

AUDIT COMMITTEE

28 SEPTEMBER 2017

| Subject Heading: | TREASURY MANAGEMENT UPDATE QUARTER 1 2017/18 |
|------------------------------------|--|
| SLT Lead: | Debbie Middleton Interim Chief Financial Officer |
| Report Author and contact details: | Reena Patel / Stephen Wild Treasury Manager / Head of Pensions and Treasury 01708432485 <u>Reena.Patel@onesource.co.uk</u> |
| Policy context: | The Code of Practice on Treasury Management 2009 recommends treasury activities to be reported on a scrutiny committee on a quarterly basis. |
| Financial summary: | There are no direct financial implications from the report. |

The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council Objectives

| Communities making Havering | [x] |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| Places making Havering | [X] |
| Places making Havering | [X] |
| Connections making Havering | [x] |

SUMMARY

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's Treasury Management Code (CIPFA's TM Code) requires that authorities report on the performance of the treasury management function to Full Council at least twice per year (mid-year and at year end). This report provides an additional quarterly update to be reviewed by the Audit Committee.

The authority has borrowed and invested substantial sums of money and is therefore exposed to financial risks including the loss of invested funds and the revenue effect of changing interest rates. This report covers activity on treasury managed investments and borrowings and the associated monitoring and control of risk.

The key highlights of the Q1 report are as follows:

- Investment portfolio return was 0.68% outperforming its Benchmark by 0.37%, the Budgeted rate of return by 0.08% despite 3 month LIBOR falling steadily over the quarter.
- The Arlingclose 13 London Borough average was 0.67% in Q1 but with a portfolio that had intrinsically more risk than the authority's own investment portfolio.
- No breach of the authority's prudential indicators and treasury indicators.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- To note the treasury management activities for the quarter detailed in the report
- To note the regulatory update on "Ring Fencing" set out in appendix C of this report.
- To note the updates on published FCA rules in relation to the second Markets in Financial Instrument Directive (MIFID II) included in appendix C of this report. Further details on the 'Opting-Up' process are also included in the appendix.

REPORT DETAIL

1. Economic Update and Outlook for 2017/18

- 1.1 UK Consumer Price Inflation (CPI) index was 2.6% in June (and remained unchanged in July) while Q1 GDP slowed to 0.2% although Q2 GDP could rebound.
- 1.2 The Bank of England made no change to Bank Rate at its June 2017 meeting. The central case is for Bank Rate to remain flat at 0.25% over the next three years. However, there is a downside risk for rates to be cut to

0.00% in the short and medium term and scope for rates to be increased from 2019 onwards, albeit modestly to 0.50%.

1.3 Gilt yields displayed some volatility with a marked uptick in late June. This was largely due to the expectation of tapering of Quantitative Easing (QE) in the US and Europe, which also had an impact on gilts. Since then however, gilt yields have eased and 50 year PWLB debt was priced at 2.26% at 11 September 2017.

| | Sep- 17 | Dec- 17 | Mar- 18 | Jun- 18 | Sep- 18 | Dec- 18 | Mar- 19 | Jun- 19 | Sep- 19 | Dec- 19 | Mar- 20 | Jun- 20 | Sep- 20 |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Official Bank Rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Upside risk % | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Arlingclose Central Case % | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Downside risk % | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |

Table 1: Bank rate forecast for the next three years.

2. Treasury Management Summary

Treasury management activity as at 30th June 2017 is shown in table 2 below.

