SPECIFIED AND NON-SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS

**SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS:**

All such investments will be sterling denominated, with **maturities up to maximum of 1 year**, meeting the minimum ‘high’ rating criteria where applicable. These are considered low risk assets where the possibility of loss of principal or investment income is small.

The criteria, time limits and monetary limits applying to institutions or investment vehicles are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Minimum Credit Criteria / Colour Band</th>
<th>£ limit per institution and single transaction</th>
<th>Max maturity period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt Management Agency Deposit Facility</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£3.0m</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term deposits – local authorities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£3.0m</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term deposits - UK part nationalised banks</td>
<td>Blue **</td>
<td>£3.0m</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term deposits – banks and building societies</td>
<td>Orange Red Green No colour</td>
<td>£3.0m</td>
<td>Up to 1 year Up to 6 months Up to 100 days Not for use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Funds</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>£3.0m</td>
<td>Liquid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**only applies to nationalised or semi nationalised UK Banks**
NON-SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS

A maximum of £1.0m will be held in aggregate in non-specified investment

1. Maturities of ANY period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Minimum Credit Criteria / Colour Band</th>
<th>Maximum Investment</th>
<th>Maximum maturity period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of deposits issued by banks and building societies</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>£1.0m</td>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Government Gilts</td>
<td>Sovereign rating</td>
<td>£1.0m</td>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds issued by multilateral development banks</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>£1.0m</td>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds issued by a financial institution which is explicitly guaranteed by the UK government</td>
<td>Sovereign rating</td>
<td>£1.0m</td>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed term deposits with variable rate and variable maturities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured deposits</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>£1.0m</td>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial paper issuance by UK banks covered by UK Government guarantee</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>£1.0m</td>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other debt issuance by UK banks covered by UK Government guarantee</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>£1.0m</td>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Authority will seek further advice on the appropriateness and associated risks with investments in these categories.

2. Maturities in excess of 1 year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Minimum Credit Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Investment</th>
<th>Maximum maturity period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term deposits – local authorities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£1.0m</td>
<td>Up to 2 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term deposits – banks and building societies</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>£1.0m</td>
<td>Up to 2 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX C

APPROVED COUNTRIES FOR INVESTMENTS

AAA
- Australia
- Canada
- Denmark
- Germany
- Luxembourg
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Singapore
- Sweden
- Switzerland

AA+
- Finland
- Hong Kong
- U.S.A.

AA
- Abu Dhabi (UAE)
- France
- U.K.

AA-
- Belgium
- Qatar
TREASURY MANAGEMENT SCHEME OF DELEGATION

1. Full Council
   - receiving and reviewing reports on treasury management policies, practices and activities;
   - approval of annual strategy.

2. Policy and Resources 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;
   - approving the selection of external service providers and agreeing terms of appointment.

3. Overview and Scrutiny Committee
   - reviewing the treasury management policy and procedures and making recommendations to the responsible body.
THE TREASURY MANAGEMENT ROLE OF THE SECTION 151 OFFICER

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.
GLOBAL OUTLOOK. World growth looks to be on an encouraging trend of stronger performance, rising earnings and falling levels of unemployment. In October, the IMF upgraded its forecast for world growth from 3.2% to 3.6% for 2017 and 3.7% for 2018.

In addition, inflation prospects are generally muted and it is particularly notable that wage inflation has been subdued despite unemployment falling to historically very low levels in the UK and US. This has led to many comments by economists that there appears to have been a fundamental shift downwards in the Phillips curve (this plots the correlation between levels of unemployment and inflation e.g. if the former is low the latter tends to be high). In turn, this raises the question of what has caused this? The likely answers probably lay in a combination of a shift towards flexible working, self-employment, falling union membership and a consequent reduction in union power and influence in the economy, and increasing globalisation and specialisation of individual countries, which has meant that labour in one country is in competition with labour in other countries which may be offering lower wage rates, increased productivity or a combination of the two. In addition, technology is probably also exerting downward pressure on wage rates and this is likely to grow with an accelerating movement towards automation, robots and artificial intelligence, leading to many repetitive tasks being taken over by machines or computers. Indeed, this is now being labelled as being the start of the fourth industrial revolution.

