

**TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT AND ANNUAL
INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2022-26**

1. This strategy statement has been prepared in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Treasury Management in the Public Services Code of Practice (the Code). Accordingly, the Council's Treasury Management Strategy will be approved annually by the full Council and there will be quarterly reports to the Corporate Governance Committee. The Corporate Governance Committee considered the contents of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy at its meeting on 28 January 2022. The aim of these reporting arrangements is to ensure that those with ultimate responsibility for the treasury management function appreciate fully the implications of treasury management policies and activities, and that those implementing policies and executing transactions have properly fulfilled their responsibilities with regard to delegation and reporting.
2. On 20th December 2021 CIPFA published revised Treasury Management and Prudential Codes of Practice with formal adoption not until the 2023/24 financial year. Further details are provided in Annex 5. The updated Codes will be reviewed to assess the impacts to the current approach and any changes required will be formally adopted within the 2023/24 Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) report.
3. The Council has adopted the following reporting arrangements in accordance with the requirements of the Code:-

| Area of Responsibility | Council/Committee/Officer | Frequency |
|---|---|--|
| Treasury Management Policy Statement | Full Council | Annually before start of financial year |
| Treasury Management Strategy/Annual Investment Strategy | Full Council | Annually before start of financial year |
| Quarterly Treasury Management updates | Corporate Governance Committee | Quarterly |
| Updates or revisions to Treasury Management Strategy/Annual Investment Strategy during year | Cabinet (following consideration by Corporate Governance Committee, wherever practical) | Ad hoc |
| Annual Treasury Outturn Report | Cabinet | Annually by end of September following year end |
| Treasury Management Practices | Director of Corporate Resources | |
| Review of Treasury Management Strategy/Annual Investment Strategy | Corporate Governance Committee | Annually before start of financial year and before consideration by full Council, wherever practical |
| Review of Treasury Management Performance | Corporate Governance Committee | Annually by end of September following year end |

Treasury Management Strategy 2022-26

4. The Local Government Act 2003 (the Act) and supporting regulations requires the Council to 'have regard to' the CIPFA Prudential Code and the CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice to set Prudential and Treasury Indicators for the next three years to ensure that the Council's capital investment plans are affordable, prudent and sustainable.

The Act requires the Council to set its treasury strategy for borrowing and to prepare an Annual Investment strategy (for Treasury Management investments) - this is included in later paragraphs of this strategy. It sets out the Council's policies for managing its Treasury Management investments and for giving priority to the security and liquidity of those investments.

This Strategy should be read in conjunction with the Corporate Asset Investment Fund (CAIF) strategy, which sets out the Councils approach when considering the acquisition of investments for the purposes of inclusion within the CAIF, and the Capital Strategy, which sets out the Councils approach to determining its medium term capital requirements. These documents form part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and together take into account the statutory guidance issued by the Secretary of State under the Local Government Act 2003.

This proposed strategy for 2022/23 in respect of the treasury management function is based upon Officers' views on interest rates, supplemented with leading market forecasts provided by the Council's treasury adviser, Link Asset Services.

Balanced Budget Requirement

5. It is a statutory requirement under Section 33 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for the Council to produce a balanced budget. In particular, Section 32 requires a local authority to calculate its budget requirement for each financial year to include the revenue costs that flow from capital financing decisions. This means that increases in capital expenditure must be limited to a level whereby the increase in charges to the revenue budget from:
 - i) increase in interest charges caused by increased borrowing to finance additional capital expenditure, and
 - ii) any increases in running costs from new capital projects

are limited to a level which is affordable within the projected income of the Council for the foreseeable future.

Treasury Limits for 2022/23 to 2025/26

6. It is a statutory duty under Section 3 of the Act and supporting regulations, for the Council to determine and keep under review how much it can afford to borrow. The amount so determined is termed the "Affordable Borrowing Limit". In England and Wales the Authorised Limit represents the legislative limit specified in the Act.

The Council must have regard to the Prudential Code when setting the Authorised Limit, which essentially requires it to ensure that total capital investment remains within sustainable limits and, in particular, that the impact upon its future council tax level is 'acceptable'.

Whilst termed an "Affordable Borrowing Limit" the capital plans to be considered for inclusion incorporate financing by both borrowing and other forms of liability, such as credit arrangements. The Authorised Limit is to be set, on a rolling basis, for the forthcoming financial year and three successive financial years. Details of the Authorised Limit can be found in Annex 2 to this Strategy.

Current Portfolio Position

7. The Council's treasury portfolio position at 31st December 2021 was:

| | | Principal £m | Average Rate % |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Fixed Rate Funding (borrowing) | PWLB | 159.1 | 6.22 |
| | Market | 103.5 | 4.37 |
| | Total Borrowing | <u>262.6</u> | 5.84 |
| Total Investments | | <u>356.8</u> | 0.19 |
| Net Investment | | <u>94.2</u> | |

The market debt relates to structures referred to as LOBOs (Lenders Option, Borrowers Option), where the lender has certain dates when they can increase the interest rate payable and, if they do, the borrower has the option of accepting the new rate or repaying the loan. All of these LOBOs have passed the first opportunity for the lender to change the rate and as a result they are all classed as fixed rate funding, even though, in theory, the rate could change in the future.

The Council's average rate of return on its treasury investments is 0.19% (as at 30 Sep 21). This compares favourably to the average of other English Counties (0.17%).