 Table 2: Treasury Management Summary in Quarter 1*

| | Balance at 01/04/17 | Raised | Repaid | Balance at 30/06/17 | Weighted Average Rate |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| | £m | £m | £m | £m | % |
| Loans | | | | | |
| PWLB | 203.234 | - | - | 203.234 | 3.60 |
| Money Market (LOBO) | 7.000 | - | - | 7.000 | 3.60 |
| Temporary Borrowing | 2.512 | 10.000 | 2.362 | 10.150 | 0.20 |
| Total Loans | 212.746 | 10.000 | 2.362 | 220.384 | 3.44 |
| | | | _ | | |
| Investments | | | | | |
| Fixed Deposits | 162.000 | 73.500 | 66.000 | 169.500 | 0.74 |
| Money Market Funds | 6.920 | 117.680 | 111.870 | 12.730 | 0.25 |
| Call Accounts | 23.176 | 12.166 | 0.950 | 34.392 | 0.45 |
| Covered Bonds | 8.808 | - | - | 8.808 | 0.59 |
| Total investments | 200.904 | 203.346 | 178.820 | 225.435 | 0.68 |

* Excludes energy renewable loan

3. Investments

- 3.1 The authority had outstanding deposits and related investments at 30 June 2017 of £225m. The Arlingclose universe of 13 London Boroughs had an average cash balance of £93.2m. The average days to maturity of the authority's investments was 294 days compared to the 154 days of the 13 London Borough's.
- 3.2 At 30 June 2017, investments were spread amongst 26 counterparties in comparison with an average of 16 counterparties in the Arlingclose universe of 13 London Boroughs. **Appendix A** shows the breakdown of counterparties and investments for the authority. Diversification of the investment portfolio meant that the exposure to banks with a potential of being affected by Bail-in was 44% in comparison with 65% in the universe.
- 3.3 Table 3 below shows treasury investment performance for quarter ending 30 June 2017 while Table 4 show the average monthly balances in the quarter.

| Period | Benchmark | Budgeted | Actual Rate | Investment Interest |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|-------------|---------------------|
| | Return | Rate of | of | Earned to |
| | 3 month LIBOR | Return | Return | Period End |
| | % (Average | % | % | £m |
| | Quarterly Rate) | | | |
| Quarter 1 | 0.31 | 0.60 | 0.68 | 0.372 |

Table 3: Treasury Investment Performance for Quarter 1 2017/18

- 3.4 3M LIBOR started the financial year at 0.337% and ended Q1 at 0.307% (It was 0.285% at 11 September) and as a result return on cash investments have continued to reduce.
- 3.5 As shown in table 3, the authority outperformed its benchmark this quarter by 37bps. This was achieved by locking into longer term deposits to mitigate the impact of falling 3 month LIBOR. However once these investments mature the cash becomes subject to current market rates.
- 3.6 The authority's 2017/18 budgeted rate of return was set at 0.60% taking into account predicted fall in Bank Rate and economic conditions. At the end of quarter 1, the authority outperformed its budgeted rate of return by 8bps. This compares with the Arlingclose London universe figure of 0.67%but the risk adjusted return for the authority was significantly higher generating 0.21% return per unit of risk on a time weighted basis compared with 0.16% for the universe
- 3.7 It is expected that the average 3 month LIBOR will drop further in Quarter 2 and as maturing deposits are replaced with new investments at lower rates

any excess interest in Quarter 1 may be eroded before the end of the financial year. Officers and their adviser will consider reinvesting in longer duration investments (exceeding 364 days) to obtain higher yield (within existing risk parameters) once the capital review is completed.

| Year | Quarter | Month | Date | Days | Average Balance (£m) | Weighted Average Rate (%) |
|-----------|---------|-------|----------------------|------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | April | April average | 30 | 212.6 | 0.69 |
| | 1 | May | May average | 31 | 220.6 | 0.67 |
| 2017/2018 | T | June | June average | 30 | 223.6 | 0.68 |
| | | | 2017/2018 Q1 average | 91 | 219.0 | 0.68 |
| | | | 2017/2018 average | 91 | 219.0 | 0.68 |

Table 4 shows the average monthly balances in Quarter 1 2017/18

4. Current Investment Opportunities

- 4.1 The Authority is occasionally made aware of long term investment opportunities by other oneSource Authorities, brokers or investment advisers.
- 4.2 Council on the 13th September approved changes to the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) which will now facilitate investment in a wider range of products.
- 4.3 In 2016/17, oneSource authorities (Newham and Bexley) and Warrington Council have invested in 5 year solar bonds. Subsequent to Cabinet's approval of the recommended changes to the TMSS, this authority now has the option of investing £3m in Solar bonds and the S151 Officer in consultation with the lead member for financial management will decide whether to take up this option.

