



ADUR & WORTHING
COUNCILS

Joint Governance Committee
28 January 2020
Agenda Item 7

Joint Strategic Committee
11 February 2020
Agenda Item 7

Key Decision : No
Ward(s) Affected: All

JOINT TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2020/21 to 2022/23, ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL AND WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR FOR DIGITAL AND RESOURCES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 This report asks Members to approve and adopt the contents of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy for 2020/21 to 2022/23 for Adur and Worthing Councils, as required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Joint Governance Committee is recommended to:
- i) Note the report (including the Prudential Indicators and Limits, and MRP Statements) for 2020/21 to 2022/23.
 - ii) Refer any comments or suggestions to the next meeting of the Joint Strategic Committee on 11 February 2020.
- 2.2 The Joint Strategic Committee is recommended to:
- i) Approve and adopt the TMSS and AIS for 2020/21 to 2022/23, incorporating the Prudential Indicators and Limits, and MRP Statements.
 - ii) Forward the Prudential Indicators and Limits, and MRP Statements of the report for approval by Worthing Council at its meeting on 18 February 2020, and by Adur Council at its meeting on 20 February 2020.

3. INTRODUCTION

3.1 Background

The Councils are required to operate a balanced budget, which broadly means that cash raised during the year will meet cash expenditure. Part of the treasury management operation is to ensure that this cash flow is adequately planned, with cash being available when it is needed. Surplus monies are invested in high quality counterparties or instruments commensurate with the Councils' low risk appetite, providing adequate liquidity initially, before considering investment return. This is consistent with national guidance which promotes security and liquidity above yield.

The second main function of the treasury management service is the funding of the Councils' capital plans. These capital plans provide a guide to the borrowing needs of the Councils, essentially the longer term cash flow planning, to ensure that the Councils can meet their capital spending obligations. This management of longer term cash may involve arranging long or short term loans, or using longer term cash flow surpluses. On occasion, when it is prudent and economic, any debt previously drawn may be restructured to meet Councils' risk or cost objectives.

The contribution the treasury management function makes to the authority is critical as the balance of debt and investment operations ensure liquidity or the ability to meet spending commitments as they fall due, either on day to day revenue or for larger capital projects. The treasury operations will see a balance of the interest costs of debt and the investment income arising from cash deposits affecting the available budget. Since cash balances generally result from reserves and balances, it is paramount to ensure adequate security of the sums invested, as a loss of principal will in effect result in a loss to the General Fund Balance.

Whilst any commercial initiatives or loans to third parties will impact on the treasury function, these activities are generally classed as non-treasury, (arising usually from capital expenditure), and are separate from the day to day treasury management activities.

CIPFA defines treasury management as:

“The management of the local authority’s investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks.”

3.2 Reporting requirements

3.2.1 Capital Strategy

The CIPFA revised 2017 Prudential and Treasury Management Codes require all local authorities to prepare a capital strategy report to provide the following:

- a high-level long term overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contribute to the provision of services
- an overview of how the associated risk is managed
- the implications for future financial sustainability

The aim of this capital strategy is to ensure that all elected Members on the full council fully understand the overall long-term policy objectives and resulting capital strategy requirements, governance procedures and risk appetite. The Capital Strategy and the Commercial Property Strategy are reported separately from the Treasury Management Strategy Statement; non-treasury investments will be reported through those reports. This ensures the separation of the core treasury function under security, liquidity and yield principles, and the policy and commercialism investments usually driven by expenditure on an asset.

The capital strategy shows:

- The corporate governance arrangements for these types of activities;
- Any service objectives relating to the investments;
- The expected income, costs and resulting contribution;
- The debt related to the activity and the associated interest costs;
- The payback period (MRP policy);
- For non-loan type investments, the cost against the current market value;
- The risks associated with each activity.

Where a physical asset is being bought, details of market research, advisers used, (and their monitoring), ongoing costs and investment requirements and any credit information will be disclosed, including the ability to sell the asset and realise the investment cash.

Where the Councils have borrowed to fund any non-treasury investment, there should also be an explanation of why borrowing was required and why the MHCLG Investment Guidance and CIPFA Prudential Code have not been adhered to.

If any non-treasury investment sustains a loss during the final accounts and audit process, the strategy and revenue implications will be reported as part of the outturn report and the annual review of the Corporate Property Investment Portfolio.

To demonstrate the proportionality between the treasury operations and the non-treasury operation, high-level comparators are shown throughout this report.

3.2.2 Treasury Management Reporting

The Councils are required to receive and approve, as a minimum, three main reports each year, which incorporate a variety of policies, estimates and actuals.

Prudential and treasury indicators and treasury strategy (this report), the first, and most important report is forward looking and covers:

- the capital plans (including prudential indicators);
- a minimum revenue provision (MRP) policy (how the repayment of borrowing associated with capital expenditure is funded from revenue over time);
- the treasury management strategy (how the investments and borrowings are to be organised) including treasury indicators; and
- an investment strategy (the parameters on how investments are to be managed).

A mid-year treasury management report – This is primarily a progress report and will update members on the capital position, amending prudential indicators as necessary, and noting whether any policies require revision.

An annual treasury report – This is a backward looking review document and provides details of a selection of actual prudential and treasury indicators and actual treasury operations compared to the estimates within the strategy.

Scrutiny - The above reports are required to be scrutinised by the Joint Governance Committee (JGC) which may make recommendations to the Joint Strategic Committee (JSC) regarding any aspects of Treasury Management policy and practices it considers appropriate in fulfilment of its scrutiny role. Such recommendations as may be made shall be incorporated within the above named reports and submitted to meetings of the JSC for consideration as soon after the meetings of the JGC as practically possible. The reports are approved by the JSC and recommended to the Councils for approval.

3.3 Treasury Management Strategy for 2020/21

The strategy for 2020/21 covers two related subjects:

Capital programme financing

- the capital expenditure plans and the associated prudential indicators;
- the minimum revenue provision (MRP) policy.

Treasury management (the management of the council's cash flow, investments and debt)

- the current treasury position;
- treasury indicators which limit the treasury risk and activities of the Councils;

- prospects for interest rates;
- the borrowing strategy;
- policy on borrowing in advance of need;
- debt rescheduling;
- the investment strategy;
- creditworthiness policy; and
- the policy on use of external service providers

These elements cover the requirements of the Local Government Act 2003, the CIPFA Prudential Code, MHCLG MRP Guidance, the CIPFA Treasury Management Code and MHCLG Investment Guidance.

3.4 Training

The CIPFA Code requires the responsible officer to ensure that members with responsibility for treasury management receive adequate training in treasury management. This especially applies to members responsible for scrutiny. A briefing for members was provided by Link Asset Services in June 2019 and further training will take place in 2020 as required.

The training needs of treasury management officers are periodically reviewed and officers attend courses provided by appropriate trainers such as Link and CIPFA.

3.5 Treasury management consultants

The Councils use Link Asset Services, Treasury Solutions as the external treasury management advisors.

The Councils recognise that responsibility for treasury management decisions remains with the organisations at all times and will ensure that undue reliance is not placed upon our external service providers. All decisions will be undertaken with regards to all available information, including, but not solely, our treasury advisers.

They also recognise that there is value in employing external providers of treasury management services in order to acquire access to specialist skills and resources. The Councils will ensure that the terms of their appointment and the methods by which their value will be assessed are properly agreed and documented, and subjected to regular review.

The scope of investments within the Councils' operations includes both conventional treasury investments, (the placing of residual cash from the Councils' functions), and commercial type investments in property. The Councils use appropriate specialist advisers in relation to the commercial activity.

4. THE CAPITAL PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS 2020/21 – 2022/23

The Councils' capital expenditure plans are the key driver of treasury management activity. The output of the capital expenditure plans is reflected

in the prudential indicators, which are designed to assist members' overview and confirm capital expenditure plans.

4.1 Capital expenditure

This prudential indicator is a summary of the Councils' capital expenditure plans, both those agreed previously, and those forming part of this budget cycle. Members are asked to approve the capital expenditure forecasts.

The tables below summarise the capital expenditure plans and how these plans are being financed by capital or revenue resources. Any shortfall of resources results in a financing or borrowing need.

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

Capital expenditure	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Non-HRA	10.041	9.719	10.200	3.116	2.794
HRA	2.993	6.593	16.768	13.537	11.870
Commercial property purchases	26.532	49.868	37.020	0.000	0.000
TOTAL	39.566	66.180	63.988	16.653	14.664
Financed by:					
Capital receipts	0.490	1.967	1.045	0.923	0.423
Capital grants and contributions	1.024	6.536	2.317	0.388	0.388
Revenue Reserves & contributions	3.405	4.838	6.423	7.371	7.618
Net financing need for the year	34.647	52.839	54.203	7.971	6.235

The net financing need for commercial property purchases included in the above table against expenditure is shown below:

Adur DC Commercial property	2018/19 Actual £m	2019/20 Estimate £m	2020/21 Estimate £m	2021/22 Estimate £m	2022/23 Estimate £m
Capital Expenditure	26.532	49.868	37.020	0.000	0.000
Financing required	26.382	49.324	35.800		
Net financing need for the year	34.647	52.839	54.203		
Percentage of total net financing need	76%	93%	66%		

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

Capital expenditure	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Non-HRA	11.576	16.932	21.470	5.671	12.075
Commercial property purchases	26.697	50.304	47.999	0.000	0.000
TOTAL	38.273	67.236	69.469	5.671	12.075
Financed by:					
Capital receipts	2.534	0.357	4.056	0.000	0.000
Capital grants and contributions	2.910	2.293	7.290	1.162	3.496
Revenue Reserves & contributions	1.305	1.727	2.764	3.291	3.477
Net financing need for the year	31.524	62.859	55.359	1.218	5.102

Worthing BC Commercial property	2018/19 Actual £m	2019/20 Estimate £m	2020/21 Estimate £m	2021/22 Estimate £m	2022/23 Estimate £m
Capital Expenditure	26.697	50.304	47.999	0.000	0.000
Financing required	26.697	49.912	46.930		
Net financing need for the year	31.524	62.859	55.359		
Percentage of total net financing need	85%	79%	85%		

4.2 The Councils' borrowing need (the Capital Financing Requirement)

The second prudential indicator is the Councils' Capital Financing Requirement (CFR). The CFR is simply the total historical outstanding capital expenditure which has not yet been paid for from either revenue or capital resources. It is essentially a measure of the Councils' indebtedness and so its underlying borrowing need. Any capital expenditure above, which has not immediately been paid for through a revenue or capital resource, will increase the CFR.

The CFR does not increase indefinitely, as the minimum revenue provision (MRP) is a statutory annual revenue charge which broadly reduces the borrowing need in line with each asset's life, and so charges the economic consumption of capital assets as they are used. The CFR includes any other long term liabilities (e.g. finance leases). Whilst these increase the CFR, and therefore the Councils' borrowing requirement, these types of scheme include

a borrowing facility and so the Councils are not required to separately borrow for these schemes. The Councils currently do not have any such schemes within the CFR. The Councils are asked to approve the CFR projections below:

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

Capital Financing Requirement (£m)	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
CFR – non-HRA	25.185	28.372	35.356	36.337	36.800
CFR Commercial	37.962	87.287	123.087	121.357	119.577
CFR – HRA	60.103	60.430	71.849	80.569	88.121
Total CFR	123.250	176.089	230.292	238.263	244.498
Movement in CFR	34.647	52.839	54.203	7.971	6.235
Movement in CFR represented by					
Net financing need for the year (above)	35.663	54.230	56.615	11.360	9.871
Less: MRP/VRP and other financing movements	(1.016)	(1.391)	(2.412)	(3.389)	(3.636)
Movement in CFR	34.647	52.839	54.203	7.971	6.235

Worthing Borough Council

Capital Financing Requirement (£m)	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
CFR – non-HRA	43.977	56.924	65.353	68.285	75.152
CFR Commercial	26.697	76.609	123.539	121.825	120.060
Total CFR	70.674	133.533	188.892	190.110	195.212
Movement in CFR	31.524	62.859	55.359	1.218	5.102
Movement in CFR represented by					
Net financing need for the year (above)	32.635	64.316	57.591	4.410	8.510
Less: MRP/VRP and other financing movements	(1.111)	(1.457)	(2.232)	(3.192)	(3.408)
Movement in CFR	31.524	62.859	55.359	1.218	5.102

A key aspect of the regulatory and professional guidance is that elected members are aware of the size and scope of any commercial activity in relation to the Councils' overall financial position. The capital expenditure figures shown above demonstrate the scope of this activity and, by approving these figures, members consider the scale proportionate to the Councils' remaining activity.