Capital Financing Requirement

8. The Council is forecast to be overborrowed as at 31 March 2022 by £37m. There are a number of reasons that the Council is in an 'overborrowed' position but among them are the lack of unsupported borrowing within it, a move by Central Government to switch capital approvals (which required external debt to be raised) to grants and the meaningful levels of voluntary Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) that have been applied in recent years. In essence this is a natural position to be in if new external debt is not required, as an annual provision is made to set aside cash in advance of loans maturing. The advantage this provides the County Council is flexibility in the use of cash resources in advance of the debt becoming due.

The new MTF5 includes a requirement to increase the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) by £143m by 2025/26. This will fund essential investment in service improvement, investment for growth and invest to save projects. Due to the levels of internal cash balances, which would otherwise be available to lend to banks, no new external loans are forecast to be required in the short to medium term. By the end of the MTF5, 2025/26, the position will move from being over-borrowed to under borrowed by £84m.

The majority of the cash requirement includes forward funding of infrastructure in advance of developer contributions through section 106 agreements or land sales, and spend to save schemes. The expectation is that this will allow cash balances to be replenished in the next 5-10 years.

9. The table below shows how the Capital Financing Requirement is expected to change over the period of the MTF5, and how this compares to the expected level of external debt. Although the level of actual debt exceeds the Capital Financing Requirement it is currently prohibitively expensive to prematurely repay existing debt. If there are cost-effective opportunities to avoid, or reduce, an overborrowed position they will be considered as long as they are in the best long-term financial interests of the Council. This will probably require both short and long-term borrowing rates to increase meaningfully from their current level.

| | 2022/23 £000 | 2023/24 £000 | 2024/25 £000 | 2025/26 £000 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Opening Capital Financing Requirement | 226,040 | 219,814 | 259,721 | 311,418 |
| New Borrowing | 0 | 46,135 | 59,082 | 37,630 |
| Statutory Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) | -6,226 | -6,229 | -7,385 | -8,865 |
| Voluntary MRP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Closing Capital Financing Requirement | 219,814 | 259,721 | 311,418 | 340,183 |
| | | | | |
| Opening external debt | 262,600 | 262,100 | 261,600 | 256,264 |
| Loans maturing | -500 | -500 | -5,336 | -500 |
| Closing external debt | 262,100 | 261,600 | 256,264 | 255,764 |
| | | | | |
| Overborrowed/(borrowing requirement) | 42,286 | 1,879 | (55,154) | (84,419) |

Minimum Revenue Provision

10. Capital financing costs are forecast to be £19.5m in 2022/23 and then rise to £22.5m in 2025/26, mainly as a result of increasing financing requirements for the capital requirement. This assumes the required new borrowing is from internal cash balances. The capital financing costs do not include the cost of interest returns foregone by using

internal cash balances, this will be reflected in a reduction to the bank and other interest budget.

11. The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) Regulations 2003 require local authorities to charge to their revenue account in each financial year a minimum amount to finance capital expenditure. This referred to as Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP).

In the context of significant medium term financial pressures the council continues to review the efficiency and effectiveness of all aspects of spend. In 2019/20 the Council reassessed the expenditure that is required under statute relating to a prudent Minimum Revenue Provision. Based on the average economic remaining life of assets held it amended the MRP calculation for supported and unsupported borrowing to a period of 40 years, which reduced the MRP charge to around £6m per annum.

The 'asset life' method is in line with the Capital Finance and Accounting Regulations 2003 and is consistent with many reviews undertaken by other Local Authorities when reviewing their MRP policy / methodology. This approach provides; a lower charge in the earlier years and is prudent as it is built on asset life, and a straight line charge, rather than reducing balance.

It should be noted that the revised approach does not change the overall amount of MRP payable; the same amount is simply repaid over a different time period, but is more aligned with the period over which the underlying assets provide benefit. Further details can be found in Annex 1 to this Strategy.

Prudential and Treasury Indicators for 2022/23 – 2025/26

12. Prudential and Treasury Indicators (as set out in the tables in Annex 2 to this Strategy) are relevant for the purpose of setting an integrated treasury management strategy. The Council is also required to indicate that it has adopted the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management, this was adopted in February 2010.

Prospects for Interest Rates

13. The Council has appointed Link Group as its treasury advisor and part of their service is to assist the Council to formulate a view on interest rates. Link provided the following forecasts on 20th December 2021. These are forecasts for certainty rates, gilt yields plus 80 bps

| Link Group Interest Rate View | | 20.12.21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--|
| | Dec-21 | Mar-22 | Jun-22 | Sep-22 | Dec-22 | Mar-23 | Jun-23 | Sep-23 | Dec-23 | Mar-24 | Jun-24 | Sep-24 | Dec-24 | Mar-25 | |
| BANK RATE | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.25 | |
| 3 month ave earnings | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.60 | 0.70 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| 6 month ave earnings | 0.40 | 0.50 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.70 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 | |
| 12 month ave earnings | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | |
| 5 yr PWLB | 1.40 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.60 | 1.60 | 1.70 | 1.80 | 1.80 | 1.80 | 1.90 | 1.90 | 1.90 | 2.00 | 2.00 | |
| 10 yr PWLB | 1.60 | 1.70 | 1.80 | 1.80 | 1.90 | 1.90 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.20 | 2.30 | |
| 25 yr PWLB | 1.80 | 1.90 | 2.00 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.20 | 2.20 | 2.20 | 2.30 | 2.30 | 2.40 | 2.40 | 2.50 | 2.50 | |
| 50 yr PWLB | 1.50 | 1.70 | 1.80 | 1.90 | 1.90 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.20 | 2.20 | 2.30 | 2.30 | |

Additional notes by Link on this forecast table: -

- LIBOR and LIBID rates will cease from the end of 2021. Work is currently progressing to replace LIBOR with a rate based on SONIA (Sterling Overnight Index Average). In the meantime, our forecasts are based on expected average earnings by local authorities for 3 to 12 months.