5. New borrowing

- 5.1 Affordability and the "cost of carry" remained important influences on the authority's borrowing strategy alongside the consideration that, for any borrowing undertaken ahead of need, the proceeds would have to be invested in the money markets at rates of interest significantly lower than the cost of borrowing.
- 5.2 As short-term interest rates have remained, and are likely to remain at least over the forthcoming two years, lower than long-term rates, the authority determined it was more cost effective in the short-term to use internal resources instead, referred to as internal borrowing.

- 5.3 As a result no long term borrowing was undertaken during the quarter but this will be kept under continuous review as capital investment plans are developed and spending is monitored.
- 5.5 Market opportunities that may provide borrowing rates at less than equivalent PWLB will be considered, where such borrowing opportunities become available. The S151 Officer will consider the cost of carry before making a decision to borrow in advance of need or forward fixing borrowing rates. Such opportunities could be used by the authority after careful consideration to potentially pay for the authority's prefunding of the LGPS past service cost and deliver General Fund savings. However the S151 Officer will ensure that full cost of the capital programme over the same period and its affordability is costed before making a decision whether to use cash balances to prefund pension fund annual past service cost pension contributions for the next 3 years.

6. Debt Rescheduling

- 6.1 The possibility of debt rescheduling is regularly discussed with our treasury adviser and is a regular agenda item at the quarterly treasury meeting held between the treasury officers, Arlingclose, the S151 officer and the lead Member for Financial Management. However opportunities have been almost non-existent in the current economic climate.
- 6.2 The premium charge for early repayment of PWLB debt remains relatively expensive for the loans in the authority's portfolio and therefore unattractive for debt rescheduling activity. No rescheduling activity was undertaken as a consequence.

7. Compliance with Treasury and Prudential Limits

- 7.1 It is a statutory duty for the authority to determine and keep under review the affordable borrowing limits. The authority's approved 2017/18 Treasury and Prudential Indicators (affordability limits) were included and approved by Full Council as part of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) in February 2017. The changes to the 2017/18 TMSS presented to this Committee in June 2017 were approved by Full Council on the 13th September 2017 meeting. These changes as reported will enable the authority to invest in secured bonds in unrated companies.
- 7.2 During the quarter, the authority has operated within the treasury limits and Prudential Indicators set out in the authority Treasury Management Strategy Statement and in compliance with the authority's Treasury Management Practices. An update on indicators and limits are reported in appendix 2 of this report.
- 7.3 There were a number of credit rating changes during the quarter. Moody's Credit Rating Agency affirmed Royal Bank of Scotland's and NatWest's long-term ratings at Baa1. The agency did downgraded the major Canadian banks' long-term ratings on the anticipation that they will face a more

challenging operating environment going forward but are expected to remain above the authority's approved ratings for highly rated counterparties.

- 7.4 Moody's also down-graded the large Australian banks to Aa3 from Aa2 reflecting the agency's view of the rising risks from the banks exposure to the Australian housing market and the elevated proportion of lending to residential property investors. However the ratings of these banks are still expected to remain within criteria of the authority's highly rated counterparties. The authority had £8m exposure with an Australian bank (Australia and New Zealand Banking Group) at the end of Q1, with a rating of AA-.
- 7.5 Standards and Poor's Credit Rating Agency (S&P) also revised Nordea banks outlook from negative to stable, whilst affirming their long-term rating at AA-.
- 7.6 The authority's treasury adviser sends out email communications, notifying changes to counterparty ratings when they take place. These are monitored by the Treasury Manager and appropriate action taken after seeking advice from the Head of Pensions and Treasury.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

There are no direct financial implications from this report.

Legal implications and risks:

There are no apparent legal implications or risks from noting this report.

