- 3.1 Commercial Investments in property can take the form of using and developing council owned assets, the definition does not include the redevelopment for council housing through the HRA.

Contribution:

- 3.2 The Councils invest in commercial and residential property within their Districts, with the intention of generating a profit that will be spent on local public services, regeneration and development.
- 3.3 The Councils emerging Joint Assets and Investment Strategy is available here
https://baberghmidsuffolk.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s3181/C-98-16%20221116-CIF_Committee_Report_09Nov2016.Final.pdf
- 3.4 The current and future property investments for council owned assets are described below.

Babergh

- **Borehamgate, Sudbury**

Babergh purchased Borehamgate shopping precinct on 1 August 2016 for £3.5m as part of a plan to redevelop the Hamilton Road quarter of Sudbury. A prospectus seeking partners was published in September 2018, setting out the potential development of up to 40 dwellings, 44 parking spaces, 2,300m² of food & beverage/retail and 2,200m² of office or cinema use. This prospective development is at an early stage, and no further investment has been included in the capital programme.

- **Belle Vue, Sudbury**

On 25 September 2018, Babergh approved a £6.5m investment to develop a restaurant and hotel on the former swimming pool site in Belle Vue, Sudbury (and then lease the property to a national hotel operator). Although partially a commercial opportunity, the regeneration of the Belle Vue site is considered essential to support the wider leisure, tourism and retail ambitions of Sudbury.

- **Former Council Offices in Hadleigh**

- In September 2016 both Councils decided to relocate from their existing Council offices in Hadleigh and Needham Market to Endeavour House in Ipswich and subsequently relocated in November 2017. In December 2018, the Councils approved investments in market led housing schemes for the former office sites to realise value from these now surplus assets. SPVs will be set up for the developments and the Councils will work in partnership with an experienced developer.
- Babergh has approved the conversion of the former Corks Lane Council office in Hadleigh into 31 new homes and also the construction of an additional 26 new homes on the site, all for market sale. A peak cash flow funding requirement of £3.77m is included in the capital programme, based on the assumption that Babergh will provide 100% of the development finance. The scheme is scheduled to commence before the end of 2018/19.

Mid Suffolk

- **Former Aldi site, Stowmarket**

Mid Suffolk bought the former Aldi site in Gipping Way, Stowmarket for £1.4m on 7 January 2019. A licence to operate the car park was entered into before completion enabling the development and use of this site for public pay and display car parking from December 2018. This will promote an economic use for the building which will be beneficial for the economy of Stowmarket and provide a rental income to the Council.

- **Former NatWest Bank premises, Stowmarket**

The former NatWest Bank in the Market Place in Stowmarket was purchased on 13 March 2018 for £351k. External redecoration works were completed before Christmas 2018. Terms have been agreed with a partner to deliver a temporary offer at the property from the New Year 2019 and into early Spring.

- **Former Stowmarket Middle School**

Mid Suffolk purchased Stowmarket Middle School on 27 February 2017 for £888k. The capital programme includes a proposal for a development scheme for £7.6m to provide new houses on the site, approximately 65% which will be for market sale (65% has been included as a capital investment) and the rest for council housing.

- **Former Council Offices in Needham Market**

- As stated above, both Councils decided to relocate their offices to Endeavour House in Ipswich and subsequently relocated in November 2017.
- Mid Suffolk has applied for planning permission for 93 new homes on the former Council office and car park sites, in Needham Market, including 83 for market sale, 7 for affordable rent and 3 for shared ownership. Later, the scheme will also include a retail area. A peak cash flow funding requirement of £2.67m (which is the Council's 50% share of the whole cost) is included in the capital programme, based on the assumption that the development partner will provide the other 50% of the finance. The scheme is not scheduled to commence until 2019/20 and the Council's 50% contribution is included in the capital expenditure shown in Table 1 that follows.

Table 1: Property held for investment purposes

Cumulative Expenditure on Property Investments						
Babergh District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Borehamgate, Sudbury	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Belle Vue, Sudbury	0.03	0.53	4.53	6.53	6.53	6.53
Council Offices, Hadleigh	0.18	0.77	1.35	3.95	3.95	3.95
Total	0.21	1.30	5.88	10.48	10.48	10.48

Cumulative Expenditure on Property Investments						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Council Offices, Needham Market	0.18	0.18	1.13	1.86	2.85	2.85
Former Aldi Premises, Stowmarket	0.00	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40
Former Natwest Premises, 11 Market Place, Stowmarket	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35
Stowmarket Middle School	0.00	0.00	2.25	4.76	4.79	4.79
Total	0.53	1.93	5.13	8.37	9.39	9.39

Security:

- 3.5 In accordance with government guidance, the Councils consider a property investment to be secure if its accounting valuation is at the same level or higher than its purchase cost including taxes and transaction costs at the time of anticipated disposal.
- 3.6 A fair value assessment of the Councils directly owned investment property portfolio has been made within the past twelve months, and the underlying assets provide security for capital investment. If during the preparation of the 2018/19 year end accounts and audit process the value of these properties materially below their purchase cost, then an updated investment strategy will be presented to Full Council detailing the impact of the loss on the security of investments and any revenue consequences arising there from.

Risk assessment:

- 3.7 As mentioned in section 8 of the main report this strategy has links to the Councils Significant Risk Register, specifically risk no. 5d and Corporate risk no. SE05 as well as section 4 – Assets and Investments.
- 3.8 The Councils assess the risk of loss before entering into and whilst holding every property investment.
- 3.9 The Councils also commission third parties to provide expert advice. These advisors are appointed on the basis of reputation, experience and price and their advice is scrutinised by the company board members and officers responsible for investment decisions.
- 3.10 Babergh purchased Borehamgate shopping precinct for £3.56m in 2016 as an investment property and the 31 March 2018 balance sheet reflects its fair value of £3.5m. This is as a result of fluctuations in the commercial property market. The retail units generate income from leases and are subject to pressures in the retail sector as a result of the general economic conditions. The Council has accepted the risks associated with this property whilst taking a longer-term view of its future as part of the regeneration and development of the Hamilton Road area in Sudbury.
- 3.11 Babergh's investment in a hotel and restaurant on the Council owned Belle Vue site is the outcome of an open tender process undertaken by Strutt & Parker on behalf of the Council. The preferred business model of the recommended bid is a 30-year lease of a building developed and owned by the Council. A development appraisal and financial viability analysis was undertaken for the Council by Carter Jonas, based on the proposed heads of terms.

Browne Jacobson are providing legal support and the Council's treasury advisors, Arlingclose, will be requested to recommend a borrowing strategy. The Council has accepted the risks associated with this development of the site.

3.12 Market sale housing development:

Purcell Architects, Lawson Planning Partnership, Hoggarth Cooke and Morley Riches & Ablewhite were appointed to support the Council with design, planning advice, feasibility and financial viability appraisals of the options for future use for the former Babergh and Mid Suffolk council office sites in Hadleigh and Needham Market.

3.13 Proposed housing schemes were approved in principle by each Council in July 2018 and three delivery options have subsequently been considered:

1. Council development of the sites,
2. Joint Venture development with a private partner, and
3. Joint Venture development with a public partner.

3.14 In addition, the immediate disposal of each site has been considered. Option 3 has been selected to enable the Councils to manage these schemes in a timely manner, control the quality of the housing, mitigate risk through securing an experienced socially wedded public sector partner and secure a commercial return.

3.15 Mid Suffolk bought the empty property, formerly occupied by Aldi, in Stowmarket, including the car park and introduced managed parking. The acquisition also aims to bring the site back into use after being vacant for over a year. Letting agents have been appointed to identify new occupiers for the building and discussions are on-going with a number of interested parties.

3.16 A marketing process has begun to identify a long-term tenant for the former Natwest Bank building.

Liquidity:

3.17 Property can be relatively difficult to sell quickly because of a lack of ready and willing investors or speculators to purchase the asset and convert to cash at short notice. However, all of these properties will be part of the Councils commercial or residential regeneration schemes.

4. Commercial Investments: Shares and Loans

4.1 The Councils invest through share ownership and giving loans to their wholly owned companies, special purpose vehicles or third parties (local organisations) as part of a strategy for generating a rate of return or improving the local economy.

Contribution:

CIFCO Ltd

4.2 The Councils invest indirectly in property, through two wholly owned holding companies, by a combination of shares (equity) and loans (debt), matching the funding requirements of the underlying investment and the returns required by the Councils. All debt financed investment complies with EU State Aid rules.

- 4.3 BDC (Suffolk Holdings) Limited, a wholly owned subsidiary of Babergh, and MSDC (Suffolk Holdings) Limited, a wholly owned subsidiary of Mid Suffolk, were both incorporated on 9 June 2017, and are commercial investment vehicles for each Council.
- 4.4 Each holding company owns 50% of the issued share capital of CIFCO Ltd which was incorporated on 12 June 2017 to invest in a portfolio of commercial property in primarily the Eastern region. Each Council's investment in these companies is split 10% share capital in their holding companies and 90% loan direct to CIFCO Ltd.
- 4.5 Each Council approved an initial investment of a total of £27.5m (£2.75m shares, £24.75m loans) and this is forecast to be fully invested by 31 March 2019. To date 9 properties have been acquired, and a further 3 acquisitions are planned.
- 4.6 Each Council plans to invest a further £25m (£2.5m shares, £22.5m loans) with £12.5m included in the 2019/20 and 2020/21 in each Council's capital programme.