4.3 **Minimum revenue provision (MRP) policy statement**

The Councils are required to set aside funds to repay the accumulated General Fund debt associated with the capital investment programme each year (the CFR) through a revenue charge to the General Fund budget (the minimum revenue provision - MRP), although they are also allowed to undertake additional voluntary payments (voluntary revenue provision - VRP).

MHCLG regulations require the full Councils to approve an MRP Statement in advance of each year. A variety of options are provided to councils, so long as there is a prudent provision.

For both Councils, the MRP relating to built assets under construction will be set aside once the asset is completed. If any finance leases are entered into, the repayments are applied as MRP.

The Councils are recommended to approve the following MRP Statements:

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

For Adur District Council it was approved by the Joint Strategic Committee on 2nd June 2016 that for borrowing incurred before 1st April 2008, the MRP will be set aside in equal instalments over the life of the associated debt. No such policy was required by Worthing Borough Council which had no debt as at 1 April 2008.

4.3.1 **General Fund**

For non-HRA capital expenditure after 1st April 2008 the MRP will be calculated as the annual amount required to repay borrowing based on the annuity method: equal annual payments of principal and interest are calculated, with the interest element reducing and the principal element increasing over the life of the asset as the principal is repaid. The interest is based on the rate available to the Council at the beginning of the year in which payments start and the MRP is calculated as the amount of principal, so that by the end of the asset's estimated life the principal is fully repaid (the Asset Life Method). The option remains to use additional revenue contributions or capital receipts to repay debt earlier.

An exception was agreed in the 2015/16 Treasury Management Strategy Statement: the Chief Financial Officer has discretion to defer MRP relating to debt arising from loans to Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) to match the profile of debt repayments from the RSL and other public bodies. RSLs normally prefer a maturity type loan as it matches the onset of income streams emanating from capital investment with the timing of the principal debt repayment. The deferral of MRP to the maturity date would therefore mean

that MRP is matched at the same point as the debt is repaid, and is therefore cash (and revenue cost) neutral to the Council.

If concerns arise about the ability of the borrower to repay the loan, the Chief Financial Officer will use the approved discretion to make MRP as a “prudent provision” from the earliest point to ensure that sufficient funds are set aside from revenue to repay the debt at maturity if the RSL defaults.

It is proposed to use the same policy for 2020/21.

4.3.2 **Housing Revenue Account**

Unlike the General Fund, the HRA is not required to set aside funds to repay debt. The Council’s MRP policy previously applied the financially prudent option of voluntary MRP for the repayment of HRA debt, to facilitate new borrowing in future for capital investment. However in order to provide additional capital funding to address the maintenance backlog identified by the condition survey, the payment of voluntary MRP was suspended for a period of 9 years from 2017/18 whilst the Council invests in its current housing stock and manages the impact of rent limitation.

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

- 4.3.3 Worthing applies the same MRP policy as Adur for capital expenditure funded from borrowing from 1 April 2008. Worthing has the same discretion as Adur Council in the application of MRP in respect of capital loans to approved Counterparties. It is proposed to retain this policy for 2020/21.

ADUR and WORTHING COUNCILS - VOLUNTARY REVENUE PROVISION

- 4.3.4 **MRP Overpayments** – A change introduced by the revised MHCLG MRP Guidance was the allowance that any charges made over the statutory MRP, voluntary revenue provision or overpayments, can, if needed, be reclaimed in later years if deemed necessary or prudent. In order for these sums to be reclaimed for use in the budget, this policy must disclose the cumulative overpayment made each year. Up until the 31st March 2020 Adur made VRP overpayments of £50k and Worthing has a cumulative £490k VRP overpayment which will be reclaimed over the following 5 years.

5. BORROWING

The capital expenditure plans set out above provide details of the service activity of the Councils. The treasury management function ensures that the Councils’ cash is organised in accordance with the relevant professional codes, so that sufficient cash is available to meet this service activity and the Councils’ Capital Strategy. This will involve both the organisation of the cash flow and, where capital plans require, the organisation of appropriate borrowing facilities. The strategy covers the relevant treasury / prudential indicators, the current and projected debt positions and the annual investment strategy.

5.1 Current portfolio position

The Councils' treasury portfolio positions at 31st March 2019 and at 31st December 2019 are shown below.

Adur District Council

	Principal at 31.03.19 £m	Actual 31.03.2019 %	Principal at 31.12.19 £m	Actual 31.12.2019 %
External Borrowing				
PWLB	(98.227)	85%	(144.367)	88%
Other Borrowing	(17.940)	15%	(20.262)	12%
Finance lease	(0.000)		(0.000)	100%
TOTAL BORROWING	(116.167)	100%	(164.629)	
Treasury Investments:				
Local Authority Property Fund	0.983	9%	2.983	16%
In-house:				
Banks	6.010	57%	9.010	48%
Building societies	0.000	0%	2.000	11%
Bonds	0.055	1%	0.030	0%
Local authorities	0.000	0%	0.000	0%
Money market funds	3.504	33%	4.624	25%
TOTAL INVESTMENTS	10.552	100%	18.647	100%
NET DEBT	(105.615)		(145.982)	

Worthing Borough Council

	Principal at 31.03.19 £m	Actual 31.03.2019 %	Principal at 31.12.19 £m	Actual 31.12.2019 %
External Borrowing				
PWLB	(61.222)	91%	(108.008)	89%
Other Borrowing	(6.028)	9%	(14.000)	11%
Finance lease	(0.000)		0.000	
TOTAL BORROWING	(67.250)	100%	(122.008)	100%

	Principal at 31.03.19 £m	Actual 31.03.2019 %	Principal at 31.12.19 £m	Actual 31.12.2019 %
Treasury Investments:				
Local Authority Property Fund	0.491	5%	1.484	8%
In-house:				
Banks	7.000	72%	4.500	25%
Building societies	0.000	0%	3.000	17%
Bonds	0.075	1%	0.050	0%
Local authorities	0.000	0%	5.000	28%
Money market funds	2.200	22%	3.850	22%
TOTAL INVESTMENTS	9.766	100%	17.884	100%
NET INVESTMENTS	(57.484)		(104.124)	

Worthing Borough Council has also made two loans which are categorised as capital rather than a treasury investment:

- a £10m loan to Worthing Homes
- a £5m loan to GBMet

The Councils' forward projections for borrowing are summarised below. The tables show the actual external debt against the underlying capital borrowing need (the Capital Financing Requirement - CFR), highlighting any over or under borrowing.

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

Adur District Council External Debt £m	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
Debt at 1 April	(85.138)	(116.167)	(168.456)	(221.709)	(228.480)
Expected change in Debt	(31.029)	(52.289)	(52.253)	(6.771)	(4.835)
Other long-term liabilities (OLTL)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Actual gross debt at 31 March	(116.167)	(168.456)	(221.709)	(228.480)	(233.315)
The Capital Financing Requirement	123.250	176.089	230.292	238.263	244.498
Under/(over) borrowing	7.083	7.633	8.583	9.783	11.183

Within the above figures the level of debt relating to commercial property is:

Adur District Council	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
External Debt for commercial activities / non-financial investments					
Actual debt at 31 March £m	(37.962)	(87.187)	(122.887)	(121.057)	(119.177)
Percentage of total external debt %	33%	52%	55%	53%	51%

Worthing Borough Council

Worthing BC External Debt £m	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
Debt at 1 April	(41.564)	(67.250)	(130.009)	(184.868)	(185.086)
Expected change in Debt	(25.686)	(62.759)	(54.859)	(0.218)	(4.102)
Other long-term liabilities (OLTL)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Actual gross debt at 31 March	(67.250)	(130.009)	(184.868)	(185.086)	(189.188)
The Capital Financing Requirement	70.674	133.533	188.892	190.110	195.212
Under/(over) borrowing	3.424	3.524	4.024	5.024	6.024

Within the above figures the level of debt relating to commercial property is:

Worthing B C	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
External Debt for commercial activities / non-financial investments					
Actual debt at 31 March £m	(26.697)	(76.509)	(123.339)	(121.525)	(119.660)
Percentage of total external debt %	40%	59%	67%	66%	63%

Within the prudential indicators there are a number of key indicators to ensure that the Councils operate their activities within well-defined limits. One of these is that the Councils need to ensure that their gross debt does not, except in the short term, exceed the total of the CFR in the preceding year plus the estimates of any additional CFR for 2020/21 and the following two financial years. This allows some flexibility for limited early borrowing for future years, but ensures that borrowing is not undertaken for revenue or speculative purposes.

The Chief Financial Officer reports that the Councils complied with this prudential indicator in the current year and does not envisage difficulties for

the future. This view takes into account current commitments, existing plans, and the proposals in this budget report.

5.2 Treasury Indicators: limits to borrowing activity

The Councils have approved a maximum budget of £125m per Council in respect of commercial property purchases.

The operational boundary - This is the limit which external debt is not normally expected to exceed. In most cases, this would be a similar figure to the CFR, but may be lower or higher depending on the levels of actual debt and the ability to fund under-borrowing by other cash resources.

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

Operational boundary £m	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
Debt	103.0	105.0	112.0	119.0
Other long term liabilities	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Commercial activities/ non-financial investments	88.0	124.0	122.0	120.0
Total	192.0	230.0	235.0	240.0

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

Operational boundary £m	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
Debt re Worthing Homes	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Debt re GB Met	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.5
Other Debt	55.0	55.0	57.3	60.5
Other long term liabilities	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Commercial activities/ non-financial investments	80.0	124.0	122.0	121.0
Total	151.0	195.0	195.0	197.0

The authorised limit for external debt - A further key prudential indicator represents a control on the maximum level of borrowing. This represents a limit beyond which external debt is prohibited, and this limit needs to be set or revised by the full Councils. It reflects the level of external debt which, while not desired, could be afforded in the short term, but is not sustainable in the longer term.

1. This is the statutory limit determined under section 3 (1) of the Local Government Act 2003. The Government retains an option to control either the total of all councils' plans, or those of a specific council, although this power has not yet been exercised.