- *Our forecasts for average earnings are averages i.e., rates offered by individual banks may differ significantly from these averages, reflecting their different needs for borrowing short term cash at any one point in time.*

14. Over the last two years, the coronavirus outbreak has done huge economic damage to the UK and to economies around the world. After the Bank of England took emergency action in March 2020 to cut Bank Rate to 0.10%, it left Bank Rate unchanged at its subsequent meetings until raising it to 0.25% at its meeting on 16th December 2021.
15. It is not expected that Bank Rate will go up fast after the initial rate rise as the supply potential of the economy is not likely to have taken a major hit during the pandemic: it should, therefore, be able to cope well with meeting demand after supply shortages subside over the next year, without causing inflation to remain elevated in the medium-term, or to inhibit inflation from falling back towards the MPC's 2% target after the spike up to around 5%. The forecast includes four increases in Bank Rate over the three-year forecast period to March 2025, ending at 1.25%. However, it is likely that these forecasts will need changing within a relatively short timeframe for the following reasons: -
 - We do not know how severe an impact Omicron could have on the economy and whether there will be another lockdown or similar and, if there is, whether there would be significant fiscal support from the Government for businesses and jobs.
 - There were already increasing grounds for viewing the economic recovery as running out of steam during the autumn and now into the winter. And then along came Omicron to pose a significant downside threat to economic activity. This could lead into stagflation, or even into recession, which would then pose a dilemma for the MPC as to whether to focus on combating inflation or supporting economic growth through keeping interest rates low.
 - Will some current key supply shortages spill over into causing economic activity in some sectors to take a significant hit?
 - Rising gas and electricity prices in October and next April and increases in other prices caused by supply shortages and increases in taxation next April, are already going to deflate consumer spending power without the MPC having to take any action on Bank Rate to cool inflation.
 - On the other hand, consumers are sitting on over £160bn of excess savings left over from the pandemic so when will they spend this sum, in part or in total?
 - It looks as if the economy coped well with the end of furlough on 30th September. It is estimated that there were around 1 million people who came off furlough then and there was not a significant increase in unemployment. The other side of the coin is that vacancies have been hitting record levels so there is a continuing acute shortage of workers. This is a potential danger area if this shortage drives up wages which then feed through into producer prices and the prices of services i.e., a second-round effect that the MPC would have to act against if it looked like gaining significant momentum.
 - We also recognise there could be further nasty surprises on the Covid front beyond the Omicron mutation.

16. In summary, with the high level of uncertainty prevailing on several different fronts, we expect to have to revise our forecasts again - in line with whatever the new news is.

Borrowing Strategy

17. Since the start of 2021, there has been a lot of volatility in gilt yields, and hence PWLB rates. As the interest forecast table for PWLB certainty rates above shows, there is forecast to be a steady, but slow, rise in both Bank Rate and gilt yields during the forecast period to March 2025, though there will doubtless be a lot of unpredictable volatility during this forecast period.
18. This unpredictability in respect of gilt yields and PWLB rates due to the following factors: -
- How strongly will changes in gilt yields be correlated to changes in US treasury yields (see below). Over 10 years since 2011 there has been an average 75% correlation between movements in US treasury yields and gilt yields. However, from time to time these two yields can diverge. Lack of spare economic capacity and rising inflationary pressures are viewed as being much greater dangers in the US than in the UK. This could mean that central bank rates will end up rising earlier and higher in the US than in the UK if inflationary pressures were to escalate; the consequent increases in treasury yields could well spill over to cause (lesser) increases in gilt yields. There is, therefore, an upside risk to forecasts for gilt yields due to this correlation. The Link Group forecasts have included a risk of a 75% correlation between the two yields.
 - Will the Fed take action to counter increasing treasury yields if they rise beyond a yet unspecified level?
 - Would the MPC act to counter increasing gilt yields if they rise beyond a yet unspecified level?
 - How strong will inflationary pressures actually turn out to be in both the US and the UK and so put upward pressure on treasury and gilt yields?
 - How will central banks implement their new average or sustainable level inflation monetary policies?
 - How well will central banks manage the withdrawal of QE purchases of their national bonds i.e., without causing a panic reaction in financial markets as happened in the “taper tantrums” in the US in 2013?
19. As the US financial markets are, by far, the biggest financial markets in the world, any upward trend in treasury yields will invariably impact and influence financial markets in other countries. Inflationary pressures and erosion of surplus economic capacity look much stronger in the US compared to those in the UK, which would suggest that Fed rate increases eventually needed to suppress inflation, are likely to be faster and stronger than Bank Rate increases in the UK. This is likely to put upward pressure on treasury yields which could then spill over into putting upward pressure on UK gilt yields.

20. Although borrowing from the Public Works Loans Board (PWLB) is still generally the most attractive external option available to the authority, the current overborrowed position makes the use of external borrowing unlikely. Even as the position changes from overborrowed to under borrowed there is not currently a requirement to take on external debt.
21. Borrowing rates very rarely move in one direction without there being periods of volatility, and it is sensible to maintain a flexible and proactive stance towards when borrowing should be carried out (if, indeed, any borrowing is taken). Likewise it is sensible to retain flexibility over whether short, medium or long-term funding will be taken and whether some element of variable rate funding might be attractive. Any borrowing carried out will take into account the medium term costs and risks and will not be based on minimising short term costs if this is felt to compromise the medium term financial position of the Council.