Gateway 14 Ltd

- 4.7 MSDC (Suffolk Holdings) Limited also owns 100% of the issued share capital of Gateway 14 Ltd which was incorporated on the 1 November 2017 as an SPV to acquire Gateway 14, a 135-acre site located to the eastern fringe of Stowmarket and develop a business park. Mid Suffolk's investment in these companies is split 10% share capital in the holding company and 90% loan to Gateway 14 Ltd.
- 4.8 Mid Suffolk Council approved an initial investment of the Gateway 14 site which was acquired for £16.5m (£1.6m shares, £14.9m loans) on 13 August 2018. An additional £1m for working capital is forecast for 2018/19 and the 2019/20 capital programme includes a further £6m for development costs. This investment by the Council will accelerate the anticipated economic and financial benefits of the site.

Regal Theatre, Stowmarket

- 4.9 On 5 February 2018 Mid Suffolk Cabinet approved funding of £2.58m for a scheme to support the redevelopment of the Regal Theatre in Stowmarket and the regeneration of the town centre. It was in the form of a £1m loan and a £1.58m capital grant to Stowmarket Town Council, who owns the theatre.

Table 2 Total Investments in shares and loans

Cumulative Investments through Shares and Loans						
Babergh District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
CIFCO Ltd (1)	12.32	25.00	27.50	27.50	27.50	27.50
CIFCO Ltd (2)	0.00	0.00	12.50	25.00	25.00	25.00
Total	12.32	25.00	40.00	52.50	52.50	52.50
Investment in Shares	1.23	2.50	4.00	5.25	5.25	5.25
Investment through Loans	11.09	22.50	36.00	47.25	47.25	47.25
Total	12.32	25.00	40.00	52.50	52.50	52.50

Appendix B – Joint Investment Strategy

Cumulative Investments through Shares and Loans						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
CIFCO Ltd (1)	12.32	25.00	27.50	27.50	27.50	27.50
CIFCO Ltd (2)	0.00	0.00	12.50	25.00	25.00	25.00
Gateway 14 Ltd	0.00	16.51	22.51	22.51	22.51	22.51
Regal Theatre, Stowmarket	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Total	12.32	42.51	63.51	76.01	76.01	76.01
Investment in Shares	1.23	4.15	6.25	7.50	7.50	7.50
Investment through Loans	11.09	38.36	57.26	68.51	68.51	68.51
Total	12.32	42.51	63.51	76.01	76.01	76.01

Risk Assessment:

- 4.10 As mentioned in section 8 of the main report this strategy has links to the Councils Significant Risk Register, specifically risk no. 4a If CIFCO does not generate forecast investment returns and 4e Gateway 14 Ltd fails to bring forward the development of site.
- 4.11 CIFCO Ltd and Gateway 14 Ltd also maintain their own risk registers and the Corporate Manager for Internal Audit attends the regular Risk Management Panel meetings.
- 4.12 The Councils holding companies have appointed directors to the board of CIFCO Ltd and Gateway 14 Ltd that offer a Council shareholder perspective (elected member directors) and commercial property expertise (industry expert directors). It is anticipated that boards of any future investment SPVs, will have a similar membership.
- CIFCO Ltd
- 4.13 CIFCO Ltd's investment strategy targets medium to long term resilience based on;
- a strategy that balances the portfolio, so a significant number of assets are 'core' and liquid; and;
 - a strategy that balances other attributes such as geography, asset class and sector so that resistance to market stresses in any individual attribute can be mitigated.
- 4.14 Each property acquisition is approved by the CIFCO Ltd Board and reported to each holding company Board for approval before funds are released, and due diligence is done on the tenant as assets are acquired, including a Dun and Bradstreet credit check.
- 4.15 On a quarterly basis, CIFCO Ltd's fund managers Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL) provide a portfolio analysis report including market forecasts and any tenancy arrears, and the CIFCO Ltd Chair (an independent industry expert) reports on performance to simultaneous holding company board meetings and twice a year to Full Council.

- 4.16 As part of annual business planning, JLL provide a full market conditions assessment, based on the individual attributes of each asset class targeted by CIFCO Ltd, and the CIFCO Ltd Board consider any revisions to its investment strategy based on this assessment and the ongoing quarterly portfolio analysis reports.
- 4.17 With financial return being the main objective, the Councils accept higher risk on commercial investments than they do with treasury management investments. The potential risks for property held for income are voids and falls in rental values. The commercial properties acquired for income are bought as long-term holdings and are professionally managed. They would be sold individually if the long-term prognosis is to underachieve net return targets.

Gateway 14 Ltd

- 4.18 Mid Suffolk and its holding company delegated authority to the board to acquire the site and develop a detailed delivery model for this business park development. Savills were commissioned to carry out a red book valuation to confirm value before purchase, and model cash flows for the development. Grant Thornton & Devonshire Solicitors were appointed to provide tax and legal advice, and treasury advisors Arlingclose were commissioned to provide a financial evaluation of the project and advise on debt funding, based on the cashflow forecasts.
- 4.19 The board monitor and manage the progress of the project. In due course a delivery model will be proposed with revised financial costs and benefits for approval by the Council and its holding company.

Regal Theatre, Stowmarket

- 4.20 Due-diligence has been undertaken with Stowmarket Town Council to understand their financial position and ability to repay the loan over a 30-year period. The Section 151 Officer is satisfied that the Town Council has the ability to finance the loan.

Liquidity:

- 4.21 Loans are repaid often over a long time and consist of principal and interest in accordance with the loan agreements. The interest is a revenue receipt and is available for use immediately. The Councils have a charge on the properties acquired by CIFCO Ltd which gives the Councils security. With regard to the Regal Theatre to protect Mid Suffolk's interest, it is proposed that the Council acquires at least 50% ownership of the venue and site to be funded and /or registering a charge on the property.

5. Proportionality

- 5.1 Both Councils have some dependency on profit generating investment activity to achieve a balanced revenue budget. Table 3 shows the extent to which the Councils expenditure is dependent on achieving the expected net profit from investments over the medium-term.

Should the Councils fail to achieve the expected net profit, both Councils have contingency plans for continuing to provide these services by reducing overheads, continuing to make services more efficient and through digital transformation.

Table 3: Proportionality of Investments

Babergh	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Gross service expenditure	35.08	37.74	32.79	32.63	33.16	33.55
Investment income	0.70	1.31	2.25	2.81	3.05	3.33
Proportion	2.00%	3.48%	6.86%	8.60%	9.20%	9.92%

Mid Suffolk	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Gross service expenditure	33.63	35.49	32.38	32.35	32.82	33.21
Investment income	0.68	2.19	3.01	3.57	3.81	3.79
Proportion	2.01%	6.16%	9.30%	11.03%	11.61%	11.41%

6. Borrowing in Advance of Need

CIPFA Prudential Code

- 6.1 The 2017 Prudential Code states that “authorities must not borrow more than or in advance of their needs purely in order to profit from the investment of the extra sums borrowed”.
- 6.2 Currently there is no definition of ‘needs’ however, the underlying need to borrow is reflected in the CFR adjusted for long term liabilities (see Appendix A Table 4). Neither Council plans to borrow above its CFR which is in accordance with the Prudential Code.
- 6.3 Further CIPFA guidance on this is planned but has not yet been published.

MHCLG Guidance

- 6.4 Government guidance issued in October 2018 has extended the Prudential Code definition to include borrowing to finance the acquisition of non-financial as well as financial investments that the organisation holds primarily or partially to generate a profit. This includes all loans and property investments.
- 6.5 Both Councils’ have borrowed and plan to borrow to invest in their own properties and to give loans to CIFCO Ltd, Gateway 14 Ltd and other special purpose vehicles in order to make a profit to reinvest in Council services and achieve a balanced revenue budget. The Councils’ view of this activity is that it meets the service needs and is within their CFR as per the CIPFA definition.
- 6.6 The Councils’ policies in investing the money borrowed, including management of the risks, for example, of not achieving the desired profit or borrowing costs increasing are:

- When exercising the power to invest, the Councils' will act for a proper purpose and act in a reasonable manner, its fiduciary duty to obtain value for money and whether the investments are proportionate and properly balanced against the anticipated benefits as well as the wider interests of the Council's local Business Rate and Council Tax payers.
- To have regard to the regeneration and development strand of the Councils' Joint Asset and Investment Strategy when investing for profit, acknowledging that the Councils' have a key role to play in using their own assets and enabling/facilitating the use of private and other public sector assets to deliver housing and economic growth. To appoint independent industry expert directors to the Councils' investment and SPV company boards
- For the SPVs to prepare a business case for each purchase and report to the council on expected cost and benefits
- To appoint relevant expert advisors when assessing, entering and holding an investment.
- When investing in development projects, where possible and appropriate, to contract with an experienced development partner.
- To prioritise medium to long term resilience of investments, over short-term gain
- To fund and structure each investment to optimise risks & rewards, having regard to previous bullet point.

7. Knowledge and Skills

- 7.1 As per section 10 of the Joint Capital Strategy in Appendix A

8. Governance – Capital Investments

- 8.1 The Capital Programme is approved as part of the annual budget setting process approved by Cabinet and Full Council in February. Other investment decisions occurring outside of this process that exceed £150k qualify as a key decision as per part one of the Councils' constitution and is approved by Cabinet and Full Council.

9. Investment Indicators

- 9.1 The Councils' have set the following quantitative indicators to allow elected members and the public to assess the Councils' total risk exposure as a result of their investment decisions. These are shown in Tables 4,5 and 6.

Total risk exposure:

- 9.2 The first indicator shows the Councils' cumulative total exposure to potential investment losses.