2. The Councils are asked to approve the following authorised limits:

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

Authorised limit £m	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
Debt	105.0	120.0	124.0	129.0
Other long term liabilities	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Commercial activities/ non-financial investments	90.0	124.0	122.0	120.0
Total	196.0	245.0	247.0	250.0

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

Authorised limit £m	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
Debt re Worthing Homes	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Debt re GB Met	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.5
Other Debt	50.0	60.0	62.3	69.5
Other long term liabilities	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Commercial activities/ non-financial investments	90.0	124.0	122.0	120.0
Total	156.0	200.0	200.0	205.0

5.3 Prospects for interest rates

The Councils have appointed Link Asset Services as their treasury advisor and part of their service is to assist the Councils to formulate a view on interest rates. The following table gives their central view:

Link Asset Services Interest Rate View														
	Dec-19	Mar-20	Jun-20	Sep-20	Dec-20	Mar-21	Jun-21	Sep-21	Dec-21	Mar-22	Jun-22	Sep-22	Dec-22	Mar-23
Bank Rate View	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
3 Month LIBID	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.10	1.20	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
6 Month LIBID	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.90	1.00	1.10	1.10	1.20	1.30	1.40	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
12 Month LIBID	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.10	1.20	1.30	1.30	1.40	1.50	1.60	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
5yr PwLB Rate	2.30	2.40	2.40	2.50	2.50	2.60	2.70	2.80	2.90	2.90	3.00	3.10	3.20	3.20
10yr PwLB Rate	2.60	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.80	2.90	3.00	3.10	3.20	3.20	3.30	3.30	3.40	3.50
25yr PwLB Rate	3.20	3.30	3.40	3.40	3.50	3.60	3.70	3.70	3.80	3.90	4.00	4.00	4.10	4.10
50yr PwLB Rate	3.10	3.20	3.30	3.30	3.40	3.50	3.60	3.60	3.70	3.80	3.90	3.90	4.00	4.00

The above forecasts have been based on an assumption that there is an agreed deal on Brexit, including agreement on the terms of trade between the UK and EU, at some point in time. The result of the general election has removed much uncertainty around this major assumption. However, it does not remove uncertainty around whether agreement can be reached with the

EU on a trade deal within the short time to December 2020, as the prime minister has pledged.

It has been little surprise that the Monetary Policy Committee (MPC) has left Bank Rate unchanged at 0.75% so far in 2019 due to the ongoing uncertainty over Brexit and the outcome of the general election. In its meeting on 7 November, the MPC became more dovish due to increased concerns over the outlook for the domestic economy if Brexit uncertainties were to become more entrenched, and for weak global economic growth: if those uncertainties were to materialise, then the MPC were likely to cut Bank Rate. However, if they were both to dissipate, then rates would need to rise at a “gradual pace and to a limited extent”. Brexit uncertainty has had a dampening effect on UK GDP growth in 2019, especially around mid-year. There is still some residual risk that the MPC could cut Bank Rate as the UK economy is still likely to only grow weakly in 2020 due to continuing uncertainty over whether there could effectively be a no deal Brexit in December 2020 if agreement on a trade deal is not reached with the EU. Until that major uncertainty is removed, or the period for agreeing a deal is extended, it is unlikely that the MPC would raise Bank Rate.

Bond yields / PWLB rates. There has been much speculation during 2019 that the bond market has gone into a bubble, as evidenced by high bond prices and remarkably low yields. However, given the context that there have been heightened expectations that the US was heading for a recession in 2020, and a general background of a downturn in world economic growth, together with inflation generally at low levels in most countries and expected to remain subdued, conditions are ripe for low bond yields. While inflation targeting by the major central banks has been successful over the last thirty years in lowering inflation expectations, the real equilibrium rate for central rates has fallen considerably due to the high level of borrowing by consumers: this means that central banks do not need to raise rates as much now to have a major impact on consumer spending, inflation, etc. This has pulled down the overall level of interest rates and bond yields in financial markets over the last thirty years. We have therefore seen over the last year, many bond yields up to ten years in the Eurozone actually turn negative. In addition, there has, at times, been an inversion of bond yields in the US whereby ten-year yields have fallen below shorter-term yields. In the past, this has been a precursor of a recession. The other side of this coin is that bond prices are elevated, as investors would be expected to be moving out of riskier assets i.e. shares, in anticipation of a downturn in corporate earnings and so selling out of equities. However, stock markets are also currently at high levels as some investors have focused on chasing returns in the context of dismal ultra-low interest rates on cash deposits.

During the first half of 2019-20 to 30 September, gilt yields plunged and caused a near halving of longer term PWLB rates to completely unprecedented historic low levels. (See paragraph 5.9 for comments on the increase in the PWLB rates margin over gilt yields of 100bps introduced on 9.10.19.) There is though, an expectation that financial markets have gone too far in their fears about the degree of the downturn in US and world growth. If, as expected, the US only suffers a mild downturn in growth, bond markets in the US are likely to sell off and that would be expected to put upward

pressure on bond yields, not only in the US, but also in the UK due to a correlation between US treasuries and UK gilts; at various times this correlation has been strong but at other times weak. However, forecasting the timing of this, and how strong the correlation is likely to be, is very difficult to forecast with any degree of confidence. Changes in UK Bank Rate will also impact on gilt yields.

One potential danger that may be lurking in investor minds is that Japan has become mired in a twenty-year bog of failing to get economic growth and inflation up off the floor, despite a combination of massive monetary and fiscal stimulus by both the central bank and government. Investors could be fretting that this condition might become contagious to other western economies.

Another danger is that unconventional monetary policy post 2008, (ultra-low interest rates plus quantitative easing), may end up doing more harm than good through prolonged use. Low interest rates have encouraged a debt-fuelled boom that now makes it harder for central banks to raise interest rates. Negative interest rates could damage the profitability of commercial banks and so impair their ability to lend and / or push them into riskier lending. Banks could also end up holding large amounts of their government's bonds and so create a potential doom loop. (A doom loop would occur where the credit rating of the debt of a nation was downgraded which would cause bond prices to fall, causing losses on debt portfolios held by banks and insurers, so reducing their capital and forcing them to sell bonds – which, in turn, would cause further falls in their prices etc.). In addition, the financial viability of pension funds could be damaged by low yields on holdings of bonds.

The overall longer run future trend is for gilt yields, and consequently PWLB rates, to rise, albeit gently. From time to time, gilt yields, and therefore PWLB rates, can be subject to exceptional levels of volatility due to geo-political, sovereign debt crisis, emerging market developments and sharp changes in investor sentiment. Such volatility could occur at any time during the forecast period.

In addition, PWLB rates are subject to ad hoc decisions by H.M. Treasury to change the margin over gilt yields charged in PWLB rates: such changes could be up or down. It is not clear that if gilt yields were to rise back up again by over 100bps within the next year or so, whether H M Treasury would remove the extra 100 bps margin implemented on 9.10.19.

Economic and interest rate forecasting remains difficult with so many influences weighing on UK gilt yields and PWLB rates. The above forecasts, (and MPC decisions), will be liable to further amendment depending on how economic data and developments in financial markets transpire over the next year. Geopolitical developments, especially in the EU, could also have a major impact. Forecasts for average investment earnings beyond the three-year time horizon will be heavily dependent on economic and political developments.

Investment and borrowing rates

Investment returns are likely to remain low during 2020/21 with little increase in the following two years. However, if major progress was made with an agreed Brexit, then there is upside potential for earnings.

Borrowing interest rates were on a major falling trend during the first half of 2019-20 but then jumped up by 100 bps on 9.10.19. The policy of avoiding new borrowing by running down spare cash balances has served local authorities well over the last few years. However, the unexpected increase of 100 bps in PWLB rates requires a major rethink of local authority treasury management strategy and risk management. The gap between longer term borrowing rates and investment rates has materially widened, and in the long term Bank Rate is not expected to rise above 2.5%, therefore the Councils will consider carefully the duration of longer term borrowing until such time as the extra 100 bps margin is removed.

While the Councils will not be able to avoid borrowing to finance new capital expenditure and to replace maturing debt, there will be a cost of carry, (the difference between higher borrowing costs and lower investment returns), to any new short or medium-term borrowing that causes a temporary increase in cash balances as this position will, most likely, incur a revenue cost.

5.4 Borrowing Strategy

The Councils are both currently maintaining an under-borrowed position. This means that the capital borrowing need (the Capital Financing Requirement), has not been fully funded with loan debt, as cash supporting the Councils' reserves, balances and cash flow has been used as a temporary measure. This strategy is prudent as investment returns are currently low and counterparty risk is still an issue that needs to be considered.

Against this background and the risks within the economic forecast, caution will be adopted with the 2020/21 treasury operations. The Chief Financial Officer will monitor interest rates in financial markets and adopt a pragmatic approach to changing circumstances:

- *if it was felt that there was a significant risk of a sharp FALL borrowing rates (e.g. due to a marked increase of risks around relapse into recession or of risks of deflation), then borrowing will be postponed.*
- *if it was felt that there was a significant risk of a much sharper RISE in borrowing rates than that currently forecast, perhaps arising from an acceleration in the rate of increase in central rates in the USA and UK, an increase in world economic activity or a sudden increase in inflation risks, then the portfolio position will be re-appraised. Most likely, fixed rate funding will be drawn whilst interest rates are lower than they are projected to be in the next few years.*

Any decisions will be reported to the appropriate decision making body at the next available opportunity.

- 5.5 Both Councils will refer in the first instance to the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) for sourcing their borrowing needs, given that they are eligible to access the PWLB “Certainty” rate of interest, being 20 basis points below the normal prevailing PWLB rates. However, borrowing from other sources, including other Local Authorities and the Local Government Association Municipal Bonds Agency, may from time to time offer options to borrow more cheaply than from the PWLB, and therefore will be considered.

Where appropriate, the Councils will investigate the possibility of using “ethical” or “green” borrowing options eg “green bonds.” Such borrowing is usually only available for significant amounts eg over £20m and takes time to arrange because the lender and the Council needs to undertake due diligence. However the new health hub may offer an opportunity to take advantage of this form of borrowing, if it is at lower rates than the PWLB.

Given the expected under borrowing position of the Councils, the borrowing strategy will give consideration to the most appropriate sources of funding from the following list:

- i) Internal borrowing, by running down cash balances and foregoing interest earned at historically low rates, as this is the cheapest form of borrowing;
 - ii) Weighing the short term advantage of internal borrowing against potential long term borrowing costs, in view of the overall forecast for long term borrowing rates to increase over the next few years;
 - iii) PWLB fixed rate loans for up to 20 years;
 - iv) Long term fixed rate market loans at rates significantly below PWLB rates for the equivalent maturity period (where available) and to maintaining an appropriate balance between PWLB, market debt and loans from other councils in the debt portfolio;
 - v) PWLB borrowing for periods under 5 years where rates are expected to be significantly lower than rates for longer periods. This offers a range of options for new borrowing which will spread debt maturities away from a concentration in longer dated debt.
 - vi) Short term loans from other Councils where appropriate;
 - vii) Longer term PWLB loans
 - viii) Other forms of borrowing where appropriate eg green bonds or the Municipal Bonds Agency where these offer better value than the PWLB
- 5.6 Preference will be given to PWLB borrowing by annuity and EIP loans instead of maturity loans, as this may result in lower interest payments over the life of the loans.

5.7 Policy on borrowing in advance of need

The Councils will not borrow more than or in advance of their needs purely in order to profit from the investment of the extra sums borrowed. Any decision to borrow in advance will be within forward approved Capital Financing Requirement estimates, and will be considered carefully to ensure that value for money can be demonstrated and that the Councils can ensure the security of such funds.

Risks associated with any borrowing in advance activity will be subject to prior appraisal and subsequent reporting through the mid-year or annual reporting mechanism.

5.8 Debt rescheduling

Rescheduling of current borrowing in our debt portfolio is unlikely to occur as the 100bps increase in PWLB rates only applied to new borrowing rates and not to premature debt repayment rates.

If rescheduling is done, it will be reported to the Councils at the earliest meeting following its action.

5.9 New financial institutions as a source of borrowing

Following the decision by the PWLB on 9 October 2019 to increase their margin over gilt yields by 100 bps to 180 basis points on loans lent to local authorities, consideration will also need to be given to sourcing funding at cheaper rates from the following:

- Local authorities (primarily shorter dated maturities)
- Financial institutions (primarily insurance companies and pension funds but also some banks, out of spot or forward dates)
- Municipal Bonds Agency (no issuance at present but there is potential)

The degree to which any of these options proves cheaper than PWLB Certainty Rate is still evolving at the time of writing but our advisors will keep us informed.