External v Internal Borrowing

22. The Council currently has significant cash balances invested, and at the end of December 2021 these stood at £357m. These balances relate to a number of different items – earmarked funds, provisions, grants received in advance of expenditure and simple cash flow are some of them. A growing source of cash balances relates to the overborrowed position outlined earlier.

As mentioned earlier the new MTFs capital programme includes a funding requirement of £143m. Due to the levels of internal cash balances and the interest return compared with the cost of raising new external debt it is more economical to temporarily utilise internal cash balances

23. The Council has over the last 10 years repaid almost £100m more of external loans than has been borrowed. There has also been no new borrowing to finance the capital programme in this period. The position is that the Council has more external borrowing than is required to fund the historic capital programme. In an ideal world action would be taken to ensure that an overborrowed position does not occur, but the reality is that this could only happen by the premature repayment of existing debt and this is currently not a cost-effective option. If an opportunity to repay debt occurs that is sensible from a financial perspective, it will be taken.
24. The balance between internal and external borrowing will be managed proactively, with the intention of minimising long-term financing costs.

Policy on borrowing in advance of need

25. The Council will not borrow in advance of need simply to benefit from earning more interest on investing the cash than is being paid on the loan. Where borrowing is required in the approved capital programme and value for money can be demonstrated by borrowing in advance this option may be taken, but only if it is felt that the money can be invested securely until the cash is required. This allows borrowing to be taken out at an opportune time rather than at the time expenditure is incurred.
26. In determining whether borrowing will be taken in advance of the need the Council will;
 - ensure that there is a clear link between the capital programme and maturity profile of existing debt which supports taking financing in advance of need

- ensure that the revenue implications of the borrowing, and the impact on future plans and budgets have been considered
- evaluate the economic and market factors which might influence the manner and timing of any decision to borrow
- consider the merits (or otherwise) of other forms of funding
- consider a range of periods and repayment profiles for the borrowing.

Debt Rescheduling/Premature Debt Repayment

27. Debt rescheduling usually involves the premature repayment of debt and its replacement with debt for a different period, to take advantage of differences in the interest rate yield curve. The repayment and replacement do not necessarily have to happen simultaneously, but would be expected to have occurred within a relatively short period of time.
28. If medium and long-term loan rates rise substantially in the coming years, there may be opportunities to adjust the portfolio to take advantage of lower rates in shorter periods. It is important that the debt portfolio is not managed to maximise short-term interest savings if this is felt to be overly risky, and a maturity profile that is overly focused into a single year will be avoided. Changes to the way that PWLB rates are set, and the introduction of a significant gap between new borrowing costs and the rate used in calculating premia/discounts for premature debt repayments, significantly reduces the probability of debt rescheduling being attractive in the future.
29. If there is a meaningful increase in medium and long-term premature repayment rates there is a possibility that premature repayment of existing debt (without any replacement) might become attractive, particularly given the current overborrowed position. This type of action would only be carried out if it was considered likely to be beneficial in the medium term.
30. All debt rescheduling or premature repayments will be reported to the Corporate Governance Committee at the earliest meeting following the action.

Annual Investment Strategy

Investment Policy

31. The Council will have regard to the MHCLG's Guidance on Local Authority Investments ("the Investment Guidance") and the CIPFA Treasury Management in Public Services Code of Practice and Cross Sectoral Guidance Notes ("the CIPFA TM Code"). The Council's investment priorities are:-
 - the security of capital and
 - the liquidity of its investments
32. The Council will aim to achieve an optimal return on its investments that is commensurate with proper level of security and liquidity. The risk appetite of this Council is low in order to give priority to security of its investments.
33. The Council's policy in respect of deciding which counterparties are acceptable has always been stringent.

34. In broad terms the list of acceptable counterparties uses the list produced by Link Asset Services (the Council's treasury management advisor) but excludes any party that is included in the Link list with a maximum loan maturity period of 100 days or less. All counterparties are also restricted to a maximum loan period of one year.
35. Inflation has been and is expected to consistently exceed the interest rates offered by acceptable counterparties resulting in the value of capital being eroded in real terms. Hence, the investment strategy recognises that alternative higher risk investments could be required to mitigate this erosion. Providing this is undertaken in a measured way the impact upon liquidity will be minimal

Creditworthiness Policy

36. Link's methodology includes the use of credit ratings from S & P, Fitch and Moody's, factors such as credit outlook reports from the credit rating agencies, the rating of the sovereign government in which the counterparty is domiciled and the level of Credit Default Swap spreads within the market (effectively the market cost of insuring against default). The general economic climate is also considered and will, on occasions, have an impact onto the list of suggested counterparties.
37. Link Asset Services issue timely information in respect of changes to credit ratings or outlooks, and changes to their suggested counterparty list are also issued. These reports are monitored within a short time of receipt and any relevant changes to the counterparty list are actioned as quickly as is practical. A weekly summary of the credit ratings etc. of counterparties is also issued and this gives an opportunity to ensure that no important information has been missed.

Country Limits

38. The Link criteria includes a requirement for the country of domicile of any counterparty to be very highly rated. This is a requirement on the basis that it will probably be the national government which will offer financial support to a failing bank, but the country must itself be financially able to afford the support. The Council's list of acceptable counterparties will include a limit on the maximum amount that can be invested in all counterparties domiciled in a single country (except for the UK) in order to mitigate sovereign risk.