Table 4: Total investment exposure

Babergh cumulative investment exposure	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Forecast £m	2020/21 Forecast £m	2021/22 Forecast £m	2022/23 Forecast £m
Treasury management investments	12.08	11.94	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
Capital Investments	12.53	26.30	45.88	62.98	62.98	62.98
Total Exposure	24.61	38.24	57.88	74.98	74.98	74.98

Mid Suffolk cumulative investment exposure	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Forecast £m	2020/21 Forecast £m	2021/22 Forecast £m	2022/23 Forecast £m
Treasury management investments	12.04	11.94	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
Capital Investments	12.85	46.27	70.47	86.21	87.23	87.23
Total Exposure	24.89	58.21	82.47	98.21	99.23	99.23

How investments are funded:

- 9.3 Government guidance is that these indicators should include how investments are funded. Since the Councils' do not normally associate particular assets with particular liabilities, this guidance is difficult to apply. However, the following investments could be described as being funded by borrowing.
- 9.4 For those investments funded by borrowing the exposure at the beginning of 2019/20 is forecast to be £26.3m for Babergh and £46.27m for Mid Suffolk as shown in Table 5 that follows.

Table 5: Investments funded by borrowings

Babergh Cumulative investments funded by borrowings	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Forecast £m	2020/21 Forecast £m	2021/22 Forecast £m	2022/23 Forecast £m
Capital Investments	12.00	26.30	45.88	62.98	62.98	62.98
Total Funded by borrowing	12.00	26.30	45.88	62.98	62.98	62.98

Mid Suffolk Cumulative investments funded by borrowings	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Forecast £m	2020/21 Forecast £m	2021/22 Forecast £m	2022/23 Forecast £m
Capital Investments	12.85	46.27	70.47	86.21	87.23	87.23
Total Funded by borrowing	12.85	46.27	70.47	86.21	87.23	87.23

Rate of return received:

- 9.5 This indicator shows the investment income received less the associated costs, including the cost of borrowing where appropriate, as a proportion of the sum initially invested. Note that due to the complex local government accounting framework, not all recorded gains and losses affect the revenue account in the year they are incurred.

Table 6: Investments net rate of return

Babergh Investments net rate of return	2017/18 Actual %	2018/19 Forecast %	2019/20 Forecast %	2020/21 Forecast %	2021/22 Forecast %	2022/23 Forecast %
Treasury Management Investments	3.52	3.41	4.06	3.91	3.90	3.83
CIFCO Ltd (1)	0.69	2.40	2.86	2.25	2.31	2.37
CIFCO Ltd (2)	0.00	0.00	1.74	2.42	2.10	2.17
All investments	2.10	2.90	2.88	2.86	2.77	2.79

Mid Suffolk Investments net rate of return	2017/18 Actual %	2018/19 Forecast %	2019/20 Forecast %	2020/21 Forecast %	2021/22 Forecast %	2022/23 Forecast %
Treasury Management Investments	3.74	3.75	3.83	3.68	3.66	3.60
CIFCO Ltd (1)	0.69	2.13	2.46	2.48	2.53	2.57
CIFCO Ltd (2)	0.00	0.00	1.74	2.42	2.10	2.17
Gateway 14 Ltd	0.00	1.93	3.18	2.14	1.65	1.65
All investments	2.22	2.60	2.80	2.68	2.49	2.50

JOINT TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2019/20

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Joint Treasury Management strategy contains the following;
- Borrowing Strategy (section 4)
 - Annual Investment Strategy (section 5)
 - Treasury Management Indicators (Appendix D)
 - Economic and Interest Rate Forecast (Appendix E)
 - Existing Investment and Debt Portfolio (Appendix F)
 - Treasury Management Policy Statement (Appendix G)
- 1.2 Treasury management is the management of the Councils cash flows, borrowing and investments, and the associated risks. Babergh and Mid Suffolk invest surplus funds and both Councils borrow to fund capital investment and manage cash flows. Both Councils are therefore exposed to financial risks including the loss of invested funds and the revenue effect of interest rate changes.
- 1.3 The successful identification, monitoring and control of financial risk are therefore central to the Councils prudent financial management.
- 1.4 The Councils will continue to:
- Make use of call accounts, if necessary
 - Use the strongest/lowest risk non-credit rated building societies
 - Use covered bonds (secured against assets) for longer term investments
 - Consider longer term investments in property or other funds
- 1.5 The Local Government Act 2003 requires the Councils to have regard to CIPFA's Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities 2017 (the Prudential Code) when determining how much money they can afford to borrow.
- 1.6 Treasury risk management at both Councils is conducted within the framework of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice 2017 Edition (the TM Code) which requires the Councils to approve a treasury management strategy before the start of each financial year. This report fulfils the Councils legal obligation under the Local Government Act 2003 to have regard to the CIPFA Code.
- 1.7 The MHCLG Investment Guidance 2018 no longer requires details of 'specified' or 'non-specified' treasury management investments. Instead, in paragraph 21 of the Guidance, it requires local authorities to prioritise Security, Liquidity and Yield in that order of importance.
- 1.8 The Joint Treasury Management Strategy for 2019/20 continues to focus primarily on the effective management and control of risk and striking a balance between the security, liquidity and yield of those investments. The Councils objective when investing money is to strike an appropriate balance between risk and return.
- 1.9 Details of investments held for service purposes or for commercial profit are included in the Joint Investment Strategy, which are shown in Appendix B.

2. External Context

- 2.1 A detailed economic and interest rate forecast provided by Arlingclose is attached at Appendix E.

3. Local Context

Interest rates on Investments and Borrowing

- 3.1 For the purpose of setting the budget, it has been assumed that new short-term investments will be made at an average rate of 0.75%, and that new long-term loans will be borrowed at an average rate of 3.00%.

Capital Financing Requirement

- 3.2 The underlying need to borrow for capital purposes is measured by the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR), while usable reserves and working capital are the underlying resources available for investment. The Councils current strategy is to maintain borrowing and investments below their underlying levels, sometimes known as internal borrowing.
- 3.3 As at the 30 November 2018, Babergh held £95.047m of borrowing and £14.723m of investments, Mid Suffolk held £115.937m of borrowing and £12.759m of investments. This is set out in further detail at Appendix F. Forecast changes in these sums are shown in the balance sheet analysis in Table 1 that follows.

Table 1: Capital Financing Requirement Summary and forecast

Cumulative Capital Financing Requirement						
Babergh	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
General Fund	18.66	19.64	26.05	26.19	25.73	27.04
Capital Investments	12.51	25.77	45.36	62.45	62.45	62.45
Council Housing (HRA)	86.85	86.35	91.07	95.98	95.83	97.09
Total CFR	118.02	131.76	162.47	184.63	184.01	186.58
Less: External Borrowing**	(98.30)	(113.88)	(112.86)	(111.93)	(110.13)	(109.51)
Internal (Over) Borrowing (Cumulative)	19.72	17.88	49.62	72.70	73.88	77.07
Less: Balances & Reserves -General Fund	(7.58)	(6.82)	(5.64)	(5.66)	(5.68)	(5.70)
Less: Balances & Reserves HRA	(19.50)	(14.00)	(9.26)	(10.87)	(12.55)	(9.08)
Less Working Capital Deficit	(3.43)	(3.43)	(3.43)	(3.43)	(3.43)	(3.43)
Net (Investments)/Borrowing Requirement	(10.79)	(6.37)	31.28	52.74	52.21	58.85

Cumulative Capital Financing Requirement						
Mid Suffolk	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
General Fund	23.15	24.24	29.64	33.79	30.83	32.21
Capital Investments	12.67	43.51	66.77	79.27	81.78	81.82
Council Housing (HRA)	86.76	88.08	91.75	95.56	95.56	95.56
Total CFR	122.58	155.83	188.15	208.62	208.17	209.59
Less: External Borrowing**	(103.09)	(139.83)	(138.49)	(137.12)	(135.88)	(134.77)
Internal (Over) Borrowing (Cumulative)	19.49	16.00	49.67	71.50	72.29	74.82
Less: Balances & Reserves -General Fund	(17.67)	(14.55)	(14.23)	(13.93)	(13.70)	(13.47)
Less: Balances & Reserves HRA	(13.07)	(9.97)	(9.46)	(7.89)	(10.98)	(11.04)
Add: Working Capital Surplus	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
Net (Investments)/Borrowing Requirement	(10.50)	(7.77)	26.72	50.43	48.36	51.05

** shows only loans to which the Councils are currently committed and excludes optional refinancing.

- 3.4 The Councils have an increasing CFR due to the capital programme, and investments will therefore be required to borrow up to £186.6m for Babergh and £209.6m for Mid Suffolk over the forecast period.
- 3.5 CIPFA's Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities recommends that the Councils total debt should be lower than their highest forecast CFR over the next three years. Table 1 above shows that the Councils expect to comply with this recommendation during 2019/20.

Liability benchmark:

- 3.6 To compare the Councils actual borrowing against an alternative strategy, a liability benchmark has been calculated showing the lowest risk level of borrowing. This assumes the same forecasts as Table 1 above, but that cash and investment balances are kept to a minimum level of £12m Treasury Investments for each Council at each year-end to maintain sufficient liquidity but minimise credit risk.