6. ANNUAL INVESTMENT POLICY AND STRATEGY

6.1 Investment Policy – Management of risk

6.1.1 The MHCLG and CIPFA have extended the meaning of ‘investments’ to include both financial and non-financial investments. This report deals solely with financial investments, (as managed by the treasury management team). The strategy and approach to managing risk for investing in non-financial investments, essentially the purchase of commercial property, is dealt with by the Commercial Property Investment Strategy which forms part of the Capital Strategy.

6.1.2 The Councils’ investment policy has regard to the following:

- MHCLG’s Guidance on Local Government Investments (“the Guidance”)

- CIPFA Treasury Management in Public Services Code of Practice and Cross Sectoral Guidance Notes 2017 (“the Code”)
- CIPFA Treasury Management Guidance Notes 2018

The Councils’ investment priorities will be security first, portfolio liquidity second and then yield, (return).

- 6.1.3 The Chief Financial Officer, under delegated powers, will undertake the most appropriate form of investments in keeping with the investment objectives, income and risk management requirements, and Prudential Indicators. As conditions in the financial markets remain uncertain, most of the proposed maximum limits for Specified and Unspecified Investments for 2020/21 are the same as for 2019/20. However the indicators will be revised to reflect the recent £5m loan by Worthing Borough Council to GB Met College. Over the forthcoming months, the Councils will consult the treasury advisors about the range of “ethical” and “green” investments that is developing. Counterparties will be asked to provide their “sustainability” or “climate change” policies to ensure that the Council invests funds appropriately.
- 6.1.4 Investment instruments identified for use in the financial year are listed in Appendix B under the ‘specified’ and ‘non-specified’ investments categories. Counterparty limits will be as set through the Councils’ treasury management practices.
- 6.1.5 The guidance from the MHCLG and CIPFA place a high priority on the management of risk. The Councils have adopted a prudent approach to managing risk and define risk appetite by the following means: -
- a) Minimum acceptable **credit criteria** are applied in order to generate a list of highly creditworthy counterparties. This also enables diversification and thus avoidance of concentration risk. The key ratings used to monitor counterparties are the short term and long-term ratings.
 - b) **Other information:** ratings will not be the sole determinant of the quality of an institution; it is important to continually assess and monitor the financial sector on both a micro and macro basis and in relation to the economic and political environments in which institutions operate. The assessment will also take account of information that reflects the opinion of the markets. To achieve this consideration the Councils will engage with the advisors to maintain a monitor on market pricing such as “**credit default swaps**” and overlay that information on top of the credit ratings.
 - c) **Other information sources** used will include the financial press, share price and other such information pertaining to the financial sector in order to establish the most robust scrutiny process on the suitability of potential investment counterparties.
 - d) The Councils have defined the list of **types of investment instruments** that the treasury management team is authorised to use. There are two lists in Appendix B under the categories of ‘specified’ and ‘non-specified’ investments.

- **Specified investments** are those with a high level of credit quality and subject to a maturity limit of one year.
 - **Non-specified investments** are those with less high credit quality, may be for periods in excess of one year, and/or are more complex instruments which require greater consideration by members and officers before being authorised for use. Once an investment is classed as non-specified, it remains non-specified all the way through to maturity ie an 18 month deposit would still be non-specified even if it has only 11 months left until maturity.
- e) **Lending limits**, (amounts and maturity), for each counterparty will be set through applying the matrix table in Appendix B.
 - f) **Transaction limits** are set for each type of investment in Appendix B.
 - g) The Councils will set a limit for the amount of its investments which are invested for **longer than 365 days**, (see paragraph 6.10).
 - h) Investments will only be placed with counterparties from countries with a specified minimum **sovereign rating** (see paragraph 6.5). The UK is excluded from this limit because it will be necessary to invest in UK banks and other institutions even if the sovereign rating is cut.
 - i) The Councils have engaged **external consultants**, (see paragraph 3.5), to provide expert advice on how to optimise an appropriate balance of security, liquidity and yield, given the risk appetite of the Councils in the context of the expected level of cash balances and need for liquidity throughout the year.
 - j) All investments will be denominated in **sterling**.
 - k) As a result of the change in accounting standards for 2019/20 under IFRS 9, the Councils will consider the implications of investment instruments which could result in an adverse movement in the value of the amount invested and resultant charges at the end of the year to the General Fund. (In November 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, [MHCLG], concluded a consultation for a temporary override to allow English local authorities time to adjust their portfolio of all pooled investments by announcing a statutory override to delay implementation of IFRS 9 for five years commencing from 1.4.18. Consequently any fluctuations in the value of the Councils' investments in the Local Authorities' Property Fund will not be taken through the general fund for the period of the override).

6.1.6 However, the Councils will also pursue value for money in treasury management and will monitor the yield from investment income against appropriate benchmarks for investment performance, (see paragraph 6.16). Regular monitoring of investment performance will be carried out during the year.

6.1.7 Changes in investment limits from last year

- a) Worthing Borough Council has added GB Met College to its list of investments.
- b) Both Councils intend to explore the options for “ethical” or “green” investments with the treasury advisors.
- c) The investment limit with other local authorities has been set at £5m per authority, to ensure that there is an appropriate spread of risk.
- d) The investment limit with AAA rated money market funds has been amended to £9m for Worthing for any period over 7 days. For Adur, investment in money market funds will now be at the discretion of the Chief Financial Officer, who will ensure that best value investment opportunities are maximised. The limit per fund of £3m remains the same.
- e) Deutsche Bank has been removed from the Specified Investments list.

6.2 Creditworthiness Policy

6.2.1 The primary principle governing the Councils’ joint treasury management service investment criteria is the security of investments, although the yield or return on the investment is also a key consideration. After this main principle, the service will ensure that:

- It maintains a policy covering the categories of investment types it will invest in, criteria for choosing investment counterparties with adequate security, and monitoring their security. This is set out in the specified and non-specified investment sections below; and
- It has sufficient liquidity in its investments. For this purpose it will set out procedures for determining the maximum periods for which funds may prudently be committed. These procedures also apply to the Councils’ prudential indicators covering the maximum principal sums invested.

6.2.2 The Chief Financial Officer will maintain a counterparty list in compliance with the following criteria and will revise the criteria and submit them to the Councils for approval as necessary. These criteria are separate to that which determines which types of investment instrument are either specified or non-specified as it provides an overall pool of counterparties considered high quality which the service may use, rather than defining what types of investment instruments are to be used.

6.2.3 Credit rating information is supplied by Link Asset Services, our treasury advisors, on all active counterparties that comply with our criteria. Any counterparty failing to meet the criteria would be omitted from the counterparty (dealing) list. Any rating changes, rating Watches (notification of a likely change), rating Outlooks (notification of the longer term bias outside the central rating view) are provided to officers almost immediately after they occur and this information is considered before dealing. For instance, a negative rating Watch applying to a counterparty at the minimum Council

criteria will be suspended from use, with all others being reviewed in light of market conditions.

- 6.2.4 The Link Asset Services' creditworthiness service uses a wider array of information other than just primary ratings. Furthermore, by using a risk weighted scoring system, it does not give undue preponderance to just one agency's ratings.
- 6.2.5 The result is a series of colour coded bands for counterparties indicating the relative creditworthiness of each as they are categorised by durational bands. These bands are used by the Councils to form a view of the duration for investments by each counterparty. The Councils are satisfied that this service gives a robust level of analysis for determining the security of its investments. It is also a service which the Councils would not be able to replicate using its own in-house resources.
- 6.2.6 Using Link's ratings service, potential counterparty ratings are monitored on a real time basis with knowledge of any changes notified electronically as the agencies notify modifications. The effect of a change in ratings may prompt the following responses:
- If a downgrade results in the counterparty/investment scheme no longer meeting the Councils' minimum criteria, its further use as a new investment will be withdrawn immediately.
 - In addition to the use of Credit Ratings the Councils will be advised by Link of movements in Credit Default Swaps and other market data on a weekly basis. Extreme market movements may result in downgrade of an institution or removal from the Councils' lending lists.
- 6.2.7 The Councils' officers recognise that ratings should not be the sole determinant of the quality of an institution and that it is important to continually assess and monitor the financial sector on both a micro and macro basis and in relation to the economic and political environments in which institutions operate. The assessment will also take account of information that reflects the opinion of the markets, the government support for banks, and the credit ratings of that government support.
- 6.2.8 Accordingly, the Councils may exercise discretion to deviate from Link's suggested durational bands for counterparties where circumstances warrant a more flexible approach being taken.

The Councils' Minimum Investment Creditworthiness Criteria

- 6.3 The minimum credit ratings criteria used by the Councils generally will be a short term rating (Fitch or equivalents) of F1, and long term rating A-. There may be occasions when the counterparty ratings from one or more of the three Ratings Agencies are marginally lower than the minimum requirements of F1 Short term, A- Long term (or equivalent). Where this arises, the counterparties to which the ratings apply may still be used with discretion, but in these instances consideration will be given to the whole range of topical market information available, not just ratings.

The Councils include the top five **building society** names in the specified investments. It is recognised that they may carry a lower credit rating than the Councils' other counterparties, therefore the lending limits for the building societies shall be £2m each, excepting that for Nationwide (the top building society) the lending limit shall be £4m.

6.4 **UK banks – ring fencing**

The largest UK banks, (those with more than £25bn of retail / Small and Medium-sized Enterprise (SME) deposits), are required, by UK law, to separate core retail banking services from their investment and international banking activities by 1st January 2019. This is known as “ring-fencing”. Whilst smaller banks with less than £25bn in deposits are exempt, they can choose to opt up. Several banks are very close to the threshold already and so may come into scope in the future regardless.

Ring-fencing is a regulatory initiative created in response to the global financial crisis. It mandates the separation of retail and SME deposits from investment banking, in order to improve the resilience and resolvability of banks by changing their structure. In general, simpler, activities offered from within a ring-fenced bank, (RFB), will be focused on lower risk, day-to-day core transactions, whilst more complex and “riskier” activities are required to be housed in a separate entity, a non-ring-fenced bank, (NRFB). This is intended to ensure that an entity's core activities are not adversely affected by the acts or omissions of other members of its group.

While the structure of the banks included within this process may have changed, the fundamentals of credit assessment have not. The Councils will continue to assess the new-formed entities in the same way that they do others and those with sufficiently high ratings, (and any other metrics considered), will be considered for investment purposes.

6.5 **Country Limits and Proposed Monitoring Arrangements**

Due care will be taken to consider the country, group and sector exposure of the Councils' investments.

The Councils have determined that they will only use approved counterparties from countries (other than the UK) with a minimum sovereign credit rating of AA- from Fitch Ratings (or equivalent from other agencies if Fitch does not provide one). The list of countries that qualify using these credit criteria as at the date of this report is reflected in the counterparty approved lending list shown at Appendix B. This list will be added to, or deducted from, by officers should ratings change, in accordance with this policy. No more than 25% of investments shall be placed in non-UK financial institutions for more than 7 days.

6.6 Although the Councils can control the foreign exposure for fixed term deposits via the choice of counterparties, the ability to do this for instant access Money Market Funds (MMFs) is more difficult, as the assets which comprise the

funds generally consist of loans to other financial institutions (UK and worldwide).

- 6.7 Recognising the present financial climate, and that any investment is only as good as the underlying assets, the Councils shall use a Money Market Fund Portal for placing and redeeming transactions. This will allow access to information on the underlying composition of the MMFs, including the geographic spread of the underlying assets.

Investment Strategy

6.8 In-house funds

Investments will be made with reference to the core balance and cash flow requirements and the outlook for short-term interest rates (i.e. rates for investments up to 12 months). Greater returns are usually obtainable by investing for longer periods. While most cash balances are required in order to manage the ups and downs of cash flow, where cash sums can be identified that could be invested for longer periods, the value to be obtained from longer term investments will be carefully assessed. For cash flow balances, the Councils will seek to use notice accounts, money market funds and short-dated deposits to benefit from the compounding of interest.