Human Resources implications and risks:

There are no HR implications from this report

Equalities implications and risks:

There are no Equalities implications arising from this report

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1.
- 2017/18 Treasury Management Strategy 2016/17 Treasury Management Annual report and Proposed Changes to 2017/18 Treasury Management Strategy Arlingclose Investment Benchmarking Q2 2017 2.
- 3.

Table 1 breakdown of Deposits at 30th June 2017

| Institution Type | 30th June 2017 Actual £'m | 31 March 2017 Actual £'m |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| UK Banks | | |
| Goldman Sachs INT"L Bank | 17.600 | 18.000 |
| Lloyds Bank PLC | 24.000 | 24.000 |
| Royal Bank of Scotland | 0.100 | - |
| Santander UK PLC | 24.005 | 23.984 |
| UK Building Societies | | |
| Coventry Building Society | - | 5.000 |
| Nationwide Building Society | 10.000 | 13.000 |
| Yorkshire Building Society | 5.000 | 5.000 |
| Local Authorities & Other Public Sector | | |
| Birmingham City Council | 15.000 | - |
| BlackBurn with Darwen Borough Council | 5.000 | - |
| Cheshire East Council | 5.000 | - |
| Eastleigh Borough Council | 5.000 | 5.000 |
| Falkirk Council | 5.000 | |
| Highland Council Inverness | 7.000 | 12.000 |
| Lancashire County Council | 15.000 | 15.000 |
| London Borough of Islington | 5.000 | 5.000 |
| Mid Suffolk District Council | 5.000 | |
| Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council | 10.000 | 5.000 |
| North Lanarkshire Council | 5.000 | 5.000 |
| Northumberland County Council | 15.000 | 15.000 |
| Stockport Borough Council | 5.000 | - |
| Non UK Banks | | |
| Australia | | |
| Australia & New Zealand Banking Group | 8.000 | 3.000 |
| Commonwealth Bank of Australia | - | 10.000 |
| Canada | | |
| Bank of Montreal | - | 4.000 |
| Netherlands | | |
| Cooperative Rabobank | 10.000 | 15.000 |
| Singapore | | |
| Development Bank Singapore | 7.000 | 2.000 |
| Overseas-Chinese Banking Corporation | 5.000 | 9.000 |
| Money Market Funds | | |
| HSBC Global Liquidity Fund Class G MMF | - | 6.920 |
| BNP Paribas Insticash Sterling MMF | 9.040 | - |
| Insight Investments Liquidity MMF | 3.690 | - |
| TOTAL INVESTMENTS | 225.435 | 200.904 |

Table 2

Investment Benchmarking

| Investment Benchmarking | | 13 London & Met Boroughs | 133 LAs |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|---------|
| 30 June 2017 | Havering | Average | Average |
| Internal Investments | £225.4m | £87.8m | £63.0m |
| External Funds | £0.0m | £3.9m | £9.2m |
| TOTAL INVESTMENTS | £225.4m | £93.2m | £72.2m |
| | | | |
| Security | | | |
| Average Credit Score | 3.97 | 4.32 | 4.32 |
| Average Credit Rating | AA- | AA- | AA- |
| Average Credit Score (time-weighted) | 3.26 | 4.22 | 3.99 |
| Average Credit Rating (time-weighted) | AA | AA- | AA- |
| Number of Counterparties / Funds | 26 | 16 | 16 |
| Proportion Exposed to Bail-in | 44% | 65% | 65% |
| | | | |
| Liquidity | | | |
| Proportion Available within 7 days | 6% | 52% | 46% |
| Proportion Available within 100 days | 32% | 70% | 66% |
| Average Days to Maturity | 294 | 154 | 45 |
| | | | |
| Market Risks | | | |
| Average Days to Next Rate Reset | 290 | 174 | 71 |
| External Fund Volatility | 0.0% | 0.4% | 1.9% |
| | | | |
| Yield | | | |
| Internal Investment Return | 0.68% | 0.51% | 0.52% |
| External Funds - Income Return | | 1.34% | 3.48% |
| External Funds - Capital Gains/Losses | | 1.20% | 1.37% |
| External Funds - Total Return | | 2.54% | 4.85% |
| Total Investments - Income Return | 0.68% | 0.58% | 0.89% |
| Total Investments - Total Return | 0.68% | 0.67% | 1.19% |

Notes to the table above

• Unless otherwise stated, all measures relate to internally managed investments only, i.e. excluding external pooled funds.