Table 2: Liability benchmark

Liability Benchmark						
Babergh	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
CFR	118.02	131.76	162.47	184.63	184.01	186.58
Less: Usable Reserves	(27.08)	(20.82)	(14.90)	(16.53)	(18.23)	(14.79)
Less Working Capital Deficit	(3.43)	(3.43)	(3.43)	(3.43)	(3.43)	(3.43)
Plus: Minimum Investments	12.08	11.94	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
Liability Benchmark	99.59	119.45	156.14	176.66	174.35	180.36

Liability Benchmark						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
CFR	122.58	155.83	188.15	208.62	208.17	209.59
Less: Usable Reserves	(30.74)	(24.52)	(23.69)	(21.81)	(24.67)	(24.51)
Add: Working Capital Surplus	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
Plus: Minimum Investments	12.04	11.94	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
Liability Benchmark	104.62	144.00	177.21	199.55	196.25	197.83

4. Borrowing Strategy

Overview

- 4.1 As at 30 November 2018 Babergh held loans of £95.047m and Mid Suffolk £115.937m. These have increased by £8.5m for Babergh and £27.7m for Mid Suffolk on the previous year, due to funding previous years' capital programmes.
- 4.2 The balance sheet forecast for borrowing in Table 1 above shows that Babergh expects to borrow up to £30.71m and Mid Suffolk expects to borrow up to £32.32m in 2019/20. The Councils may borrow to pre-fund future years' requirements, providing this does not exceed the authorised limit for borrowing of £179m for Babergh and £204m for Mid Suffolk, as shown in Appendix A Table 8.

Objectives

- 4.3 The Councils chief objective when borrowing money is to strike an appropriately low risk balance between securing low interest costs and achieving certainty of those costs over the period for which funds are required. The flexibility to renegotiate loans, should the Councils long-term plans change, is a secondary objective.

Strategy

- 4.4 Given the significant cuts to public expenditure and in particular to local government funding, the Councils borrowing strategy continues to address the key issue of affordability without compromising the longer-term stability of the debt portfolios. With short-term interest rates currently much lower than long-term rates, it is likely to be more cost effective in the short-term to either use internal resources, or to borrow short-term loans instead. This position will be monitored and evaluated on an ongoing basis to ensure both Councils achieve value for money.
- 4.5 By doing so, the Councils are able to reduce net borrowing costs (despite foregone investment income) and reduce overall treasury risk. The benefits of internal and short-term borrowing will be monitored regularly against the potential for incurring additional costs by deferring borrowing into future years when long-term borrowing rates are forecast to rise modestly. Arlingclose (the Councils treasury advisers) will assist the Councils with this 'cost of carry' and breakeven analysis.
- 4.6 Its output may determine whether the Councils borrow additional sums at long-term fixed rates in 2019/20 with a view to keeping future interest costs low, even if this causes additional cost in the short-term.
- 4.7 Alternatively, the Councils may arrange forward starting loans during 2019/20, where the interest rate is fixed in advance, but the cash is received in later years. This would enable certainty of cost to be achieved without suffering a cost of carry in the intervening period.
- 4.8 In addition, the Councils may borrow short-term loans to cover unplanned cash flow shortages.

Sources of borrowing

- 4.9 The approved sources of long-term and short-term borrowing are:
- Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) and any successor body
 - any institution approved for investments (see below)
 - any other bank or building society authorised to operate in the UK
 - any other UK public sector body
 - UK public and private sector pension funds (except Suffolk County Council Pension Fund)
 - capital market bond investors
 - UK Municipal Bonds Agency plc and other special purpose companies created to enable local authority bond issues

Municipal Bonds Agency

- 4.10 UK Municipal Bonds Agency plc was established in 2014 by the Local Government Association as an alternative to the PWLB. It plans to issue bonds on the capital markets and lend the proceeds to local authorities. This will be a more complicated source of finance than the PWLB for two reasons:
- borrowing authorities will be required to provide bond investors with a joint and several guarantee to refund their investment in the event that the agency is unable to for any reason;
 - there will be a lead time of several months between committing to borrow and knowing the interest rate payable. Any decision to borrow from the Agency will therefore be the subject of a separate report to Full Council

LOBOs

- 4.11 Mid Suffolk holds £4m of LOBO (Lender's Option Borrower's Option) loans where the lender has the option to propose an increase in the interest rate at set dates, following which the Council has the option to either accept the new rate or to repay the loan at no additional cost. All of these loans have options during 2019/20, and although the Council understands that lenders are unlikely to exercise their options in the current low interest rate environment, there remains an element of refinancing risk. The Council will take the option to repay LOBO loans at no cost if it has the opportunity to do so. Total borrowing via LOBO loans will be limited to £4m.

Short-term and variable rate loans

- 4.12 These loans leave the Councils exposed to the risk of short-term interest rate rises and are therefore subject to the interest rate exposure limits in the treasury management indicators below.

Other sources of debt finance

- 4.13 In addition, capital finance may be raised by the following methods that are not borrowing, but may be classed as other debt liabilities:
- leasing
 - hire purchase
 - Private Finance Initiative
 - sale and leaseback

Local Application

- 4.14 The Councils have previously raised the majority of their long-term borrowing from the PWLB, but continues to investigate other sources of finance, such as local authority loans and bank loans, that may be available at more favourable rates.
- 4.15 The PWLB allows authorities to repay loans before maturity and either pay a premium or receive a discount according to a set formula based on current interest rates. Other lenders may also be prepared to negotiate premature redemption terms. The Councils may take advantage of this and replace some loans with new loans, or repay loans without replacement, where this is expected to lead to an overall cost saving or a reduction in risk.

Appendix C - Joint Treasury Management Strategy

- 4.16 Consideration will be given to all forms of borrowing/financing in relation to any future capital investment plans. This is most likely to be via the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) but consideration will also be given to borrowing from other sources such as other local authorities, commercial banks, the European Investment Bank (EIB), money markets, capital markets (stock issues, commercial paper and bills) and leasing. The Councils will receive the “certainty rate” discount of 0.2% on PWLB loans.
- 4.17 In conjunction with advice from Arlingclose, both Councils will keep these sources of finance under review.
- 4.18 Officers will take advice on the optimum time to undertake additional borrowing and will adopt a flexible approach in consultation with their treasury advisors, after consideration of the following:
- Affordability
 - Maturity profile of existing debt
 - Interest rate and refinancing risks
 - Borrowing source
- 4.19 The General Fund revenue budget for 2019/20 will include provision for interest payments relating to external borrowing and the statutory Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) to ensure the principal is repaid. Different arrangements apply to the Housing Revenue Account (Council Housing) in that there is no MRP. The strategy and activities are affected by a number of factors, including the regulatory framework, economic conditions, best practice and interest rate/liquidity risk. Appendix D, E, F, G, H and I summarise the regulatory framework, economic background and information on key activities for the year.
- 4.20 In accordance with the MHCLG Guidance, the Councils will be asked to approve a revised Treasury Management Strategy if the assumptions on which this report is based change significantly. Such circumstances would include, for example, a large unexpected change in interest rates, or in the Councils capital programmes or in the level of investment balances.

Debt rescheduling

- 4.21 The PWLB allows authorities to repay loans before maturity and either pay a premium or receive a discount according to a set formula based on current interest rates. Other lenders may also be prepared to negotiate premature redemption terms. The Councils may take advantage of this and replace some loans with new loans, or repay loans without replacement, where this is expected to lead to an overall cost saving or a reduction in risk.

5. Annual Investment Strategy

- 5.1 The Councils hold significant invested funds, representing income received in advance of expenditure plus balances and reserves held. In the past twelve months, Babergh’s investment balances have ranged between £11.105m and £28.766m and those of Mid Suffolk between £10.687m and £38.061m. Similar levels are expected to be maintained in the forthcoming year.

Objectives

- 5.2 CIPFA's TM Code requires the Councils to invest funds prudently, and to have regard to the security and liquidity of its investments before seeking the highest rate of return, or yield. The Councils objective when investing money is to strike an appropriate balance between risk and return, minimising the risk of incurring losses from defaults and the risk of receiving unsuitably low investment income.
- 5.3 Cash that is likely to be spent in the short term is invested securely, for example with the government, other local authorities or selected high-quality banks, to minimise the risk of loss. Money that will be held for longer terms is invested more widely, including in bonds, shares and property, to balance the risk of loss against the risk of receiving returns below inflation. Both short-term and longer-term investments may be held in pooled funds, where an external fund manager makes decisions on which particular investments to buy and the Councils may request their money back at short notice.
- 5.4 Where balances are expected to be invested for more than one year, the Councils will aim to achieve a total return that is equal or higher than the prevailing rate of inflation, in order to maintain the spending power of the sum invested.
- 5.5 Table 3 shows the planned level of investments for treasury management purposes over the medium-term. Long term investments are those made for more than one year. Cash and cash equivalents include money market funds and current bank accounts.

Table 3: Treasury management investments

Treasury Management Investments						
Babergh District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Long Term Investments	9.64	9.44	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Cash and Cash Equivalents	2.45	2.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Total Investments	12.08	11.94	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00

Treasury Management Investments						
Mid Suffolk District Council	2017/18 Actual £m	2018/19 Forecast £m	2019/20 Budget £m	2020/21 Budget £m	2021/22 Budget £m	2022/23 Budget £m
Long Term Investments	9.64	9.44	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Cash and Cash Equivalents	2.39	2.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Total Investments	12.04	11.94	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00

Governance – Treasury Management:

- 5.6 Decisions on treasury management investment and borrowing are made daily and are delegated to the Assistant Director - Corporate Resources (the S151 Officer) and Finance staff, who must act in line with the Joint Treasury Management Strategy approved by Full Council in February each year.
- 5.7 There is a Joint Half Year and Joint Annual Outturn Report on treasury management activity presented to Council. The Joint Audit and Standards Committee is responsible for scrutinising treasury management decisions.

Negative interest rates

- 5.8 If the UK enters into a recession in 2019/20, there is a small chance that the Bank of England could set its Bank Rate at or below zero, which is likely to feed through to negative interest rates on all low risk, short-term investment options. This situation already exists in many other European countries. In this event, security will be measured as receiving the contractually agreed amount at maturity, even though this may be less than the amount originally invested.