- If it is thought that Bank Rate is likely to rise significantly within the time horizon being considered, then consideration will be given to keeping most investments as being short term or variable.
- Conversely, if it is thought that Bank Rate is likely to fall within that time period, consideration will be given to locking in higher rates currently obtainable, for longer periods.

The Chief Financial Officer, under delegated powers, will undertake the most appropriate form of investments in keeping with the investment objectives, income and risk management requirements and Prudential Indicators. Decisions taken on the core investment portfolio will be reported to the meetings of the JGC and JSC in accordance with the reporting arrangements contained in the Treasury Management Practices Statement.

6.9 Investment returns expectations

On the assumption that the UK and EU agree a Brexit deal including the terms of trade by the end of 2020 or soon after, then Bank Rate is forecast to increase only slowly over the next few years to reach 1.00% by quarter 1 2023. Bank Rate forecasts for financial year ends (March) are:

- Q1 2021 0.75%
- Q1 2022 1.00%
- Q1 2023 1.25%

The suggested budgeted investment earnings rates for returns on investments placed for periods up to about three months during each financial year are as follows:

2019/20	0.75%
2020/21	0.75%
2021/22	1.00%
2022/23	1.25%
2023/24	1.50%
2024/25	1.75%
Later years	2.25%

The overall balance of risks to economic growth in the UK is probably to the downside due to the weight of all the uncertainties over Brexit, as well as a softening global economic picture.

The balance of risks to increases in Bank Rate and shorter term PWLB rates are broadly similarly to the downside.

In the event that a Brexit deal is agreed with the EU and approved by Parliament, the balance of risks to economic growth and to increases in Bank Rate is likely to change to the upside.

- 6.10 **Investment treasury indicator and limit** - total principal funds invested for greater than 365 days. These limits are set with regard to the Councils' liquidity requirements and to reduce the need for early sale of an investment, and are based on the availability of funds after each year-end.

The Councils are asked to approve the following treasury indicators and limits:

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

MAXIMUM PROPORTION OF PRINCIPAL SUMS INVESTED > 365 DAYS			
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Principal sums invested > 365 days	50%	50%	50%

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

MAXIMUM PROPORTION OF PRINCIPAL SUMS INVESTED > 365 DAYS			
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Principal sums invested > 365 days	50%	50%	50%

Both Councils are currently holding investments in the Local Authorities' Property Fund and other small bonds (£50k for Worthing and £25k for Adur) which are expected to be invested for more than 365 days.

- 6.11 In any sustained period of significant stress in the financial markets, the default position is for investments to be placed with The Debt Management Account Deposit Facility of the Debt Management Office (DMO) of the UK central government. The rates of interest are below equivalent money market rates, however, the returns are an acceptable trade-off for the guarantee that the Councils' capital is secure.

6.12 The Councils' proposed investment activity for placing cash deposits in 2020/21 will be to use:

- AAA-rated Money Market Funds with a Constant Net Asset Value (CNAV) or a Low Volatility Net Asset Value (LVNAV) under the new money market fund regulations
- other local authorities, parish councils etc.
- business reserve accounts and term deposits. These are primarily restricted to UK institutions that are rated at least A- long term.
- the top five building societies by asset size

Other Options for Longer Term Investments

6.13 To provide the Councils with options to enhance returns above those available for short term durations, it is proposed to retain the option to use the following for longer term investments, as an alternative to cash deposits:

- a) **Supranational bonds greater than 1 year to maturity** eg European Reconstruction and Development Bank
- b) **Gilt edged securities** with a maturity of greater than one year. These are Government bonds and so provide the highest security of interest and the repayment of principal on maturity. Similar to category (a) above, the value of the bond may rise or fall before maturity and losses may accrue if the bond is sold before maturity.
- c) **The Councils' own banker** if it fails to meet the basic credit criteria. In this instance balances will be minimised as far as is possible.
- d) **Building societies not meeting the basic security requirements under the specified investments.** The operation of some building societies does not require a credit rating, although in every other respect the security of the society would match similarly sized societies with ratings. The Council may use the top five building societies by asset size up to £2m, (£4m Nationwide).
- e) Any **bank or building society** that has a minimum long term credit rating of A- for deposits with a maturity of greater than one year (including forward deals in excess of one year from inception to repayment).
- f) Any **non-rated subsidiary** of a credit rated institution included in the specified investment category. These institutions will be included as an investment category subject to a guarantee from the parent company, and total exposure up to the limit applicable to the parent.
- g) **Registered Social Landlords** (Housing Associations) **and other public sector bodies** - subject to confirming that the Councils have appropriate powers, consideration will be given to lending to Registered Social Landlords and other public sector bodies. Such lending may either be as an investment for treasury management purposes, or for

the provision of “social policy or service investment”, that would not normally feature within the Treasury Management Strategy.

- h) **Property Investment Funds** for example the Local Authorities’ Property Fund. The Councils will consult the Treasury Management Advisors and undertake appropriate due diligence before investment of this type is undertaken. Some of these funds are deemed capital expenditure – the Councils will seek guidance on the status of any fund considered for investment.
- i) **Other local authorities**, parish councils etc.
- j) **Loan capital** in a body corporate.
- k) **Share capital in a body corporate** – *The use of these instruments will be deemed to be capital expenditure, and as such will be an application (spending) of capital resources. Revenue resources will not be invested in corporate bodies.*

(Note: For (j) and (k) above the Councils will seek further advice on the appropriateness and associated risks with investments in these categories as and when an opportunity presents itself).

6.14 **The accounting treatment** may differ from the underlying cash transactions arising from investment decisions made by the Councils. To ensure that the Councils are protected from any adverse revenue impact, which may arise from these differences, the accounting implications of new transactions will be reviewed before they are undertaken.

6.15 The Councils will not transact in any investment that may be deemed to constitute **capital expenditure** (e.g. Share Capital, or pooled investment funds other than Money Market Funds), without the resource implications being approved as part of the consideration of the Capital Programme or other appropriate Committee report.

6.16 **Investment risk benchmarking** – the Councils will subscribe to Link’s Investment Benchmarking Club to review the investment performance and risk of the portfolios.

6.17 **End of year investment report** – at the end of the financial year the Councils will report on investment activity as part of the Annual Treasury Report.

6.18 **Local Authorities’ Property Fund** – both Councils hold investments in the Fund (Adur DC - £3m and Worthing BC £1.5m). The treasury service receives regular reports and quarterly dividends. Representatives of the Fund are due to visit the Councils at the end of January to give a presentation on current and forecast performance.

7. OTHER MATTERS

- 7.1 **Balanced budget requirement** - the Councils comply with the provisions of S32 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to set a balanced budget.
- 7.2 **Worthing Leisure Trust** - the arrangements for establishing The Worthing Leisure Trust include provision for Worthing Council to provide the Trust with temporary cash flow advances (if required) up to a maximum of £500k to assist it in the early start-up years. Such advances as may be made shall be repayable as soon as practical and attract a rate of interest for the loan term of Bank Base Rate plus 5%.

8. ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

- 8.1 The Adur and Worthing Councils’ treasury management team provides treasury services to Mid Sussex District Council through a shared services arrangement (SSA). The SSA is provided under a Service Level Agreement that was renewed from 18th October 2019, and which defines the respective roles of the client and provider authorities for a period of three years.
- 8.2 Information and advice is supplied throughout the year by Link Asset Services Ltd, the professional consultants for the Councils’ shared treasury management service.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 This report has no quantifiable additional financial implications to those outlined above. Interest payable and interest receivable arising from treasury management operations, and annual revenue provisions for repayment of debt, form part of the revenue budget.

Finance Officer Date.

10. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The approval and adoption of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Annual Investment Strategy, Minimum Revenue Provision Policy and Prudential Indicators is required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003.

Legal Officer: Susan Sale Date: 16th January 2020

Background Papers

Joint Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy Report 2019/20 to 21/22 – Joint Governance Committee, 22 January 2019 and Joint Strategic Committee 31 January 2019

Annual Joint In-House Treasury Management Operations Report 1 April 2018 – 31 March 2019 for Adur District Council and Worthing Borough Council – Joint Governance Committee, 30 July 2019 and Joint Strategic Committee, 10 September 2019

Overall Budget Estimates 2020/201and Setting of 2020/21 Council Tax Report

Link Asset Services Ltd TMSS Template 2020/21

Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice and Cross Sectoral Guidance Notes (CIPFA, December 2017)

The Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (CIPFA, December 2017)

MHCLG Investment Guidance

Funding and Management Agreement with South Downs Leisure Trust

Officer Contact Details:-

Pamela Coppelman

Group Accountant (Strategic Finance)

Telephone: 01903 221236

Email: pamela.coppelman@adur-worthing.gov.uk

SUSTAINABILITY & RISK ASSESSMENT

1. ECONOMIC

The treasury management function ensures that the Councils have sufficient liquidity to finance their day to day operations. Borrowing is arranged as required to fund the capital programmes. Available funds are invested according to the specified criteria to ensure security of the funds, liquidity and, after these considerations, to maximise the rate of return.

2. SOCIAL

2.1 Social Value

Matter considered and no issues identified.

2.2 Equality Issues

Matter considered and no issues identified.

2.3 Community Safety Issues (Section 17)

Matter considered and no issues identified.

2.4 Human Rights Issues

Matter considered and no issues identified.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL

Matter considered and no issues identified.

4. GOVERNANCE

4.1 The Councils' Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy place the security of investments as foremost in considering all treasury management dealing. By so doing it contributes towards the Council priorities contained in Platforms for our Places.

4.2 The operation of the treasury management function is as approved by the Councils' Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy 2020/21 - 2022/23, submitted and approved before the commencement of the 2020/21 financial year.

4.3 In the current economic climate the security of investments is paramount, the management of which includes regular monitoring of the credit ratings and other incidental information relating to credit worthiness of the Councils' investment counterparties.

Appendix A

THE CAPITAL PRUDENTIAL AND TREASURY INDICATORS 2020/21 – 2022/23

- 1.1 The Councils' capital expenditure plans are the key driver of treasury management activity. The output of the capital expenditure plans is reflected in the prudential indicators, which are designed to assist members' overview and confirm capital expenditure plans.

Adur District Council

Adur Capital expenditure	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Non-HRA	10.041	9.719	10.200	3.116	2.794
HRA	2.993	6.593	16.768	13.537	11.870
Commercial activities	26.532	49.868	37.020	0.000	0.000
TOTAL	39.566	66.180	63.988	16.653	14.664

Worthing Borough Council

Worthing Capital expenditure	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Non-HRA	11.576	16.932	21.470	5.671	12.075
Commercial activities	26.697	50.304	47.999	0.000	0.000
TOTAL	38.273	67.236	69.469	5.671	12.075

1.2 Affordability prudential indicators

The previous sections cover the overall capital and control of borrowing prudential indicators, but within this framework prudential indicators are required to assess the affordability of the capital investment plans. These provide an indication of the impact of the capital investment plans on the Councils' overall finances. The Councils are asked to approve the following indicators:

Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream

This indicator identifies the trend in the cost of capital (borrowing and other long term obligation costs net of investment income) against the net revenue stream.

Adur District Council

Adur %	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
	%	%	%	%	%
Non-HRA	16.04	14.81	16.45	22.29	23.58
HRA	23.82	25.10	27.24	29.86	30.50
Commercial activities	(8.25)	(19.45)	(25.51)	(24.02)	(22.69)
TOTAL	31.61	20.46	18.18	28.13	31.39

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

Worthing %	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
	%	%	%	%	%
Non-HRA	4.84	3.62	2.53	4.89	6.39
Commercial activities	(2.43)	(10.64)	(19.09)	(17.32)	(16.41)
TOTAL	2.41	(7.02)	(16.56)	(12.43)	(10.02)

The estimates of financing costs include current commitments and the proposals in this budget report.