• Averages within a portfolio are weighted by size of investment, but averages across authorities are not weighted.

• Credit scores are calculated as AAA = 1, AA+ = 2, etc.

• Volatility is the standard deviation of weekly total returns, annualised.

SOURCE: Arlingclose Quarterly benchmarking

Compliance Report

All treasury management activities undertaken during quarter 1 complied fully with the CIPFA Code of Practice and the authority's approved Treasury Management Strategy. Compliance with specific treasury limits is demonstrated in tables below.

1.1 Interest Rate Exposures

1.1.1 This indicator is set to control the authority's exposure to interest rate risk on its debt portfolio. The upper limits on fixed and variable rate interest rate exposures, expressed as the proportion of gross principal borrowed will be:

Table1: Interest rate exposure activity

| | 2017/18 Limit % | 2017/18 Q1 Actual % | 2018/19 Limit % | 2019/20 Limit % |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Upper limit on fixed interest rate exposure | 100 | 92.22 | 100 | 100 |
| Upper limit on variable interest rate exposure | 25 | 7.78 | 30 | 35 |

Fixed rate borrowings are those borrowings where the rate of interest is fixed for the whole financial year. Instruments that mature during the financial year are classed as variable rate.

1.1.2 Having larger amounts of fixed interest rate borrowing gives the authority greater stability with regards to its interest payments and reduces the risk of higher interest costs should interest rates rise. Traditionally local authorities have taken advantage of fixing interest rates long term to reduce interest rate exposure. The table excludes Salix Finance loans as these are held at zero interest hence no interest rate exposure.

1.2 Maturity Structure of Borrowing

1.2.1 This indicator is set to control the authority's exposure to refinancing risk. The upper and lower limits on the maturity structure of fixed rate borrowing will be:

| | Upper % | Lower % | Actual % |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Under 12 months | 40 | 0 | 7.78 |
| 12 months and within 24 months | 40 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 24 months and within 5 years | 60 | 0 | 0.50 |
| 5 years and within 10 years | 75 | 0 | 9.77 |
| 10 years and above | 100 | 25 | 81.94 |

Table 2: Loan maturity structure

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

1.3 Principal Sums Invested for Periods Longer than 364 days

- 1.3.1 The purpose of this indicator is to control the authority's exposure to the risk of incurring losses by seeking early repayment of its investments.
- 1.3.2 The limits set in the 2017/18 treasury management strategy in comparison to the quarter one is set below. It is the authority's policy to classify available for sale investments with maturities exceeding one year as short term investments.

 Table 3: Investments for periods longer than 364 days

| | 2017/18 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|
| | Limit | Actual | Limit |
| | £m | £m | £m |
| Limit on principal invested beyond year end | 75 | 40 | 75 |

1.4 Liquidity Treasury Indicator

1.4.1 The authority has adopted a voluntary measure of its exposure to liquidity risk by monitoring the amount of cash available to meet unexpected payments overnight and within a rolling three month period without additional borrowing. £12.830m amounts to 5.64% of total investments while £24.5m amounts to 10.87%.

Table 4: Liquidity activity as 30/06/2017

| | Target £m | Actual £m |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| Total cash available by the next working day | 5.000 | 12.830 |
| Total cash available within 3 months | 30.000 | 24.500 |

1.5 Gross Debt and the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR)

1.5.1 In order to ensure that over the medium term debt will only be for a capital purpose, the authority should ensure that debt does not, except in the short term, exceed the total of CFR in the preceding year plus the estimates of any additional CFR for the current and next two financial years. This is a key indicator of prudence.