Strategy

- 5.9 Given the increasing risk and very low returns from short-term unsecured bank investments, both Councils have diversified into higher yielding asset classes. This diversification represents a continuation of the new strategy adopted in 2015/16.

Business Models

- 5.10 Under the new IFRS 9 standard, accounting for certain investments depends on the Councils "business model" for managing them. The Councils aim to achieve value from their internally managed treasury investments by a business model of collecting the contractual cash flows and therefore, where other criteria are also met, these investments will continue to be accounted for at amortised cost.

Approved counterparties

- 5.11 The minimum proposed investment criteria for UK counterparties in the 2019/20 TMS remains at A-. (See Appendix I for list). (Note: This would be the lowest credit rating determined by credit rating agencies).
- 5.12 In line with advice received from Arlingclose the Councils may invest surplus funds with any of the counterparty types in Table 3 that follows, subject to the cash limits (per counterparty) and the time limits shown.

Table 3: Approved investment counterparties and limits for Babergh and Mid Suffolk

Credit Rating	Banks Unsecured	Banks Secured	Government	Corporates	Registered Providers
UK Govt	n/a	n/a	£ Unlimited 50 years	n/a	n/a
AAA	£2m 5 years	£2m 20 years	£2m 50 years	£1m 20 years	£1m 20 years
AA+	£2m 5 years	£2m 10 years	£2m 25 years	£1m 10 years	£1m 10 years
AA	£2 m 4 years	£2m 5 years	£2m 15 years	£1m 5 years	£1m 10 years
AA-	£2m 3 years	£2m 4 years	£2m 10 years	£1m 4 years	£1m 10 years
A+	£2m 2 years	£2m 3 years	£2m 5 years	£1m 3 years	£1m 5 years
A	£2 m 13 months	£2m 2 years	£2m 5 years	£1 m 2 years	£1m 5 years
A-	£2m 6 months	£2m 13 months	£2m 5 years	£1m 13 months	£1m 5 years

Appendix C - Joint Treasury Management Strategy

Credit Rating	Banks Unsecured	Banks Secured	Government	Corporates	Registered Providers
None	£1m 6 months	n/a	£1m 25 years	£50,000 5 years	£1m 5 years
Pooled funds	£5m per fund				

Table 3 should be read in conjunction with the following notes:

- **Credit rating**
Investment limits are set by reference to the lowest published long-term credit rating from a selection of external rating agencies. Where available, the credit rating relevant to the specific investment or class of investment is used, otherwise the counterparty credit rating is used. However, investment decisions are never made solely based on credit ratings, and all other relevant factors including external advice will be taken into account.
- **Banks unsecured**
Accounts, deposits, certificates of deposit and senior unsecured bonds with banks and building societies, other than multilateral development banks. These investments are subject to the risk of credit loss via a bail-in should the regulator determine that the bank is failing or likely to fail. See below for arrangements relating to operational bank accounts.
- **Banks secured**
Covered bonds, reverse repurchase agreements and other collateralised arrangements with banks and building societies. These investments are secured on the bank's assets, which limits the potential losses in the unlikely event of insolvency, and means that they are exempt from bail-in. Where there is no investment specific credit rating, but the collateral upon which the investment is secured has a credit rating, the higher of the collateral credit rating and the counterparty credit rating will be used to determine cash and time limits. The combined secured and unsecured investments in any one bank will not exceed the cash limit for secured investments.
- **Government**
Loans, bonds and bills issued or guaranteed by national governments, regional and local authorities and multilateral development banks. These investments are not subject to bail-in, and there is generally a lower risk of insolvency, although they are not zero risk. Investments with the UK Central Government may be made in unlimited amounts for up to 50 years.
- **Corporates**
Loans, bonds and commercial paper issued by companies other than banks and registered providers. These investments are not subject to bail-in but are exposed to the risk of the company going insolvent. Loans to unrated companies will only be made either following an external credit assessment or to a maximum of £50,000 per company as part of a diversified pool in order to spread the risk widely.

- **Registered providers**
Loans and bonds issued by, guaranteed by or secured on the assets of registered providers of social housing and registered social landlords, formerly known as housing associations. These bodies are tightly regulated by the Regulator of Social Housing (in England). As providers of public services, they retain the likelihood of receiving government support if needed.
- **Pooled funds**
Shares or units in diversified investment vehicles consisting of any of the above investment types, plus equity shares and property. These funds have the advantage of providing wide diversification of investment risks, coupled with the services of a professional fund manager in return for a fee. Short-term Money Market Funds that offer same-day liquidity and very low or no volatility will be used as an alternative to instant access bank accounts, while pooled funds whose value changes with market prices and/or have a notice period will be used for longer investment periods.

Bond, equity and property funds offer enhanced returns over the longer term but are more volatile in the short term. These allow the Councils to diversify into asset classes other than cash without the need to own and manage the underlying investments. Because these funds have no defined maturity date, but are available for withdrawal after a notice period, their performance and continued suitability in meeting the Councils investment objectives will be monitored regularly.

If the risks or returns of pooled funds change significantly enough over a period that they no longer meet the Councils objectives, the funds will be withdrawn at the earliest opportunity. No new or re-investments will be made into those funds and alternatives will be considered. This will continue to be applied to Funding Circle in 2019/20.

Council banker and Operational bank accounts

- 5.13 The Councils may incur operational exposures, for example through current accounts, collection accounts and merchant acquiring services, to any UK bank with credit ratings no lower than BBB- and with assets greater than £25 billion. These are not classed as investments but are still subject to the risk of a bank bail-in, and balances will therefore be kept below £2m per bank. The Bank of England has stated that in the event of failure, banks with assets greater than £25 billion are more likely to be bailed-in than made insolvent, increasing the chance of the Councils maintaining operational continuity. Both Councils bank with Lloyds Bank plc which currently has a credit rating of A+.

Risk assessment and credit ratings

- 5.14 Credit ratings are obtained and monitored by the Councils treasury advisers, who will notify changes in ratings as they occur. Where an entity has its credit rating downgraded so that it fails to meet the approved investment criteria then:
- no new investments will be made,
 - any existing investments that can be recalled or sold at no cost will be, and

- full consideration will be given to the recall or sale of all other existing investments with the affected counterparty.

- 5.15 Where a credit rating agency announces that a credit rating is on review for possible downgrade (also known as “rating watch negative” or “credit watch negative”) so that it may fall below the approved rating criteria, then only investments that can be withdrawn on the next working day will be made with that organisation until the outcome of the review is announced. This policy will not apply to negative outlooks, which indicate a long-term direction of travel rather than an imminent change of rating.
- 5.16 See the table in Appendix I for an explanation of the credit ratings issued by the main credit ratings agencies.

Other information on the security of investments

- 5.17 The Councils understand that credit ratings are good, but not perfect, predictors of investment default. Full regard will therefore be given to other available information on the credit quality of the organisations in which it invests, including credit default swap prices, financial statements, information on potential government support, reports in the quality financial press and analysis and advice from the Councils treasury management adviser. No investments will be made with an organisation if there are substantive doubts about its credit quality, even though it may otherwise meet the above criteria.
- 5.18 When deteriorating financial market conditions affect the creditworthiness of all organisations, as happened in 2008 and 2011, this is not generally reflected in credit ratings, but can be seen in other market measures. In these circumstances, the Councils will restrict investments to those organisations of higher credit quality and reduce the maximum duration of investments to maintain the required level of security. The extent of these restrictions will be in line with prevailing financial market conditions. If these restrictions mean that insufficient commercial organisations of high credit quality are available to invest the Councils cash balances, then the surplus will be deposited with the UK Government via the Debt Management Office (DMADF) or invested in government treasury bills for example, or with other local authorities. This will cause a reduction in the level of investment income earned but will protect the principal sum invested.

Investment limits

- 5.19 The Councils revenue reserves available to cover investment losses are forecast to be £6.3m for Babergh and £14.5m for Mid Suffolk on 31 March 2019. In order to minimise the available reserves that would be put at risk in the case of a single default, the maximum that will be lent to any one organisation (other than the UK Government) will be £5m.
- 5.20 A group of banks under the same ownership will be treated as a single organisation for limit purposes. Limits will also be placed on fund managers, investments in brokers’ nominee accounts, foreign countries and industry sectors as stated in Table 4 that follows. Investments in pooled funds and multilateral development banks do not count against the limit for any single foreign country, since the risk is diversified over many countries.

Table 4: Investment limits for Babergh and Mid Suffolk

Investment Limits	Babergh	Mid Suffolk
Any single organisation, except the UK Central Government	£2m each	£2m each
UK Central Government	Unlimited	Unlimited
Any group of organisations under the same ownership	£1m per group	£1m per group
Any group of pooled funds under the same management	£5m per manager	£5m per manager
Negotiable instruments held in a broker's nominee account	£10m per broker	£10m per broker
Foreign countries	£2m per country	£2m per country
Registered Providers and registered social landlords	£5m in total	£5m in total
Unsecured investments with building societies	£2m in total	£2m in total
Loans to unrated corporates	£1m in total	£1m in total
Money Market Funds	50% total Investments	50% total Investments

Liquidity management

- 5.21 The Councils use purpose-built cash flow forecasts to determine the maximum period for which funds may prudently be committed. The forecast is compiled on a prudent basis to minimise the risk of the Councils being forced to borrow on unfavourable terms to meet its financial commitments. Limits on long-term investments are set by reference to the Councils medium-term budget planning and cash flow forecasts.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT INDICATORS

The Councils measure and manage their exposure to treasury management risks using the following indicators:

1. Security

- 1.1 The Councils have adopted a voluntary measure of their exposure to credit risk by monitoring the value-weighted average credit score of their investment portfolio. This is calculated by applying a score to each investment (AAA=1, AA+=2, etc.) and taking the arithmetic average, weighted by the size of each investment. Unrated investments are assigned a score based on their perceived risk. Positions at the 30th September 2018 were Babergh 5.71 and Mid Suffolk 5.88 respectively.