HRA Ratio

Adur	2018/19 Actual	2019/20 Estimate	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate
HRA debt £m	(59.581)	(59.908)	(71.327)	(80.046)	(87.599)
Number of HRA dwellings	2552	2540	2539	2560	2574
Debt per dwelling	£23.3k	£23.6k	£28.1k	£31.3k	£34.0k

1.3 Maturity structure of borrowing

These gross limits are set to reduce the Councils' exposure to large fixed rate sums falling due for refinancing, and are required for upper and lower limits. Neither Council has any variable rate borrowing.

The Councils are asked to approve the following treasury indicators and limits:

Adur District Council

Limits to maturity structure of fixed interest rate borrowing 2020/21		
	Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Under 12 months	0%	20%
12 months to 2 years	0%	25%
2 years to 5 years	0%	40%
5 years to 10 years	0%	70%
10 years to 20 years	0%	80%
20 years to 30 years	0%	60%
30 years to 40 years	0%	60%
40 years to 50 years	0%	45%

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

Limits to maturity structure of fixed interest rate borrowing 2020/21		
	Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Under 12 months	0%	35%
12 months to 2 years	0%	35%
2 years to 5 years	0%	75%
5 years to 10 years	0%	75%
10 years to 20 years	0%	75%
20 years to 30 years	0%	75%
30 years to 40 years	0%	75%
40 years to 50 years	0%	75%

TREASURY MANAGEMENT PRACTICE (TMP1) – CREDIT AND COUNTERPARTY RISK MANAGEMENT

The MHCLG issued Investment Guidance in 2018, and this forms the structure of the Councils' policy below. These guidelines do not apply to either trust funds or pension funds which operate under a different regulatory regime.

The key intention of the Guidance is to maintain the current requirement for councils to invest prudently, and that priority is given to security and liquidity before yield. In order to facilitate this objective the guidance requires the Councils to have regard to the CIPFA publication Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice and Cross-Sectoral Guidance Notes, which will apply to all investment activity. In accordance with the Code, the Chief Financial Officer has produced its treasury management practices (TMPs). This part, TMP 1(1), covering investment counterparty policy requires approval each year.

Annual investment strategy - The key requirements of both the Code and the investment guidance are to set an annual investment strategy, as part of the annual treasury strategy for the following year, covering the identification and approval of following:

- The strategy guidelines for choosing and placing investments, particularly non-specified investments;
- The principles to be used to determine the maximum periods for which funds can be committed;
- Specified investments that the Councils will use. These are high security (i.e. high credit rating, although this is defined by the Councils, and no guidelines are given), and high liquidity investments in sterling and with a maturity of no more than a year;
- Non-specified investments, clarifying the greater risk implications, identifying the general types of investment that may be used and a limit to the overall amount of various categories that can be held at any time.

The investment policy proposed for the Councils is:

Strategy guidelines – The main strategy guidelines are contained in the body of the treasury strategy statement.

SPECIFIED AND NON SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS

Specified Investments identified for use by the Councils

These investments are sterling investments of not more than one-year maturity, or those which could be for a longer period but where the Councils have the right to be repaid within 12 months if they wish. These are considered low risk assets where the possibility of loss of principal or investment income is small. These would include sterling investments which would not be defined as capital expenditure with:

- The UK Government (such as the Debt Management Account deposit facility, UK treasury bills or a gilt* with less than one year to maturity)
- Supranational bonds of less than one year's duration*
- A local authority, housing association, parish council or community council
- Pooled investment vehicles (such as money market funds) that have been awarded a AAA rating by Standard and Poor's, Moody's and/or Fitch rating agencies
- A body that is considered of a high credit quality (such as a bank or building society). This covers bodies with a minimum Short Term rating of F1 (or the equivalent) as rated by Standard and Poor's, Moody's and/or Fitch rating agencies.
- *Certificates of deposit with banks and building societies

** Investments in these instruments will be on advice from the Councils' treasury advisor.*

Within these bodies, and in accordance with the Code, the Councils have set additional criteria to set the time and amount of monies which will be invested in these bodies - see Annexes 1 and 2.

Non-Specified Investments identified for use by the Councils

These are any other type of investment (ie not defined as specified above). The identification and rationale supporting the selection of these other investments and the maximum limits to be applied are set out in Annexes 1 and 2.

For credit rated counterparties, the minimum criteria, excepting for the Councils' own banker and the specified building societies, (see below) will be the short-term / long-term ratings assigned by various agencies which may include Moody's Investors Services, Standard and Poor's, Fitch Ratings, being:

Long-term investments (over 365 days): minimum: A- (Fitch) or equivalent

Or

Short-term investments (365 days or less): minimum: F1 (Fitch) or equivalent

For all investments the Councils will also take into account information on corporate developments of, and market sentiment towards, investment counterparties.

Where appropriate the Ring Fenced entities of banks will be used.

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL - SPECIFIED AND NON SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS

Specified Investments identified for use by the Council

New specified investments will be made within the following limits:

Instrument	Country and sovereign rating	Counterparty	Max'm exposure limit £m and/or %
Term Deposits	UK	DMADF, DMO	No limit
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Other UK Local Authorities	£5m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Santander UK	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Bank of Scotland/ Lloyds (RFB)	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Barclays (RFB)	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Clydesdale	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	HSBC (RFB)	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Close Brothers Ltd	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Royal Bank of Scotland/Nat West Group (RFB)	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	Australia - AAA	National Australia Bank Ltd	£3m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	US - AAA	JP Morgan Chase Bank NA	£3m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Handelsbanken plc	£3m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Goldman Sachs International Bank	£3m
Gilts	UK	Debt Management Office (DMO)	£3m or 25% of funds

Instrument	Country and sovereign rating	Counterparty	Max'm exposure limit £m and/or %
Bonds	EU	European Investment Bank/ Council of Europe	£3m or 25% of funds
AAA rated Money Market Funds		Constant Net Asset Value or LVNAV MMFs	to manage liquidity, maximum £3m per fund
Other MMFs and CIS	UK	Collective Investment Schemes	25%
Term Deposits	UK	Nationwide BS	£4m
Term Deposits	UK	Yorkshire BS	£2m
Term Deposits	UK	Coventry BS	£2m
Term Deposits	UK	Skipton BS	£2m
Term Deposits	UK	Leeds BS	£2m
Share Capital	n/a	West Sussex Credit Union	£0.025m deferred shares
Share Capital	n/a	Local Capital Finance Co (Municipal Bonds Agency)	£0.05m

NB Any existing deposits outside of the current criteria will be reinvested with the above criteria on maturity.

NB No more than 25% of funds shall be invested in Non-UK financial institutions whether by term deposits, call accounts or Money Market Funds, or any combination thereof, except that this limit may be breached for liquidity purposes for up to 1 week at any time.

NB Investments in AAA rated Money Market Funds are to be used for liquidity purposes - funds should be invested to achieve higher returns wherever possible.

APPENDIX B - ANNEX 1

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL NON-SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS DETERMINED FOR USE BY THE COUNCIL:

Having considered the rationale and risk associated with Non-Specified Investments, the following have been determined for the Council's use.

	In-house use	Use by Fund Managers	Maximum Maturity	Maximum % of portfolio or £m	Capital Expenditure ?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☒ Deposits with banks and building societies ☒ Certificates of deposit with banks and building societies ☒ Deposits with Local Authorities ☒ The UK Government 	√	√	5 years	The higher of £8m or 50% of funds, maximum of £2m per institution	No
<p>Gilts and Bonds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☒ Gilts ☒ Bonds issued by multilateral development banks ☒ Bonds issued by financial institutions guaranteed by the UK government ☒ Sterling denominated bonds by non-UK sovereign governments 	√	√	5 years	The higher of £3m or 25% of funds	No
<p>Money Market Funds and Collective Investment Schemes (pooled funds which meet the definition of a collective investment scheme as defined in SI 2004 No. 534 and SI 2007, No. 573), but which are not credit rated.</p>	√ (on advice from treasury advisor)	√	These funds do not have a defined maturity date.	The higher of £5m or 30% of funds, maximum of £3m per fund	No
<p>Government guaranteed bonds and debt instruments (e.g. floating rate notes) issued by corporate bodies</p>	√ (on advice from treasury advisor)	√	5 years	The higher of £2m or 10% of funds	Yes

APPENDIX B - ANNEX 1

**ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL
NON-SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS DETERMINED FOR USE BY THE COUNCIL:**

	In-house use	Use by Fund Managers	Maximum Maturity	Maximum % of portfolio or £m	Capital Expenditure?
Non-guaranteed bonds and debt instruments (e.g. floating rate notes) issued by corporate bodies	√ (on advice from treasury advisor)	√	5 years	The higher of £2m or 10% of funds	Yes
Property Funds approved by HM Treasury and operated by managers regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority, such as the Local Authorities' Property Fund	√ (on advice from treasury advisor)	√	These funds do not have a defined maturity date	£3m	To be confirmed
Collective Investment Schemes (pooled funds) which do not meet the definition of collective investment schemes in SI 2004 No. 534 or SI 2007, No. 573.	√ (on advice from treasury advisor)	√	These funds do not have a defined maturity date	The higher of £2m or 20% of funds	Yes

1. In determining the period to maturity of an investment, the investment should be regarded as commencing on the date of the commitment of the investment rather than the date on which funds are paid over to the counterparty.
2. The use of the above instruments by the Council's fund manager(s) will be by reference to the fund guidelines contained in the agreement between the Council and the individual manager.
3. The Council's own banker may also be used if it fails to meet the basic credit criteria. In this instance balances will be minimised as far as possible.

APPENDIX B - ANNEX 2

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL SPECIFIED AND NON SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS

Specified Investments identified for use by the Council

New specified investments will be made within the following limits:

Instrument	Country and sovereign rating	Counterparty	Max'm exposure limit £m and/or %
Term Deposits	UK	DMADF, DMO	No limit
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Other UK Local Authorities	£5m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Santander UK	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Bank of Scotland/ Lloyds (RFB)	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Barclays (RFB)	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Clydesdale	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	HSBC (RFB)	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Close Brothers Ltd	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Royal Bank of Scotland/Nat West Group (RFB)	£4m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	Australia - AAA	National Australia Bank Ltd	£3m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	US - AAA	JP Morgan Chase Bank NA	£3m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Handelsbanken plc	£3m
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Goldman Sachs International Bank	£3m
Gilts	UK	Debt Management Office (DMO)	£3m or 25% of funds

Instrument	Country and sovereign rating	Counterparty	Max'm exposure limit £m and/or %
Bonds	EU	European Investment Bank/ Council of Europe	£3m or 25% of funds
AAA rated Money Market Funds		Constant Net Asset Value or LVNAV MMFs	£9m (the limit may be exceeded for up to 7 days), maximum £3m per fund
Other MMFs and CIS	UK	Collective Investment Schemes	25%
Term Deposits	UK	Nationwide BS	£4m
Term Deposits	UK	Yorkshire BS	£2m
Term Deposits	UK	Coventry BS	£2m
Term Deposits	UK	Skipton BS	£2m
Term Deposits	UK	Leeds BS	£2m
*Term Deposits	UK	Worthing Homes (10 year loan)	£10m
*Term Deposits	UK	GB Met (20 year loan)	£5m
Share Capital	n/a	West Sussex Credit Union	£0.05m deferred shares
Share Capital	n/a	Local Capital Finance Co (Municipal Bonds Agency)	£0.05m
Temporary Loans	n/a	Worthing Leisure Trust	£0.5m

NB Any existing deposits outside of the current criteria will be reinvested with the above criteria on maturity.