Table 5: Gross debt and the CFR

| | 31.03.17 Actual £m | 31.03.18 Estimate £m | 31.03.19 Estimate £m | 31.03.20 Estimate £m |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Long Term External Debt | 210.234 | 210.234 | 210.234 | 256.234 |
| CFR | 250.578 | 280.794 | 325.527 | 371.890 |
| Internal Borrowing | 40.344 | 70.56 | 115.293 | 115.656 |

1.5.2 Total debt is expected to remain below the CFR during the year. The actual debt levels are monitored against the Operational Boundary and authorised Limit for External Debt, below.

1.6 Operational Boundary for External Debt

1.6.1 The operational boundary is based on the authority's estimate of most likely, i.e. prudent, but not worst case scenario for external debt.

 Table 6: Operational Boundary

| Operational Boundary | 2017/18 £m | 2018/19 £m | 2019/20 £m |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Borrowing | 276.300 | 310.600 | 341.400 |
| Other long-term liabilities | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 |
| Total | 278.300 | 312.600 | 343.400 |

1.7 Authorised Limit for External Debt

1.7.1 The authorised limit is the affordable borrowing limit determined in compliance with the Local Government Act 2003. It is the maximum amount of debt that the authority can legally owe. The authorised limit provides headroom over and above the operational boundary for unusual cash movements.

 Table 7: Authorised limit for external debt

| Authorised Limit | 2017/18 £m | 2018/19 £m | 2019/20 £m |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Borrowing | 303.900 | 341.700 | 375.500 |
| Other long-term liabilities | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 |
| Total Debt | 305.900 | 343.700 | 377.500 |
| Long Term Debt | 210.200 | 210.200 | 210.200 |
| Headroom | 95.700 | 133.500 | 133.500 |



Regulatory Update

Appendix C

1.0 Ring-fencing

- 1.1 Ring-fencing which requires the larger UK banks to separate their core retail banking activity from the rest of their business, is expected to be implemented within the next year.
- 1.2 In May, Arlingclose advice has been for clients to reduce the maximum duration of its deposits at RBS, HSBC and Lloyds bank from 13 months to 6 months as there is some uncertainty surrounding which banking entities the authority will be dealing with once ring-fencing is implemented. The Committee was provided with an update on ring-fencing in the Q4 report, further updates will be provided once the final balance sheet structures of those banks are known.
- 1.3 There is a potential risk that arises from the ring fencing of larger UK banks. The authority would not be able to lock into the favourable rates that are offered for longer term investments with these banks and therefore the prospects of meeting the investment income target for the current year is at an additional risk.
- 1.4 Although bail-in legislation has been enacted and is due to be implemented shortly in Canada in the absence of credit default swaps, Arlingclose is of the belief that these bank's balance sheets no longer support their existing credit stance they have therefore advised clients to reduce the duration of new investments in Bank of Montreal, Bank of Nova Scotia, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Royal Bank of Canada and Toronto Dominion Bank from 12 months to 6 months although investments in these banks collateralised against secured securities within the authority's Treasury Management Strategy can be for longer in so far as they remain with the approved limits.

2.0 MIFID II Client Categorisation of Local Authorities

- 2.1 The FCA's final rules were published in a policy statement on 3rd July 2017. There were some differences and some clarification compared to the original proposals. The Committee were provided with an update in the Q4 2016/17 report.
- 2.2 Although the UK has voted to leave the EU, MIFID II will be implemented in the UK because the UK is still subject to EU laws until we leave, secondly the UK government is in favour of strengthening investor protection and UK firms will wish to continue to provide financial services across the EU after we leave therefore need to comply with equivalent regulations.