	Target
Portfolio average credit score	7.0

2. Liquidity

- 2.1 The Councils have adopted a voluntary measure of their exposure to liquidity risk by monitoring the amount they can borrow each quarter without giving prior notice.

Liquidity risk indicator	
Total sum borrowed in past 3 months without prior notice	2019/20 Target
Babergh District Council	£5m
Mid Suffolk District Council	£5m

3. Interest rate exposures

- 3.1 This indicator is set to control the Councils exposure to interest rate risk. The Boundary on the one-year revenue impact of a 1% rise in interest rates will be:


Interest rate risk indicator	
Upper impact on Revenue of a 1% increase in rates	2019/20 Limit £m
Babergh District Council	0.376
Mid Suffolk District Council	0.490

- 3.2 The impact of a change in interest rates is calculated on the assumption that maturing loans and investments will be replaced at current rates.

4. Maturity structure of borrowing

- 4.1 This indicator is set to control the Councils exposure to refinancing risk. The upper and lower limits on the maturity structure of borrowing will be:

Refinancing rate risk indicator				
% of total borrowing	Babergh 30.11.2018 %	Mid Suffolk 30.11.2018 %	Upper Limit %	Lower Limit %
Under 12 months	9.47%	22.43%	50.00	0.00
12 months and within 24 months	0.42%	13.80%	50.00	0.00
24 months and within 5 years	0.95%	0.00%	50.00	0.00
5 years and within 10 years	12.63%	13.71%	100.00	0.00
10 years and within 20 years	75.38%	25.88%	100.00	0.00
20 years and within 30 years	0.00%	13.55%	100.00	0.00
30 years and above	1.16%	10.64%	100.00	0.00



4.2 Time periods start on the first day of each financial year. The maturity date of borrowing is the earliest date on which the lender can demand repayment.

5. Principal sums invested for periods longer than a year

5.1 The purpose of this indicator is to control the Councils exposure to the risk of incurring losses by seeking early repayment of their investments. The limits on the long-term principal sum invested to final maturities beyond the period will be:

Price risk indicator			
Limit on principal invested beyond year end	2019/20 Limit	2020/21 Limit	2021/22 Limit
Babergh District Council	£2m	£2m	£2m
Mid Suffolk District Council	£2m	£2m	£2m

6. Related Matters

6.1 The CIPFA TM Code requires the Councils to include the following in their Joint Treasury Management Strategy.

Policy on the use of financial derivatives

6.2 Local authorities have previously made use of financial derivatives embedded into loans and investments both to reduce interest rate risk (e.g. interest rate collars and forward deals) and to reduce costs or increase income at the expense of greater risk (e.g. LOBO loans and callable deposits). The general power of competence in Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 removes much of the uncertainty over local authorities' use of standalone financial derivatives (i.e. those that are not embedded into a loan or investment).

6.3 The Councils will only use standalone financial derivatives (such as swaps, forwards, futures and options) where they can be clearly demonstrated to reduce the overall level of the financial risks that the Councils are exposed to. Additional risks presented, such as credit exposure to derivative counterparties, will be taken into account when determining the overall level of risk. Embedded derivatives, including those present in pooled funds and forward starting transactions, will not be subject to this policy, although the risks they present will be managed in line with the overall treasury risk management strategy.

6.4 Financial derivative transactions may be arranged with any organisation that meets the approved investment criteria. The current value of any amount due from a derivative counterparty will count against the counterparty credit limit and the relevant foreign country limit.

Policy on apportioning interest to the HRA

6.5 On 1 April 2012, the Councils notionally split each of their existing long-term loans into General Fund and HRA pools. In the future, new long-term loans borrowed will be assigned in their entirety to one pool or the other. Interest payable and other costs/income arising from long-term loans (e.g. premiums and discounts on early redemption) will be charged/ credited to the respective revenue account.

6.6 Differences between the value of the HRA loans pool and the HRA's underlying need to borrow (adjusted for HRA balance sheet resources available for investment) will result in a notional cash balance which may be positive or negative. This balance will be measured annually, and interest transferred between the General Fund and HRA at each Council's average interest rate on investments, adjusted for credit risk.

Markets in Financial Instruments Directive

6.7 The Councils have opted up to professional client status with their providers of financial services, including advisers, banks, brokers and fund managers, allowing access to a greater range of services but without the greater regulatory protections afforded to individuals and small companies. Given the size and range of the Councils treasury management activities, the S151 Officer believes this to be the most appropriate status.

Financial Implications

- 6.8 The budget for investment income in 2019/20 is £1.888m for Babergh and £2.407m for Mid Suffolk, based on an average investment portfolio of £47m for Babergh and £55.2m Mid Suffolk.
- 6.9 The budget for debt interest paid in 2019/20 is £4.065m for Babergh and £4.208 m for Mid Suffolk, based on an average debt portfolio of £167.449m for Babergh and £178.143m for Mid Suffolk.
- 6.10 If actual levels of investments and borrowing, or actual interest rates, differ from those forecast, performance against budget will be correspondingly different.

Other Options Considered

- 6.11 The CIPFA TM Code does not prescribe any particular treasury management strategy for local authorities to adopt. The S151 Officer believes that the above strategy represents an appropriate balance between risk management and cost effectiveness. Some alternative strategies, with their financial and risk management implications, are listed in the following table.

Alternative	Impact on income and expenditure	Impact on risk management
Invest in a narrower range of counterparties and/or for shorter times	Interest income will be lower	Lower chance of losses from credit related defaults, but any such losses may be greater
Invest in a wider range of counterparties and/or for longer times	Interest income will be higher	Increased risk of losses from credit related defaults, but any such losses may be smaller
Borrow additional sums at long-term fixed interest rates	Debt interest costs will rise; this is unlikely to be offset by higher investment income	Higher investment balance leading to a higher impact in the event of a default; however long-term interest costs may be more certain
Borrow short-term or variable loans instead of long-term fixed rates	Debt interest costs will initially be lower	Increases in debt interest costs will be broadly offset by rising investment income in the medium term, but long-term costs may be less certain
Reduce level of borrowing	Saving on debt interest is likely to exceed lost investment income	Reduced investment balance leading to a lower impact in the event of a default; however long-term interest costs may be less certain

ECONOMIC & INTEREST RATE FORECAST

1 Economic background

- 1.1 The UK's progress negotiating its exit from the European Union, together with its future trading arrangements, will continue to be a major influence on the Councils Joint Treasury Management Strategy for 2019/20.
- 1.2 Following a weak reading in the first quarter of 2018 attributed to weather-related factors, UK GDP growth rebounded in the second quarter to 0.4%, but at an annual rate of only 1.2% this remains below trend. As economic growth had evolved broadly in line with its May Inflation Report forecast, the Bank of England's Monetary Policy Committee (MPC) voted unanimously for a rate rise of 0.25% in August, taking Bank Rate to 0.75%. In November 2018 the MPC maintained Bank Rate at 0.75% while the Inflation Report showed that compared to the August report further interest rate increases may be required to bring inflation down to the 2% target over the forecast horizon.
- 1.3 The headline rate of UK Consumer Price Inflation fell back to 2.4% year-on-year in September 2018 from 2.7% in August, as higher import and energy prices continued to hold inflation above the Bank of England target. Labour market data is positive. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) unemployment rate fell to 4%, its lowest level since 1975. The 3-month average annual growth rate for pay excluding bonuses rose to 3.1% in August providing some evidence that a shortage of labour is supporting wages. However, adjusting for inflation this means real wages were only up by 0.7% and only likely to have a moderate impact on household spending.
- 1.4 While external inflationary pressures from energy costs and import prices are expected to subside, domestic pressures are projected to build over the forecast horizon with the balance of these effects likely to keep inflation above the Bank of England's target throughout most of their forecast horizon.
- 1.5 The fallout from the US-China trade war continues which, combined with tighter monetary policy, risks contributing to a slowdown in global economic activity in 2019. Despite slower growth in the region, the European Central Bank (ECB) has started conditioning markets for the end of quantitative easing as well as the timing of the first interest rate hike, currently expected in 2019, and the timing and magnitude of increases thereafter.

2 Credit outlook

- 2.1 The big four UK banking groups have now divided their retail and investment banking divisions into separate legal entities under ringfencing legislation. Bank of Scotland, Barclays Bank UK, HSBC UK Bank, Lloyds Bank, National Westminster Bank, Royal Bank of Scotland and Ulster Bank are the ringfenced banks that now only conduct lower risk retail banking activities. Barclays Bank, HSBC Bank, Lloyds Bank Corporate Markets and NatWest Markets are the investment banks. Credit rating agencies have adjusted the ratings of some of these banks with the ringfenced banks generally being better rated than their non-ringfenced counterparts.

- 2.2 European banks are considering their approach to Brexit, with some looking to create new UK subsidiaries to ensure they can continue trading here. The credit strength of these new banks remains unknown, although the chance of parental support is assumed to be very high if ever needed. The uncertainty caused by protracted negotiations between the UK and EU is weighing on the creditworthiness of both UK and European banks with substantial operations in both jurisdictions.