NB No more than 25% of funds shall be invested in Non-UK financial institutions whether by term deposits, call accounts or Money Market Funds, or any combination thereof, except that this limits may be breached for liquidity purposes for up to 1 week at any time.

* These loans are for more than 1 year, therefore are "unspecified", but are included here as they have been approved by Council.

APPENDIX B - ANNEX 2

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL NON-SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS DETERMINED FOR USE BY THE COUNCIL:

Having considered the rationale and risk associated with Non-Specified Investments, the following have been determined for the Council's use.

	In-house use	Use by Fund Managers	Maximum Maturity	Maximum % of portfolio or £m	Capital Expenditure?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Deposits with banks and building societies ☞ Certificates of deposit with banks and building societies ☞ Deposits with Local Authorities ☞ The UK Government 	√	√	5 years	The higher of £8m or 50% of funds, maximum of £2m per institution	No
<p>Gilts and Bonds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Gilts ☞ Bonds issued by multilateral development banks ☞ Bonds issued by financial institutions guaranteed by the UK government ☞ Sterling denominated bonds by non-UK sovereign governments 	√	√	5 years	The higher of £3m or 25% of funds	No
<p>Money Market Funds and Collective Investment Schemes (pooled funds which meet the definition of a collective investment scheme as defined in SI 2004 No. 534 and SI 2007, No. 573), but which are not credit rated.</p>	√ (on advice from treasury advisor)	√	These funds do not have a defined maturity date.	The higher of £5m or 30% of funds, maximum of £3m per fund	No
<p>Government guaranteed bonds and debt instruments (e.g. floating rate notes) issued by corporate bodies</p>	√ (on advice from treasury advisor)	√	5 years	The higher of £2m or 10% of funds	Yes

APPENDIX B- ANNEX 2

**WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL
NON-SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS DETERMINED FOR USE BY THE COUNCIL:**

	In-house use	Use by Fund Managers	Maximum Maturity	Maximum % of portfolio or £m	Capital Expenditure?
Non-guaranteed bonds and debt instruments (e.g. floating rate notes) issued by corporate bodies	√ (on advice from treasury advisor)	√	5 years	The higher of £2m or 10% of funds	Yes
Property Funds approved by HM Treasury and operated by managers regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority, such as the Local Authorities' Property Fund	√ (on advice from treasury advisor)	√	These funds do not have a defined maturity date	£3m	To be confirmed
Collective Investment Schemes (pooled funds) which do not meet the definition of collective investment schemes in SI 2004 No. 534 or SI 2007, No. 573.	√ (on advice from treasury advisor)	√	These funds do not have a defined maturity date	The higher of £2m or 20% of funds	Yes

1. In determining the period to maturity of an investment, the investment should be regarded as commencing on the date of the commitment of the investment rather than the date on which funds are paid over to the counterparty.
2. The use of the above instruments by the Council's fund manager(s) will be by reference to the fund guidelines contained in the agreement between the Council and the individual manager.
3. The Council's own banker may also be used if it fails to meet the basic credit criteria. In this instance balances will be minimised as far as possible.

**COUNTERPARTIES WHERE THE COUNCILS HAVE OPTED UP TO
PROFESSIONAL INVESTOR STATUS**

(i) **Money Market Funds**

Invesco
Federated Investors
CCLA
Black Rock

(ii) **Building Societies**

Skipton Building Society
Coventry Building Society
Leeds Building Society

(iii) **Brokers**

BGC (Sterling)
Tradition
ICAP
Imperial

(iv) **Other**

ICD (Portal used for money market fund investments)
Link Asset Services

These arrangements will be regularly reviewed as appropriate.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT SCHEME OF DELEGATION

(i) Full Council

- receiving and reviewing reports on treasury management policies, practices and activities
- approval of annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy
- approval of MRP Statement

(ii) Joint Strategic Committee

- approval of/amendments to the organisation's adopted clauses, treasury management policy statement and treasury management practices
- budget consideration and approval
- approval of the division of responsibilities
- receiving and reviewing regular monitoring reports and acting on recommendations
- approving the selection of external service providers and agreeing terms of appointment.

(iii) Joint Governance Committee

Receiving and reviewing the following, and making recommendations to the Joint Strategic Committee

- regular monitoring reports on compliance with the Treasury Management Strategy, practices and procedures.

(iv) The S151 (responsible) officer

- recommending clauses, treasury management policy/practices for approval, reviewing the same regularly, and monitoring compliance
- submitting regular treasury management policy reports
- submitting budgets and budget variations
- receiving and reviewing management information reports
- reviewing the performance of the treasury management function
- ensuring the adequacy of treasury management resources and skills, and the effective division of responsibilities within the treasury management function
- ensuring the adequacy of internal audit, and liaising with external audit
- recommending the appointment of external service providers.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT SCHEME OF DELEGATION

The revised CIPFA Treasury Management and Prudential Codes have extended the functions of the S151 role in respect of non-financial investments

- preparation of a capital strategy to include capital expenditure, capital financing, non-financial investments and treasury management
- ensuring that the capital strategy is prudent, sustainable and affordable in the long term and provides value for money
- ensuring that due diligence has been carried out on all treasury and non-financial investments and is in accordance with the risk appetite of the authorities
- ensuring that the authority has appropriate legal powers to undertake expenditure on non-financial assets and their financing
- ensuring the proportionality of all investments so that the authority does not undertake a level of investing which exposes the authority to an excessive level of risk compared to its financial resources
- ensuring that an adequate governance process is in place for the approval, monitoring and ongoing risk management of all non-financial investments and long term liabilities
- provision to members of a schedule of all non-treasury investments including material investments in subsidiaries, joint ventures, loans and financial guarantees
- ensuring that members are adequately informed and understand the risk exposures taken on by an authority
- ensuring that the authority has adequate expertise, either in house or externally provided, to carry out the above
- creation of Treasury Management Practices which specifically deal with how non treasury investments will be carried out and managed

ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

UK. Brexit. 2019 has been a year of upheaval on the political front as Theresa May resigned as Prime Minister to be replaced by Boris Johnson on a platform of the UK leaving the EU on 31 October 2019, with or without a deal. However, MPs blocked leaving on that date and the EU agreed an extension to 31 January 2020. In late October, MPs approved an outline of a Brexit deal to enable the UK to leave the EU on 31 January. Now that the Conservative Government has gained a large overall majority in the general election on 12 December, this outline deal will be passed by Parliament by that date. However, there will still be much uncertainty as the detail of a trade deal will need to be negotiated by the current end of the transition period in December 2020, which the Prime Minister has pledged he will not extend. This could prove to be an unrealistically short timetable for such major negotiations that leaves open two possibilities; one, the need for an extension of negotiations, probably two years, or, a no deal Brexit in December 2020.

GDP growth has taken a hit from Brexit uncertainty during 2019; quarter three 2019 surprised on the upside by coming in at +0.4% q/q, +1.1% y/y. However, the peak of Brexit uncertainty during the final quarter appears to have suppressed quarterly growth to probably around zero. The economy is likely to tread water in 2020, with tepid growth around about 1% until there is more certainty after the trade deal deadline is passed.

While the Bank of England went through the routine of producing another **quarterly Inflation Report**, (now renamed the Monetary Policy Report), on 7 November, it is very questionable how much all the writing and numbers were worth when faced with the uncertainties of where the UK will be after the general election. The Bank made a change in their Brexit assumptions to now include a deal being eventually passed. Possibly the biggest message that was worth taking note of from the Monetary Policy Report, was an increase in concerns among MPC members around weak global economic growth and the potential for Brexit uncertainties to become entrenched and so delay UK economic recovery. Consequently, the MPC voted 7-2 to maintain Bank Rate at 0.75% but two members were sufficiently concerned to vote for an immediate Bank Rate cut to 0.5%. The MPC warned that if global growth does not pick up or Brexit uncertainties intensify, then a rate cut was now more likely. Conversely, if risks do recede, then a more rapid recovery of growth will require gradual and limited rate rises. The speed of recovery will depend on the extent to which uncertainty dissipates over the final terms for trade between the UK and EU and by how much global growth rates pick up. The Bank revised its inflation forecasts down – to 1.25% in 2019, 1.5% in 2020, and 2.0% in 2021; hence, the MPC views inflation as causing little concern in the near future.

The MPC meeting of 19 December repeated the previous month's vote of 7-2 to keep Bank Rate on hold. Their key view was that there was currently 'no evidence about the extent to which policy uncertainties among companies and households had declined' i.e. they were going to sit on their hands and see how the economy goes in the next few months. The two members who voted for a cut were concerned that the labour market was faltering. On the other hand, there was a clear warning in the minutes that the MPC were concerned that domestic "unit labour costs have continued to grow at rates above those consistent with meeting the inflation target in the medium term".

If economic growth were to weaken considerably, the MPC has relatively little room to make a big impact with Bank Rate still only at 0.75%. It would therefore, probably suggest that it would be up to the Chancellor to provide help to support growth by way of a **fiscal boost** by e.g. tax cuts, increases in the annual expenditure budgets of government departments and services and expenditure on infrastructure projects, to boost the economy. The Government

has already made moves in this direction and it made significant promises in its election manifesto to increase government spending by up to £20bn p.a., (this would add about 1% to GDP growth rates), by investing primarily in infrastructure. This is likely to be announced in the next Budget, probably in February 2020. The Chancellor has also amended the fiscal rules in November to allow for an increase in government expenditure.

As for **inflation** itself, CPI has been hovering around the Bank of England's target of 2% during 2019, but fell again in both October and November to a three-year low of 1.5%. It is likely to remain close to or under 2% over the next two years and so it does not pose any immediate concern to the MPC at the current time. However, if there was a hard or no deal Brexit, inflation could rise towards 4%, primarily because of imported inflation on the back of a weakening pound.

With regard to the **labour market**, growth in numbers employed has been quite resilient through 2019 until the three months to September where it fell by 58,000. However, there was an encouraging pick up again in the three months to October to growth of 24,000 which showed that the labour market was not about to head into a major downturn. The unemployment rate held steady at a 44 year low of 3.8% on the Independent Labour Organisation measure in October. Wage inflation has been steadily falling from a high point of 3.9% in July to 3.5% in October (3 month average regular pay, excluding bonuses). This meant that in real terms, (i.e. wage rates higher than CPI inflation), earnings grew by about 2.0%. As the UK economy is very much services sector driven, an increase in household spending power is likely to feed through into providing some support to the overall rate of economic growth in the coming months. The other message from the fall in wage growth is that employers are beginning to find it easier to hire suitable staff, indicating that supply pressure in the labour market is easing.

USA. President Trump's massive easing of fiscal policy in 2018 fuelled a temporary boost in consumption in that year which generated an upturn in the rate of growth to a robust 2.9% y/y. Growth in 2019 has been falling after a strong start in quarter 1 at 3.1%, (annualised rate), to 2.0% in quarter 2 and then 2.1% in quarter 3. The economy looks likely to have maintained a growth rate similar to quarter 3 into quarter 4; fears of a recession have largely dissipated. The strong growth in employment numbers during 2018 has weakened during 2019, indicating that the economy had been cooling, while inflationary pressures were also weakening. However; CPI inflation rose from 1.8% to 2.1% in November, a one year high, but this was singularly caused by a rise in gasoline prices.