- 2.3 With the changes to Client Categorisation rules, all Local Authorities will be reclassified as 'retail' clients by default, with the option of being treated as 'elective professional', provided they can meet a set of qualitative and quantitative criteria (detailed in points 2.5 & 2.6)
- 2.4 A decision to maintain "Retail" status is expected to limit the investment options available, compared to "Professional" status. It also is important to note that the option to opt-up is not a one off exercise. It will need to be undertaken with each and every counterparty / fund manager that a client may wish to transact. Without "Professional" status the authority will be unable to deliver its Treasury Management Strategy and the investment income assumed in the budget strategy.

2.5 Qualitative Test Criteria

- (a) This test is based around the financial firm being confident that their client can demonstrate their experience and knowledge, to a level at which they have sufficient assurance that the client is capable of making investment decisions and has an understanding of the risks involved.
- (b) The qualitative test criteria are provided as guidance and each investment counter-party would then set its particular criteria. Rather than a simple pro-forma that could be used to meet each individual request, there are likely to be differences in each approach from each individual financial institution and fund manager. The differences could simply depend on the nature of the potential investment a client may make with the entity, or there could be other factors that also play a role.
- (c) The onus will be on each financial services firm to document and evidence that each client satisfies the above criteria, if they wish to allow an authority to re-categorise as professional. The information that will be needed as part of this process will have to be supplied by the local authority.

2.6 Quantitative Test Criteria

The quantitative test criteria that must be satisfied are detailed below.

- (a) the size of the client's financial instrument portfolio, defined as including cash deposits and financial instruments, exceeds £10,000,000
- (b) the client has carried out transactions, in significant size, on the relevant market at an average frequency of 10 per quarter over the previous four quarters
- (c) the client works or has worked in the financial sector for at least one year in a professional position, which requires knowledge of the transactions or services envisaged

- 2.7 In the July briefing from the authority's treasury adviser, it was noted that none of the main broker and adviser firms serving Local Authorities are currently authorised to serve retail clients, including Arlingclose.
- 2.8 There is a portal that has been provided by CIPFA, the CIPFA/PS Link MiFID II portal, to manage the opting up process. The authority has been registered on this portal and intends to complete the necessary stages towards the opting up process through this portal.



Glossary of Terms

Appendix D

A bond is a debt instrument in which an investor lends money for a specified period of time at a fixed rate of interest. The issuing entity could be corporate, financial or government.

A floating rate note (FRN) is a money market instrument with a Floating/variable rate of interest, which re-fixes over a reference rate, for example 3 month LIBOR.

Bail in is rescuing a financial institution on the brink of failure by making its creditors and depositors take a loss on their holdings. A **bail**-in is the opposite of a **bail**-out, which involves the rescue of a financial institution by external parties, typically governments using taxpayer's money.

Basis point (bp) One hundredth of 1% e.g. 0.01%

Certificates of deposit (CDs) are a negotiable form of fixed deposit, ranked pari passu with fixed deposits. The difference is that you are not obligated to hold the CD to maturity, you can realise the cash by selling in the secondary market.

Coupon is the total amount of interest a security will pay. The coupon period depends on the security. A CD will often pay interest at maturity, while a bond may pay semi annually or annually and an FRN will most likely pay every 3 months.

Covered bond Covered bonds are conventional bonds (fixed or floating) issued by financial institutions, that are backed by a separate group of loans, usually prime residential mortgages. This lowers the creditor's exposure to default risk, enhancing the credit. This is why the issue is usually rated AAA, higher than the rating given to the issuer reduces exposure to bail-in risk.

Credit rating A measure of the credit worthiness of a borrower. A credit rating can be assigned to country, organisation or specific debt issue/ financial obligation. There are a number of credit ratings agencies but the main 3 are Standard & Poor's, Fitch or Moody's.

MIFID is the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive. A European Union Directive.

Principal is the total amount being borrowed or lent.

Spread is the difference between the buy and sell price of a security. It can also be the gap, usually in basis points, between the yield of a security and the benchmark security.

Treasury bills (T-bills) are UK government rated, short-dated form of Government debt, issued by the Debt Management Office (DMO) via a weekly tender. T-bills are normally issued for one, three or six month duration.