UK Local Authorities

39. The counterparty list from Link does not include Local Authorities, due to credit ratings not being available for the majority of organisations. Having never defaulted in history, UK Local authorities and levying authorities are and have always been regarded as safe counterparties.
40. Despite the difficult financial situation that many organisations find themselves in the legal basis underpinning local authorities and their requirement to repay loans has not changed. It is considered very unlikely that one will be allowed to collapse and default on its debt. The language used to describe the financial position of Local authorities and companies is very similar. However, the actual position is very different. Despite Government cuts to grants Local Authorities are in control of the majority of their income, due to their tax-raising powers. To regain a balanced budget service reduction can take place without a corresponding income reduction. Companies do not have this

ability and if a service is cut by them, all of the related income stops. Historically when public sector re-organisations have taken place, resulting in the cessation of one or more entities, government has nominated successor organisations. These organisations take on all of the historic assets and liabilities of the original entities. If a limited company ceases trading the known liabilities can only be settled out of the assets held by the company at that time.

41. Local authorities remain very low risk counterparties and it is extremely unlikely that loans would not be repaid in full, on time and with full interest. The Council's treasury management advisors are aware of local authorities being on the list of authorised counterparties and are supportive of it, and comfortable that they remain low-risk counterparties. There is evidence that lending between local authorities continues to happen, including to those that have been highlighted as in very difficult financial positions.

Counterparty List

42. The combination of all these factors produces a counterparty list, for the County Council, which comprises only very secure financial institutions, and a list that is managed pro-actively as new information is available.
43. The investment instruments identified for use in the financial year are listed below. The limits for both maximum loan periods and amounts will be set in line with the criteria shown in Annex 3. This list has been updated for 2022-23; the maximum amount that can be invested in all counterparties domiciled within a single country (other than the UK) has been increased from £30m to £50m.
44. Although the maximum amount that can be invested in a single country has increased, the amount that can be invested in an individual institution will remain the same. This serves to expand the Council's lending capacity without increasing exposure to any individual institution.
45. There is a requirement within the Annual Investment Strategy to state which of the approved methods of lending are specified, and which are non-specified. In broad terms a specified investment will be capable of repayment within one year and be made to a counterparty with a high credit rating; by implication non-specified investments are more risky than specified investments as they are either for longer periods of time or to lower-quality counterparties. Anything that does not meet either of these 'tests' is, by default, non-specified and must be highlighted as such within the Strategy. The long-term nature of the 'LOBO-offset' loan to Danske Bank means that it is non-specified investment, although the off-setting nature of the borrowing and the loan actually makes it low risk. Investment in pooled private debt funds is also non-specified, primarily due to the illiquid and medium-term nature of the investment.

| Investment | Repayment within 12 months | Level of Security | Maximum Period | Maximum % of Portfolio or cash sum ¹ |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---|
| Term deposits with the Debt Management Office | Yes | Government-Backed | 1 year | 100% |
| UK Government Treasury Bills | Yes | Government-Backed | 1 year | 100% |
| Term deposits with credit-rated institutions with maturities up to 1 | Yes | Varied acceptable credit ratings, but | 1 year | 100% |

| | | | | |
|--|-----|--|---|--|
| year ² (including both ring fenced and non-ring fenced banks) | | high security | | |
| Term deposits with overseas banks domiciled within a single country. | Yes | Varied acceptable credit ratings, but high security | 1 year | £50m |
| Private Term deposits that are legally capable of offset against existing LOBO borrowing that the Council has ³ | No | Varied, but off-setting nature of borrowing against loan gives a very low risk | 20 years | 25% |
| Money Market Funds: Constant NAV ⁴ Low Volatility NAV ⁵ | Yes | At least as high as acceptable credit – rated banks | Daily, same-day redemptions and subscriptions | £125m (includes any investment in variable NAV MMFs) |
| Variable NAV Money Market Funds ⁶ | Yes | At least as high as acceptable credit – rated banks | Same day subscriptions, 2 – 3 day redemption period | £125m (includes any investment in other MMFs) |
| Pooled private debt funds | No | Diversification within pooled fund and historic loss rate suggests high security | Varies across funds – likely to be at least a three year investment period, followed by a further three years to redeem all loans | £40m (£20m plus temp £20m overlap at renewal) |
| Term Deposits with UK Local Authorities up to 1 year | Yes | LA's do not have credit ratings, but high security | 1 year | 50% |
| Certificates of Deposit with credit-rated institutions with maturities of up to 1 year | Yes | Varied acceptable credit ratings, but high security | 1 year | 100% |

- (1) As the value of the investment portfolio is variable, the limit applies at time of agreeing the investment. Subsequent changes in the level of the portfolio will not be classed as a breach of any limits.
- (2) For administrative purposes a commitment may need to be made in advance of the investment period commencing. To avoid being overexposed with a counterparty this will be kept to a few days.
- (3) Non-specified investment
- (4) Funds where the capital value of a unit will always be maintained at £1. These funds have to maintain at least 99.5% of their assets in government backed assets.
- (5) Funds are permitted to maintain the unit price at £1 as long as the net asset value does not deviate by more than 0.20% from this level.
- (6) Funds will value their units on the basis of the underlying value of the assets that they hold; the unit price will not necessarily always be exactly £1
46. Following the lasting implications of the COVID-19 pandemic, in particular, the demonstration that unforeseeable events can very quickly cause significant uncertainty and shock financial markets. It is recognised that in exceptional circumstances the Director of Corporate Resources, in order to protect capital balances and liquidity, may have to take immediate action that breaches the above policy on a temporary basis. The action will only be taken as a last resort and will be reported, along with the rationale behind it, to the Corporate Governance Committee at the first opportunity.