The Fed finished its series of increases in rates to 2.25 – 2.50% in December 2018. In July 2019, it cut rates by 0.25% as a 'midterm adjustment' but flagged up that this was not intended to be seen as the start of a series of cuts to ward off a downturn in growth. It also ended its programme of quantitative tightening in August, (reducing its holdings of treasuries etc). It then cut rates by 0.25% again in September and by another 0.25% in its October meeting to 1.50 – 1.75%.. At its September meeting it also said it was going to start buying Treasuries again, although this was not to be seen as a resumption of quantitative easing but rather an exercise to relieve liquidity pressures in the repo market. Despite those protestations, this still means that the Fed is again expanding its balance sheet holdings of government debt. In the first month, it will buy \$60bn, whereas it had been reducing its balance sheet by \$50bn per month during 2019. As it will be buying only short-term (under 12 months) Treasury bills, it is technically correct that this is not quantitative easing (which is purchase of long term debt). The Fed left rates unchanged in December. However, the accompanying statement was more optimistic about the the future course of the economy so this would indicate that further cuts are unlikely.

Investor confidence has been badly rattled by the progressive ramping up of increases in tariffs President Trump has made on Chinese imports and China has responded with

increases in tariffs on American imports. This **trade war** is seen as depressing US, Chinese and world growth. In the EU, it is also particularly impacting Germany as exports of goods and services are equivalent to 46% of total GDP. It will also impact developing countries dependent on exporting commodities to China. However, in November / December, progress has been made on agreeing a phase one deal between the US and China to roll back some of the tariffs; this gives some hope of resolving this dispute.

EUROZONE. Growth has been slowing from +1.8 % during 2018 to around half of that in 2019. Growth was +0.4% q/q (+1.2% y/y) in quarter 1, +0.2% q/q (+1.2% y/y) in quarter 2 and then +0.2% q/q, +1.1% in quarter 3; there appears to be little upside potential in the near future. German GDP growth has been struggling to stay in positive territory in 2019 and fell by -0.1% in quarter 2; industrial production was down 4% y/y in June with car production down 10% y/y. Germany would be particularly vulnerable to a no deal Brexit depressing exports further and if President Trump imposes tariffs on EU produced cars.

The European Central Bank (ECB) ended its programme of quantitative easing purchases of debt in December 2018, which then meant that the central banks in the US, UK and EU had all ended the phase of post financial crisis expansion of liquidity supporting world financial markets by quantitative easing purchases of debt. However, the downturn in EZ growth in the second half of 2018 and into 2019, together with inflation falling well under the upper limit of its target range of 0 to 2%, (but it aims to keep it near to 2%), has prompted the ECB to take new measures to stimulate growth. At its March meeting it said that it expected to leave interest rates at their present levels “at least through the end of 2019”, but that was of little help to boosting growth in the near term. Consequently, it announced a third round of TLTROs; this provides banks with cheap borrowing every three months from September 2019 until March 2021 that means that, although they will have only a two-year maturity, the Bank was making funds available until 2023, two years later than under its previous policy. As with the last round, the new TLTROs will include an incentive to encourage bank lending, and they will be capped at 30% of a bank’s eligible loans. However, since then, the downturn in EZ and world growth has gathered momentum; at its meeting on 12 September, it cut its deposit rate further into negative territory, from -0.4% to -0.5%, and announced a resumption of quantitative easing purchases of debt for an unlimited period; (at its October meeting it said this would start in November at €20bn per month - a relatively small amount compared to the previous buying programme). It also increased the maturity of the third round of TLTROs from two to three years. However, it is doubtful whether this loosening of monetary policy will have much impact on growth and, unsurprisingly, the ECB stated that governments will need to help stimulate growth by ‘growth friendly’ fiscal policy.

There were no policy changes in the December meeting which was chaired for the first time by the new President of the ECB, Christine Lagarde. However, the outlook continued to be down beat about the economy; this makes it likely there will be further monetary policy stimulus to come in 2020. She did also announce a thorough review of how the ECB conducts monetary policy, including the price stability target. This review is likely to take all of 2020.

On the political front, Austria, Spain and Italy have been in the throes of forming **coalition governments** with some unlikely combinations of parties i.e. this raises questions around their likely endurance. The latest results of German state elections has put further pressure on the frail German CDU/SDP coalition government and on the current leadership of the CDU. The results of the Spanish general election in November have not helped the prospects of forming a stable coalition.

CHINA. Economic growth has been weakening over successive years, despite repeated rounds of central bank stimulus; medium term risks are increasing. Major progress still needs to be made to eliminate excess industrial capacity and the stock of unsold property, and to

address the level of non-performing loans in the banking and shadow banking systems. In addition, there still needs to be a greater switch from investment in industrial capacity, property construction and infrastructure to consumer goods production.

JAPAN. has been struggling to stimulate consistent significant GDP growth and to get inflation up to its target of 2%, despite huge monetary and fiscal stimulus. It is also making little progress on fundamental reform of the economy.

WORLD GROWTH. Until recent years, world growth has been boosted by increasing globalisation i.e. countries specialising in producing goods and commodities in which they have an economic advantage and which they then trade with the rest of the world. This has boosted worldwide productivity and growth, and, by lowering costs, has also depressed inflation. However, the rise of China as an economic superpower over the last thirty years, which now accounts for nearly 20% of total world GDP, has unbalanced the world economy. The Chinese government has targeted achieving major world positions in specific key sectors and products, especially high tech areas and production of rare earth minerals used in high tech products. It is achieving this by massive financial support, (i.e. subsidies), to state owned firms, government directions to other firms, technology theft, restrictions on market access by foreign firms and informal targets for the domestic market share of Chinese producers in the selected sectors. This is regarded as being unfair competition that is putting western firms at an unfair disadvantage or even putting some out of business. It is also regarded with suspicion on the political front as China is an authoritarian country that is not averse to using economic and military power for political advantage. The current trade war between the US and China therefore needs to be seen against that backdrop. It is, therefore, likely that we are heading into a period where there will be a reversal of world globalisation and a decoupling of western countries from dependence on China to supply products. This is likely to produce a backdrop in the coming years of weak global growth and so weak inflation. **Central banks are, therefore, likely to come under more pressure to support growth by looser monetary policy measures and this will militate against central banks increasing interest rates.**

The trade war between the US and China is a major concern to financial markets due to the synchronised general weakening of growth in the major economies of the world, compounded by fears that there could even be a recession looming up in the US, though this is probably overblown. These concerns resulted in government bond yields in the developed world falling significantly during 2019. If there were a major worldwide downturn in growth, central banks in most of the major economies will have limited ammunition available, in terms of monetary policy measures, when rates are already very low in most countries, (apart from the US). There are also concerns about how much distortion of financial markets has already occurred with the current levels of quantitative easing purchases of debt by central banks and the use of negative central bank rates in some countries. The latest PMI survey statistics of economic health for the US, UK, EU and China have all been predicting a downturn in growth; this confirms investor sentiment that the outlook for growth during the year ahead is weak.

INTEREST RATE FORECASTS

The interest rate forecasts provided by Link Asset Services in paragraph 3.3 are **predicated on an assumption of an agreement being reached on Brexit between the UK and the EU.** On this basis, while GDP growth is likely to be subdued in 2019 and 2020 due to all the uncertainties around Brexit depressing consumer and business confidence, an agreement on the detailed terms of a trade deal is likely to lead to a boost to the rate of growth in subsequent years which could, in turn, increase inflationary pressures in the economy and so cause the Bank of England to resume a series of gentle increases in Bank Rate. Just how fast, and how far, those increases will occur and rise to, will be data dependent. The

forecasts in this report assume a modest recovery in the rate and timing of stronger growth and in the corresponding response by the Bank in raising rates.

- In the event of an **orderly non-agreement exit in December 2020**, it is likely that the Bank of England would take action to cut Bank Rate from 0.75% in order to help economic growth deal with the adverse effects of this situation. This is also likely to cause short to medium term gilt yields to fall.
- If there was a **disorderly Brexit**, then any cut in Bank Rate would be likely to last for a longer period and also depress short and medium gilt yields correspondingly. Quantitative easing could also be restarted by the Bank of England. It is also possible that the government could act to protect economic growth by implementing fiscal stimulus.

The balance of risks to the UK

- The overall balance of risks to economic growth in the UK is probably even, but dependent on a successful outcome of negotiations on a trade deal.
- The balance of risks to increases in Bank Rate and shorter term PWLB rates are broadly similarly to the downside.
- In the event that a Brexit deal was agreed with the EU and approved by Parliament, the balance of risks to economic growth and to increases in Bank Rate is likely to change to the upside.

One risk that is both an upside and downside risk, is that all central banks are now working in very different economic conditions than before the 2008 financial crash as there has been a major increase in consumer and other debt due to the exceptionally low levels of borrowing rates that have prevailed since 2008. This means that the neutral rate of interest in an economy, (i.e. the rate that is neither expansionary nor deflationary), is difficult to determine definitively in this new environment, although central banks have made statements that they expect it to be much lower than before 2008. Central banks could therefore either over or under do increases in central interest rates.

Downside risks to current forecasts for UK gilt yields and PWLB rates currently include:

- **Brexit** – if it were to cause significant economic disruption and a major downturn in the rate of growth.
- **Bank of England** takes action too quickly, or too far, over the next three years to raise Bank Rate and causes UK economic growth, and increases in inflation, to be weaker than we currently anticipate.
- **A resurgence of the Eurozone sovereign debt crisis.** In 2018, Italy was a major concern due to having a populist coalition government which made a lot of anti-austerity and anti-EU noise. However, in September 2019 there was a major change in the coalition governing Italy which has brought to power a much more EU friendly government; this has eased the pressure on Italian bonds. Only time will tell whether this new coalition based on an unlikely alliance of two very different parties will endure.
- Weak capitalisation of some **European banks**, particularly Italian banks.
- **German minority government.** In the German general election of September 2017, Angela Merkel's CDU party was left in a vulnerable minority position dependent on the fractious support of the SPD party, as a result of the rise in popularity of the

anti-immigration AfD party. The CDU has done badly in recent state elections but the SPD has done particularly badly and this has raised a major question mark over continuing to support the CDU. Angela Merkel has stepped down from being the CDU party leader but she intends to remain as Chancellor until 2021.

- **Other minority EU governments.** Austria, Finland, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Netherlands and Belgium also have vulnerable minority governments dependent on coalitions which could prove fragile.
- **Austria, the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary** now form a strongly anti-immigration bloc within the EU. There has also been rising anti-immigration sentiment in Germany and France.
- In October 2019, the IMF issued a report on the World Economic Outlook which flagged up a synchronised slowdown in world growth. However, it also flagged up that there was **potential for a rerun of the 2008 financial crisis**, but this time centred on the huge debt binge accumulated by corporations during the decade of low interest rates. This now means that there are corporates who would be unable to cover basic interest costs on some \$19trn of corporate debt in major western economies, if world growth was to dip further than just a minor cooling. This debt is mainly held by the shadow banking sector i.e. pension funds, insurers, hedge funds, asset managers etc., who, when there is \$15trn of corporate and government debt now yielding negative interest rates, have been searching for higher returns in riskier assets. Much of this debt is only marginally above investment grade so any rating downgrade could force some holders into a fire sale, which would then depress prices further and so set off a spiral down. The IMF's answer is to suggest imposing higher capital charges on lending to corporates and for central banks to regulate the investment operations of the shadow banking sector. In October 2019, the deputy Governor of the Bank of England also flagged up the dangers of banks and the shadow banking sector lending to corporates, especially highly leveraged corporates, which had risen back up to near pre-2008 levels.
- **Geopolitical risks**, for example in North Korea, but also in Europe and the Middle East, which could lead to increasing safe haven flows.

Upside risks to current forecasts for UK gilt yields and PWLB rates

- **Brexit** – if agreement was reached all round that removed all threats of economic and political disruption between the EU and the UK.
- **The Bank of England** is too slow in its pace and strength of increases in Bank Rate and, therefore, allows inflationary pressures to build up too strongly within the UK economy, which then necessitates a later rapid series of increases in Bank Rate faster than we currently expect.
- **UK inflation**, whether domestically generated or imported, returning to sustained significantly higher levels causing an increase in the inflation premium inherent to gilt yields.