3 Underlying assumptions

- 3.1 The MPC left Bank Rate unchanged at the September meeting, after voting unanimously to increase Bank Rate to 0.75% in August.
- 3.2 Arlingclose's projected outlook for the UK economy means we maintain the significant downside risks to our interest rate forecast. The UK economic environment is relatively soft, despite seemingly strong labour market data. GDP growth recovered somewhat in Q2 2018, but the annual growth rate of 1.2% remains well below the long-term average. Arlingclose's view is that the UK economy still faces a challenging outlook as the country exits the European Union and Eurozone economic growth softens.
- 3.3 Cost pressures were projected to ease but have risen more recently and are forecast to remain above the Bank's 2% target through most of the forecast period. The rising price of oil and tight labour market means inflation may remain above target for longer than expected. This means that strong real income growth is unlikely in the near future.
- 3.4 The MPC has a bias towards tighter monetary policy but is reluctant to push interest rate expectations too strongly. Arlingclose believes that MPC members consider both that: 1) ultra-low interest rates result in other economic problems, and 2) higher Bank Rate will be a more effective policy weapon should downside Brexit risks crystallise and cuts are required.
- 3.5 The global economy appears to be slowing, particularly the Eurozone and China, where the effects of the trade war has been keenly felt. Despite slower growth, the European Central Bank (ECB) is adopting a more strident tone in conditioning markets for the end of QE, the timing of the first rate increase (2019) and their path thereafter. Meanwhile, European political issues, mostly lately with Italy, continue.
- 3.6 The US economy is expanding more rapidly. The Federal Reserve has tightened monetary policy by raising interest rates to the current 2%-2.25% range; further rate hikes are likely, which will start to slow economic growth. Central bank actions and geopolitical risks have and will continue to produce significant volatility in financial markets, including bond markets.

4 Interest Rate Forecast

- 4.1 Following the increase in Bank Rate to 0.75% in August 2018, the Councils, treasury management adviser Arlingclose is forecasting two more 0.25% hikes during 2019 to take official UK interest rates to 1.25%. The Bank of England's MPC has maintained expectations for slow and steady rate rises over the forecast horizon. The MPC continues to have a bias towards tighter monetary policy but is reluctant to push interest rate expectations too strongly. Arlingclose believes that MPC members consider both that ultra-low interest rates result in other economic problems, and that higher Bank Rate will be a more effective policy weapon should downside Brexit risks crystallise when rate cuts will be required.

Appendix E – Economic & Interest Rate Forecast

- 4.2 The UK economic environment remains relatively soft, despite seemingly strong labour market data. Arlingclose’s view is that the economy still faces a challenging outlook as it exits the European Union and Eurozone growth softens. Whilst assumptions are that a Brexit deal is struck, and some agreement reached on transition and future trading arrangements before the UK leaves the EU, the possibility of a “no deal” Brexit still hangs over economic activity. As such, the risks to the interest rate forecast are considered firmly to the downside.
- 4.3 Gilt yields and hence long-term borrowing rates have remained at low levels but some upward movement from current levels is expected based on Arlingclose’s interest rate projections, due to the strength of the US economy and the ECB’s forward guidance on higher rates. 10-year and 20-year gilt yields are forecast to remain around 1.5% and 2% respectively over the interest rate forecast horizon, however volatility arising from both economic and political events are likely to continue to offer borrowing opportunities.

Table 1 Interest Rate Forecast



	Dec-18	Mar-19	Jun-19	Sep-19	Dec-19	Mar-20	Jun-20	Sep-20	Dec-20	Mar-21	Jun-21	Sep-21	Dec-21	Average
Official Bank Rate														
Upside risk	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.17
Arlingclose Central Case	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.17
Downside risk	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.65
3-mth money market rate														
Upside risk	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.15	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.17
Arlingclose Central Case	0.80	1.00	1.10	1.20	1.30	1.30	1.25	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.17
Downside risk	0.20	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.80	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.68
1-yr money market rate														
Upside risk	0.20	0.30	0.30	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.33
Arlingclose Central Case	1.05	1.25	1.35	1.40	1.50	1.45	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.37
Downside risk	0.35	0.50	0.60	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.69
5-yr gilt yield														
Upside risk	0.15	0.20	0.25	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.32
Arlingclose Central Case	1.15	1.20	1.25	1.35	1.40	1.40	1.35	1.35	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Downside risk	0.30	0.35	0.45	0.50	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.54
10-yr gilt yield														
Upside risk	0.20	0.25	0.25	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.32
Arlingclose Central Case	1.60	1.65	1.65	1.70	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
Downside risk	0.30	0.45	0.50	0.55	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.55
20-yr gilt yield														
Upside risk	0.20	0.25	0.25	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.32
Arlingclose Central Case	1.90	1.95	1.95	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.98
Downside risk	0.30	0.40	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.43
50-yr gilt yield														
Upside risk	0.20	0.25	0.25	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.32
Arlingclose Central Case	1.80	1.85	1.85	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.88
Downside risk	0.30	0.40	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.43

PWLB Certainty Rate (Maturity Loans) = Gilt yield + 0.80%

PWLB Local Infrastructure Rate (Maturity Loans) = Gilt yield + 0.60%



EXISTING INVESTMENT & DEBT PORTFOLIO POSITION

Babergh	30.11.2018 Portfolio £m	Average Rate %
External Borrowing		
Public Works Loan Board	86.05	3.00%
Local Authority Short term	9.00	0.75%
Total External borrowing	95.05	2.79%
Treasury Investments		
Banks & Building Societies	1.79	0.52%
Money Market Funds	3.50	0.55%
Other Pooled Funds	9.43	5.19%
Total Treasury Investments	14.72	4.09%
Net Debt	80.32	



Appendix F – Existing Investment & Debt Portfolio Position

Mid Suffolk	30.11.2018 Portfolio £m	Average Rate %
External Borrowing		
Public Works Loan Board	69.94	4.15%
LOBO's	4.00	4.21%
Local Authority Long term	16.00	1.20%
Local Authority Short term	26.00	0.78%
Total External borrowing	115.94	2.99%
Treasury Investments		
Banks & Building Societies	1.34	0.49%
Money Market Funds	2.00	0.59%
Other Pooled Funds	9.42	5.14%
Total Treasury Investments	12.76	3.68%
Net Debt	103.18	



TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY STATEMENT

1. Introduction and Background

- 1.1 The Councils adopt the key recommendations of the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management in Public Services 2017 Edition (the TM Code) as described in Section 5 of the Code.
- 1.2 In addition, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) revised guidance on Local Councils Investments issued in 2018 requires councils to approve a treasury management investment strategy before the start of each financial year.
- 1.3 Accordingly, the Councils will create and maintain, as the cornerstones for effective treasury management:
- A treasury management policy statement, stating the policies, objectives and approach to risk management of its treasury management activities.
 - Suitable treasury management practices (TMPs), setting out the manner in which the Councils will seek to achieve those policies and objectives, and prescribing how they will manage and control those activities.
- 1.4 The content of the policy statement and TMPs will follow the recommendations contained in Sections 6 and 7 of the TM Code, subject only to amendment where necessary to reflect the particular circumstances of the Councils. Such amendments will not result in the Councils materially deviating from the TM Code's key principles.
- 1.5 The Full Council meeting for Babergh and Mid Suffolk will receive recommendations from Cabinet on their treasury management policies, practices and activities including, as a minimum, an annual strategy and plan in advance of the year, a half-year review and an annual outturn report after its close.
- 1.6 The Councils delegate responsibility for the implementation of their treasury management policies and practices to the Cabinet, monitoring to the Joint Audit and Standards Committee and the execution and administration of treasury management decisions to the Section 151 Officer and/or Corporate Manager - Financial Services, who will act in accordance with the Councils policy statement, the TMPs and CIPFA's Standard of Professional Practice on Treasury Management.
- 1.7 The Joint Audit and Standards Committee is responsible for ensuring effective scrutiny of the Joint Treasury Management Strategy and policies.

2. Policies and Objectives of Treasury Management Activities

- 2.1 The Councils define their treasury management activities in line with the TM Code definition as: "the management of the organisations investments and cash flows, their banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance associated with those risks."

Appendix G – Treasury Management Policy Statement

- 2.2 The Councils regard the successful identification, monitoring and control of risk to be the prime criteria by which the effectiveness of their treasury management activities will be measured. Accordingly, the analysis and reporting of treasury management activities will focus on the risk implications for the Councils and any financial instruments entered into to manage these risks.
- 2.3 The Councils recognise that effective treasury management will provide support towards the achievement of their business and service objectives. They are therefore committed to the principles of achieving value for money in treasury management, and to employing suitable performance measurement techniques within the context of effective risk management.
- 2.4 Both Councils borrowing will be affordable, sustainable and prudent and consideration will be given to the management of interest rate risk and refinancing risk. The source from which the borrowing is taken, and the type of borrowing should allow the Councils transparency and control over their debt.
- 2.5 Both Councils primary objectives in relation to investments remain the security of capital. The liquidity or accessibility of the Councils investments followed by the yield earned on investments remain important but are secondary considerations.