47. As at the end of December 2021 £25m had been invested. This is classified as a service investment, rather than a treasury management investment. Following approval by the Cabinet on 19th November 2021 the Council intends to divest £7.5m from one or more pooled property funds and reinvest the funds into pooled infrastructure funds. This is expected to take place during 2022/23. Types of pooled infrastructure include, energy infrastructure, including renewables, water treatment works and transport infrastructure such as rail and air terminals. The infrastructure investment will also be classified as a service investment, rather than a treasury management investment

Investment Strategy

48. The investment strategy shall be to only invest in those institutions and/or asset types that are included in the counterparty list, and only to lend up to the limit set for each counterparty. Periods for which loans are placed will take into account the outlook for interest rates and, to a lesser extent, the need to retain cash flows. There may be occasions when it is necessary to borrow to fund short-term cashflow issues, but there will generally be no deliberate intention to make regular borrowing necessary.

Policy on the use of External Service Providers

49. External investment managers will not be used, except to the extent that a Money Market Fund or the managers of pooled property or private debt funds can be considered as an external manager.
50. The Council uses Link Asset Services as its external treasury management adviser, but recognises that responsibility for treasury management decisions remains with the Council at all times. Undue reliance on the Councils external advisers will be avoided, although the value of employing an external adviser and accessing specialist skills and resources is recognised.

Scheme of Delegation

51. (i) Full Council
 - Approval of annual strategy
 - Other matters where full Council approval is required under guidance or statutory requirement
- (ii) Cabinet
 - Approval of updates or revisions to strategy during the year
 - Approval of Annual Treasury Outturn report
- (iii) Corporate Governance Committee
 - Mid-year treasury management updates (usually quarterly)
 - Review of treasury management policy and procedures, including making recommendations to responsible body
 - Scrutiny of Treasury Management Strategy/Annual Investment Strategy and Annual Treasury Outturn report.
- (iv) Director of Corporate Resources
 - Day-to-day management of treasury management, within agreed policy
 - Appointment of external advisers, within existing Council procurement procedures

Role of Section 151 Officer

52. The Section 151 Officer is the Director of Corporate Resources, who has responsibility for the day-to-day running of the treasury management function.

Pension Fund Cash

53. The Council will comply with the requirements of The Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2009, which were implemented on 1st January 2010, and will not pool pension fund cash with its own cash balances for investment purposes. Any investments made by the pension fund directly with the County Council after 1st April 2010 will comply with the requirements of SI 2009 No 3093. From time to time the Council will manage short term cash flow requirements for either the County Council or the Pension Fund on a non-beneficial basis.

Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation (ESPO)

54. As part of the service level agreement with ESPO, the council provides a treasury management service on behalf of ESPO for investment of surplus balances. This service is carried out with due regard to this policy and responsibility for day to day management lies with the Director of Corporate Resources. Surplus balances are invested in their own right and not pooled with the county council.

ANNUAL STATEMENT FOR THE DETERMINATION OF THE ANNUAL MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION (MRP)

Statutory regulations introduced in 2008 require local authorities to make prudent provision for the repayment of debt raised to finance capital expenditure. In addition a statement of the level of MRP has to be submitted to the County Council for approval before the start of the next financial year.

Prudent Provision.

The definition of what is prudent provision is determined by each local authority based on guidance rather than statutory regulation

It is proposed that provision is made on the following basis:

Government supported borrowing:

Provision to be based on the estimated life of the asset to be financed from government borrowing with repayments by equal annual instalments.

The extent of borrowing required to finance the capital programme is not directly linked to any specific projects thus in determining the average life of assets an average of 40 years has been taken as a proxy for the average life of assets.

Prudential (unsupported) borrowing and expenditure capitalised by direction of the Secretary of State and certain other expenditure classified as capital incurred after 1st April 2008:

Provision to be based on the estimated life of the asset to be financed by that borrowing, with repayment by equal annual instalments.

The extent of borrowing required to finance the capital programme is not directly linked to any specific projects thus in determining the average life of assets an average of 40 years has been taken as a proxy for the average life of assets.

The County Council will also look to take opportunities to use general underspends and one-off balances to make additional (voluntary) revenue provision where possible to reduce ongoing capital financing costs. As at 31 March 2022, the cumulative amount of voluntary MRP paid in advance is £47.8m.

Financial Implications

MRP is a constituent of the Financing of Capital budget shown within Central Items component of the revenue budget and for 2022/23 totals £6.2m. This comprises £5.8m in respect of supported borrowing and £0.4m in respect of unsupported borrowing incurred since 2008/09.

PRUDENTIAL AND TREASURY INDICATORS

In line with the requirements of the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in local authorities, the various indicators that inform authorities whether their capital investment plans are affordable, prudent and sustainable, are set out below.

A further key objective of the code is to ensure that treasury management decisions are taken in accordance with good professional practice and in a manner that supports prudence, affordability and sustainability. The indicators for Treasury management are set out in this paper.

Compliance with the Code is required under Part I of the Local Government Act 2003.

| | <u>2020/21</u> <u>Actual</u> | <u>2021/22</u> <u>Estimate</u> | <u>2022/23</u> <u>Estimate</u> | <u>2023/24</u> <u>Estimate</u> | <u>2024/25</u> <u>Estimate</u> | <u>2025/26</u> <u>Estimate</u> |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Capital Expenditure | £105m | £109m | £139m | £170m | £142m | £103m |
| Capital financing requirement | £232m | £226m | £220m | £260m | £311m | £340m |
| Ratio of total financing costs to net revenue stream | 3.8% | 3.9% | 3.8% | 3.8% | 4.0% | 4.2% |

The projected level of capital expenditure shown above differs from the total of the detailed four year programme presented in this report as an allowance has been provided to cover estimated additional expenditure that may occur during the course of a year, for instance projects funded by government grants, section 106 contributions and projects funded from the future developments programme.

The capital financing requirement (CFR) measures the Authority's need to borrow for capital purposes and as such is influenced by the availability of capital receipts and income from third parties, e.g. grants and developer contributions. The CFR is increasing during the MTFS period for essential investment in services, investment for growth and invest to save projects.

The prudential code includes the following as a key indicator of prudence:

'In order to ensure that over the medium term net borrowing will only be for a capital purpose, the local authority should ensure that net external borrowing does not, except in the short term, exceed the total of capital financing requirement in the preceding year plus the estimates of any additional capital financing requirement for the current and next two financial years'. In the short term this indicator will not be met due to the reduction in the capital financing requirement in recent years and the currently prohibitively expensive premiums to repay existing debt. The Council will consider options to reduce this position where they are in the long term financial interests of the Council. Further details are included in the main Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy 2022/23.

In respect of external debt, it is recommended that the Council approves the limits detailed in the tables below for its total external debt for the next four financial years. These limits separately identify borrowing from other long term liabilities such as finance leases. The Council is asked to approve these limits and to delegate authority to the Director of Corporate Resources, within the total limit for any individual year, to effect movement between the

separately agreed limits for borrowing and other long term liabilities. Any such changes made will be reported to the Cabinet at its next meeting following the change.

There are two limits on external debt: the 'Operational Boundary' and the 'Authorised Limit'. Both are consistent with the current commitments, existing plans and the proposals in the budget report for capital expenditure and financing, and with approved treasury management policy statement and practices. They are both based on estimates of most likely, but not worst case, scenario. The key difference is that the Authorised Limit cannot be breached without prior approval of the County Council. It therefore includes more headroom to take account of eventualities such as delays in generating capital receipts, forward borrowing to take advantage of attractive interest rates, use of borrowing in place of operational leasing, "invest to save" projects, occasional short term borrowing to cover temporary revenue cash flow shortfalls as well as an assessment of risks involved in managing cash flows. The Operational Boundary is a more realistic indicator of the likely position.

Operational boundary for external debt

| | <u>2022/23</u> | <u>2023/24</u> | <u>2024/25</u> | <u>2025/26</u> |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | <u>£m</u> | <u>£m</u> | <u>£m</u> | <u>£m</u> |
| Borrowing | 263 | 263 | 311 | 340 |
| Other long term liabilities | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 264 | 264 | 312 | 341 |

Authorised limit for external debt

| | <u>2022/23</u> | <u>2023/24</u> | <u>2024/25</u> | <u>2025/26</u> |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | <u>£m</u> | <u>£m</u> | <u>£m</u> | <u>£m</u> |
| Borrowing | 273 | 273 | 321 | 350 |
| Other long term liabilities | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 274 | 274 | 322 | 351 |

In agreeing these limits, the Council is asked to note that the authorised limit determined for 2022/23 will be the statutory limit determined under Section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 2003.

Comparison of original 2021/22 indicators with the latest forecast

In February 2021 the County Council approved certain prudential limits and indicators, the latest projections of which are shown below:

| | <u>Prudential</u> <u>Indicator</u> <u>2021/22</u> | <u>Latest</u> <u>Projection</u> <u>17/01/22</u> |
|---|---|---|
| Actual Capital Financing Costs as a % of Net Revenue Stream | 4.10% | 3.90% |
| Capital Expenditure | £145m | £111m |
| Operational Boundary for External Debt | £264.1m | £264.1m |
| Authorised Limit for External Debt | £274.1m | £274.1m |
| Interest Rate Exposure – Fixed | 50-100% | 100% |
| Interest Rate Exposure – Variable | 0-50% | 0% |
| Capital Financing Requirement | £237m | £226m |

All of the indicators are within the targets set. The latest forecast of external debt, £262.6m, shows that it is within both the authorised borrowing limit and the operational boundary set for 2021/22. The maturity structure of debt is within the indicators set. The latest projection for capital expenditure is below the indicator set, due to the refresh of the capital programme in September 2021 and slippage in forecast spend within the capital programme.

Treasury Management Indicators

The Local Government Act 2003 requires the County Council to ensure that treasury management is carried out with good professional practice. The Prudential Code includes the following as the required indicators in respect of treasury management:

- a) Upper limits on fixed interest and variable rate external borrowing.
- b) Upper and lower limits for the maturity structure of borrowings.
- c) Upper limit for principal sums invested for periods longer than 364 days.

After reviewing the current situation and assessing the likely position next year, the following limits are recommended:

- a) An upper limit on fixed interest rate exposures for 2022/23 to 2025/26 of 100% of its net outstanding principal sums and an upper limit on its variable interest rate exposures for 2022/23 to 2025/26 of 50% of its net outstanding principal sums.
- b) Upper and lower limits for the maturity structure of its borrowings as follows:
Amount of projected borrowing that is fixed rate maturing in each period as a percentage of total projected borrowing that is fixed rate:

| | <u>Upper Limit %</u> | <u>Lower Limit%</u> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| under 12 months | 30 | 0 |
| 12 months and within 24 months | 30 | 0 |
| 24 months and within 5 years | 50 | 0 |
| 5 years and within 10 years | 70 | 0 |
| 10 years and above | 100 | 25 |

- c) An upper limit for principal sums invested for periods longer than 364 days is 10% of the portfolio.