ANNUAL MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION (MRP) STATEMENT 2019/20

- 1.1 Where the Councils finance their capital expenditure by debt, they must put aside resources to repay that debt in later years. The amount charged to the revenue budget for the repayment of debt is known as Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP), although there has been no statutory minimum since 2008. The Local Government Act 2003 requires the Councils to have regard to the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government's Guidance on Minimum Revenue Provision (the CLG Guidance) most recently issued in 2018 and effective from 1 April 2018.
- 1.2 The broad aim of the CLG Guidance is to ensure that debt is repaid over a period that is either reasonably commensurate with that over which the capital expenditure provides benefits, or, in the case of borrowing supported by grant income that has been rolled into Government Revenue Support Grant, reasonably commensurate with the period implicit in the determination of that grant.
- 1.3 A charge to a revenue account for MRP cannot be a negative charge.
- 1.4 The CLG Guidance requires Full Council to approve an Annual MRP Statement each year and recommends a number of options for calculating an amount of MRP that they consider to be prudent. The following paragraph lists the options recommended in the Guidance.
- 1.5 The four MRP options available are:
 - Option 1: Regulatory Method
 - Option 2: CFR Method
 - Option 3: Asset Life Method
 - Option 4: Depreciation Method
- 1.6 For capital expenditure incurred before 1 April 2008, MRP will be determined in accordance with the former regulations that applied on 31 March 2008, incorporating an "Adjustment A" of £2.4m for Mid Suffolk (Option 1). Babergh does not have any capital expenditure incurred before 1st April 2008 on which to charge MRP.
- 1.7 For capital expenditure incurred after 31 March 2008, MRP will be determined by charging the expenditure over the expected useful life of the relevant asset on an annuity basis using an interest rate equivalent to the average PWLB annuity rate for the year of expenditure. MRP charges start in the year after the asset becomes operational. MRP on purchases of freehold land will be charged over 50 years. MRP on expenditure not related to fixed assets but which has been capitalised by regulation or direction will be charged over 20 years. (Option 3).
- 1.8 Where investments are made in the Councils subsidiaries for the purpose of the companies purchasing land and buildings, MRP will be charged over 40 years.

Appendix H – Annual Minimum Revenue Provision Statement

- 1.9 For capital expenditure loans to third parties that are repaid in annual or more frequent instalments of principal, the Councils will make no MRP charge, but will instead apply the capital receipts arising from principal repayments to reduce the capital financing requirement. In years where there is no principal repayment, MRP will be charged in accordance with the MRP policy for the assets funded by the loan, including where appropriate, delaying MRP until the year after the assets become operational.
- 1.10 No MRP will be charged in respect of assets held within the Housing Revenue Account. However, voluntary MRP contributions from the HRA may be made.
- 1.11 Capital expenditure incurred during 2018/19 will not be subject to an MRP charge until 2019/20 and capital expenditure incurred during 2019/20 will not be subject to an MRP charge until 2020/21.
- 1.12 If it is ever proposed to vary the terms of the original MRP Statement during the year, a revised statement will be put to Full Council at that time.
- 1.13 Based on the Councils latest estimates of their Capital Financing Requirements on 31 March 2019, the budget for MRP for 2019/20 has been set as follows:

Estimated Capital Financing Requirement		
Babergh District Council	31.3.2019 Estimated CFR £m	2019/20 Estimated MRP £m
Unsupported capital expenditure after 31.3.2008	22.39	1.05
Loans to other bodies repaid in instalments	23.03	-
Total General Fund	45.42	1.05
HRA subsidy reform payment	86.35	-
Total Housing Revenue Account	86.35	-
Total CFR	131.77	1.05

Estimated Capital Financing Requirement		
Mid Suffolk District Council	31.3.2019 Estimated CFR £m	2019/20 Estimated MRP £m
Capital expenditure before 01.04.2008	8.29	0.07
Unsupported capital expenditure after 31.3.2008	22.11	0.96
Loans to other bodies repaid in instalments	37.36	-
Total General Fund	67.75	1.04
Assets in the Housing Revenue Account	30.87	-
HRA subsidy reform payment	57.21	-
Total Housing Revenue Account	88.08	-
Total CFR	155.83	1.04

INSTITUTIONS MEETING HIGH CREDIT RATINGS CRITERIA

- 1.1 Detailed below is the list of the banks and building societies that both Councils can lend to (based on information on credit risk and credit ratings as at November 2018). This will be continuously monitored as the position changes throughout the year as credit ratings are reviewed and additional market information is evaluated.
- 1.2 This is based on UK Banks and Building Societies A-, Money Market Funds, Foreign Banks AA-. Foreign banks must be in a country with a sovereign rating of AAA.

Counterparty	Long term rating - Fitch	Duration
UK BANKS		
Bank of Scotland PLC	A+	***
Barclays Bank PLC	A*+	**
Barclays Bank UK PLC	A*+	**
Close Brothers Limited	A	***
Goldman Sachs International Bank	A	**
HSBC Bank PLC	AA-	***
HSBC UK Bank PLC	AA-	***
Lloyds Bank PLC	A+	***
Santander UK PLC	A+	***
Standard Chartered Bank	A+	***
UK BUILDING SOCIETIES		
Nationwide Building Society	A+	***
Leeds Building Society	A-	**
Coventry Building Society	A	***
FOREIGN BANKS		
Australia		
Australia and NZ Banking Group	AA-	***
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	AA-	***
National Australia Bank	AA-	***
Westpac Banking Group	AA-	***
Canada		
Bank of Montreal	AA-	***
Bank of Nova Scotia	AA-	***
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce	AA-	***
Royal Bank of Canada	AA	***
Toronto-Dominion Bank	AA-	***
Finland		
Nordea Bank AB	AA-	****
Netherlands		
Cooperative Rabobank	AA-	****
Singapore		
DBS Bank Ltd	AA-	****
Oversea-Chinese Banking Corporation	AA-	****
United Overseas Bank	AA-	****
Sweden		
Svenska Handelsbanken	AA	***

Appendix I – Institutions Meeting High Credit Ratings Criteria

Counterparty	Long term rating - Fitch	Duration
MONEY MARKET FUNDS (MMF)		
Aberdeen Standard Sterling Liquidity Fund	AAAmmf	*
Goldman Sterling Liquid Reserves Fund	AAAmmf	*
Insight Sterling Liquidity Fund	AAAmmf	*
Federated Investors (UK) Sterling Liquidity Fund	AAAmmf	*
Invesco AIM STUC Sterling Liquidity Portfolio	AAAmmf	*
Blackrock Institutional Sterling Liquidity Fund	*1	*

*	Overnight Limit
**	Maximum limit to maturity 100 days
***	Maximum limit to maturity 6 months
****	Maximum limit to maturity 13 months
*****	Maximum exposure limit 10% of total investments per fund
*1	Blackrock has withdrawn from Fitch Rating

- 1.3 MMFs – Federated is domiciled in the UK for tax and administration purposes, Standard Life, Goldman Sachs, BlackRock, Invesco and Insight are domiciled in Ireland for tax and administration purposes.

Long Term Investments Grades - Fitch

Agency - Fitch	
Rating	Definition
AAA	Highest credit quality – ‘AAA’ ratings denote the lowest expectation of credit risk. They are assigned only in case of exceptionally strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is highly unlikely to be adversely affected by foreseeable events.
AA	Very high credit quality ‘AA’ ratings denote expectations of very low credit risk. They indicate very strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is not significantly vulnerable to foreseeable events.
A	High credit quality – ‘A’ ratings denote expectations of low credit risk. The capacity for payment of financial commitments is considered strong. This capacity may, nevertheless, be more vulnerable to changes in circumstances or in economic conditions than is the case for higher ratings.

Long Term Investments Grades – Moody’s

Agency - Moody’s	
Rating	Definition
Aaa	Obligations rated Aaa are judged to be of the highest quality, with minimal credit risk.
Aa1	Obligations rated Aa are judged to be of high quality and are subject to very low credit risk.
Aa2	
Aa3	
A1	Obligations rated A are considered upper-medium grade and are subject to low credit risk.
A2	
A3	

Long Term Investments Grades – Standard & Poor’s

Agency - Standard & Poor’s	
Rating	Definition
AAA	An obligator rated ‘AAA’ has extremely strong capacity to meet its financial commitments. ‘AAA’ is the highest issuer credit rating assigned by Standard & Poor’s.
AA	An obligator rated ‘AA’ has very strong capacity to meet its financial commitments. It differs from the highest rated obligators only to a small degree.
A	An obligator rated ‘A’ has strong capacity to meet its financial commitments but is somewhat more susceptible to the adverse effects of changes in circumstances and economic conditions than obligators in higher rated categories.

Glossary of Terms

CCLA	Churches, Charities and Local Authority Property Fund
CFR	Capital Financing Requirement. The underlying need to borrow to finance capital expenditure.
CIPFA	The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy. This is the leading professional accountancy body for public services.
CLG	Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government. This is a ministerial department.
DMADF	Debt Management Account Deposit Facility.
Funding Circle	Accounts set up to lend money to local and national businesses at competitive rates
GDP	Gross Domestic Product. This is the market value of all officially recognised goods and services produced within a country in a given period of time.
HRA	Housing Revenue Account. The statutory account to which are charged the revenue costs of providing, maintaining and managing Council dwellings. These costs are financed by tenants' rents.
LOBO	Lender's Option Borrower's Option. This is a loan where the lender has certain dates when they can increase the interest rate payable and, if they do, the Council has the option of accepting the new rate or repaying the loan.
MIFID II	Markets in Financial Instruments Directive 2014/65/EU. Effective from 1 January 2018. The Councils have met the conditions to opt up to professional status. The Councils will continue to have access to products including money market funds, pooled funds, treasury bills, bonds, shares and to financial advice.
MPC	Monetary Policy Committee – A committee of the Bank of England which meets each month to decide the official interest in the UK. It is also responsible for other aspects of the Government's monetary policy framework such as quantitative easing and forward guidance.
MRP	Minimum Revenue Provision. Local authorities are required to make a prudent provision for debt redemption on General Fund borrowing.

Appendix J – Glossary of Terms

PWLB	Public Works Loan Board - offers loans to local authorities below market rates.
QE	Quantitative Easing. The purchase of Government bonds by the Bank of England to boost the money supply.
T Bills	Treasury Bill. A short-term Government Bond.
UBS	UBS Multi Asset Income Fund (UK) - a pooled fund