The County Council has adopted the CIPFA code of Practice for Treasury Management in the Public Services.

ANNEX 3**POLICY ON APPROVED ORGANISATIONS FOR LENDING****APPROVED ORGANISATIONS/ LIMITS FOR LENDING**

| <u>Institution*</u> | <u>Maximum Sum Outstanding/Period of Loan</u> |
|---|--|
| UK Clearing Banks and UK Building Societies** | £30m/6 months up to £50m/12months (Not special Institutions) £70m/12months (special Institutions) 'Special' = significant element of UK government ownership. |
| UK Debt Management Office | No maximum sum outstanding/12 months |
| UK Government Treasury Bills | No maximum sum outstanding/12 months |
| Overseas Banks | £10m/6 months £20m/12 months |
| Money Market Funds | £30m limit within any AAA-rated fund. £125m maximum exposure to all Money Market Funds |
| UK Local Authorities | £10m/12 months |
| Pooled Private Debt Funds | £40m/variable 3-6 years |

* includes ring fenced and non-ring fenced banks.

**In the event that an investment is entered into which is legally offset against borrowing in the form of a LOBO (Lender's Option, Borrower's Option) from the same counterparty, the maximum period will be 20 years and the maximum sum will be the amount of the LOBO deal against which the legal offset exists.

The list of acceptable institutions will mirror the list of suggested counterparties maintained by Link Asset Services, except the maximum maturity period will be restricted to 1 year and any institution with a suggested maturity period of 100 days or less will be excluded.

Some financial institutions have both a parent company and a subsidiary that are licensed deposit takers in the UK. Where this is the case a 'group limit' will apply, and this will be the limit that is given to the parent company.

In some cases the parent company will be an overseas institution and they will have UK-registered subsidiaries. Where this is the case the parent company limit will apply at a total group level, even if this limit is less than would be given to the UK subsidiary on a stand-alone basis. Any money invested with a UK subsidiary of an overseas institution will be classed as being invested in the country of domicile of the parent if the parent is an overseas institution for country-maximum purposes.

If the credit rating of an individual financial institution decreases to a level which no longer makes them an acceptable counterparty the Director of Corporate Resources will take action to bring this back into line at the earliest opportunity. It should be noted that there will be no legal right to cancel a loan early, and any premature repayment can only be made with the

approval of the counterparty and may include financial penalties. Similar actions will be taken if a counterparty is downgraded to a level which allows them to remain on the list of acceptable counterparties, but where the unexpired term of any loan is longer than the maximum period for which a new loan could be placed with them.

In the event that the circumstances highlighted above occur, the Director of Corporate Resources will report to the Corporate Governance Committee.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY STATEMENT (TMPS)

1. This organisation defines its treasury management activities as:

“The management of the 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”
2. This organisation regards the successful identification, monitoring and control of risk to be the prime criteria by which the effectiveness of its treasury management activities will be measured. Accordingly, the analysis and reporting of treasury management activities will focus on their risk implications for the organisation.
3. This organisation acknowledges that effective treasury management will provide support towards the achievement of its business and service objectives. It is therefore committed to the principles of achieving value for money in treasury management, and to employing suitable comprehensive performance measurement techniques, within the context of effective risk management.

2021 REVISED CIPFA TREASURY MANAGEMENT CODE AND PRUDENTIAL CODE

CIPFA published the revised codes on 20th December 2021 and has stated that formal adoption is not required until the 2023/24 financial year.

The revised codes will have the following implications:

1. a requirement for the Council to adopt a new debt liability benchmark treasury indicator to support the financing risk management of the capital financing requirement;
2. clarify what CIPFA expects a local authority to borrow for and what they do not view as appropriate. This will include the requirement to set a proportionate approach to commercial and service capital investment;
3. address ESG issues within the Capital Strategy;
4. require implementation of a policy to review commercial property, with a view to divest where appropriate;
5. create new Investment Practices to manage risks associated with non-treasury investment (similar to the current Treasury Management Practices);
6. ensure that any long term treasury investment is supported by a business model;
7. a requirement to effectively manage liquidity and longer term cash flow requirements;
8. amendment to TMP1 to address ESG policy within the treasury management risk framework;
9. amendment to the knowledge and skills register for individuals involved in the treasury management function - to be proportionate to the size and complexity of the treasury management conducted by each council;
10. a new requirement to clarify reporting requirements for service and commercial investment, (especially where supported by borrowing/leverage).

In addition, all investments and investment income must be attributed to one of the following three purposes: -

Treasury management

Arising from the organisation's cash flows or treasury risk management activity, this type of investment represents balances which are only held until the cash is required for use. Treasury investments may also arise from other treasury risk management activity which seeks to prudently manage the risks, costs or income relating to existing or forecast debt or treasury investments.

Service delivery

Investments held primarily and directly for the delivery of public services including housing, regeneration and local infrastructure. Returns on this category of investment which are funded by borrowing are permitted only in cases where the income is "either related to the financial viability of the project in question or otherwise incidental to the primary purpose".

Commercial return

Investments held primarily for financial return with no treasury management or direct service provision purpose. Risks on such investments should be proportionate to a council's

financial capacity – i.e., that ‘plausible losses’ could be absorbed in budgets or reserves without unmanageable detriment to local services. An authority must not borrow to invest primarily for financial return.

As this Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy deals solely with treasury management investments, the categories of service delivery and commercial investments will be dealt with as part of the Capital Strategy report.

These changes will be reviewed for their impact on the County Councils current approach and any changes required will be formally adopted within the 2023/24 TMSS report.

This page is intentionally left blank