KEY RISKS - central bank monetary policy measures
Looking back on nearly ten years since the financial crash of 2008 when liquidity suddenly dried up in financial markets, it can be assessed that central banks’ monetary policy measures to counter the sharp world recession were successful. The key monetary policy measures they used were a combination of lowering central interest rates and flooding financial markets with liquidity, particularly through unconventional means such as Quantitative Easing (QE), where central banks bought large amounts of central government debt and smaller sums of other debt.

The key issue now is that that period of stimulating economic recovery and warding off the threat of deflation is coming towards its close and a new period has already started in the US, and more recently, in the UK, on reversing those measures i.e. by raising central rates and (for the US) reducing central banks’ holdings of government and other debt. These measures are now required in order to stop the trend of an on-going reduction in spare capacity in the economy, and of unemployment falling to such low levels that the re-emergence of inflation is viewed as a major risk. It is, therefore, crucial that central banks get their timing right and do not cause shocks to market expectations that could destabilise financial markets. In particular, a key risk is that because QE-driven purchases of bonds drove up the price of government debt, and therefore caused a sharp drop in income yields, this then also encouraged investors into a search for yield and into investing in riskier assets such as equities. This resulted in bond markets and equity market prices both rising to historically high valuation levels simultaneously. This, therefore, makes both asset categories vulnerable to a sharp correction. It is important, therefore, that central banks only gradually unwind their holdings of bonds in order to prevent destabilising the financial markets. It is also likely that the timeframe for central banks unwinding their holdings of QE debt purchases will be over several years. They need to balance their timing to neither squash economic recovery by taking too rapid and too strong action, or, alternatively, let inflation run away by taking action that was too slow and/or too weak. The potential for central banks to get this timing and strength of action wrong are now key risks.

There is also a potential key question over whether economic growth has become too dependent on strong central bank stimulus and whether it will maintain its momentum against a backdrop of rising interest rates and the reversal of QE. In the UK, a key vulnerability is the
low level of productivity growth, which may be the main driver for increases in wages; and decreasing consumer disposable income, which is important in the context of consumer expenditure primarily underpinning UK GDP growth.

A further question that has come to the fore is whether an inflation target for central banks of 2%, is now realistic given the shift down in inflation pressures from internally generated inflation, (i.e. wage inflation feeding through into the national economy), given the above mentioned shift down in the Phillips curve.

- Some economists favour a shift to a lower inflation target of 1% to emphasise the need to keep the lid on inflation. Alternatively, it is possible that a central bank could simply 'look through' tepid wage inflation, (i.e. ignore the overall 2% inflation target), in order to take action in raising rates sooner than might otherwise be expected.
- However, other economists would argue for a shift UP in the inflation target to 3% in order to ensure that central banks place the emphasis on maintaining economic growth through adopting a slower pace of withdrawal of stimulus.
- In addition, there is a strong argument that central banks should target financial market stability. As mentioned previously, bond markets and equity markets could be vulnerable to a sharp correction. There has been much commentary, that since 2008, QE has caused massive distortions, imbalances and bubbles in asset prices, both financial and non-financial. Consequently, there are widespread concerns at the potential for such bubbles to be burst by exuberant central bank action. On the other hand, too slow or weak action would allow these imbalances and distortions to continue or to even inflate them further.
- Consumer debt levels are also at historically high levels due to the prolonged period of low cost of borrowing since the financial crash. In turn, this cheap borrowing has meant that other non-financial asset prices, particularly house prices, have been driven up to very high levels, especially compared to income levels. Any sharp downturn in the availability of credit, or increase in the cost of credit, could potentially destabilise the housing market and generate a sharp downturn in house prices. This could then have a destabilising effect on consumer confidence, consumer expenditure and GDP growth. However, no central bank would accept that it ought to have responsibility for specifically targeting house prices.

UK. After the UK surprised on the upside with strong economic growth in 2016, growth in 2017 has been disappointingly weak; quarter 1 came in at only +0.3% (+1.8% y/y), quarter 2 was +0.3% (+1.5% y/y) and quarter 3 was +0.4% (+1.5% y/y). The main reason for this has been the sharp increase in inflation, caused by the devaluation of sterling after the EU referendum, feeding increases in the cost of imports into the economy. This has caused, in turn, a reduction in consumer disposable income and spending power and so the services sector of the economy, accounting for around 80% of GDP, has seen weak growth as consumers cut back on their expenditure. However, more recently there have been encouraging statistics from the manufacturing sector which is seeing strong growth, particularly as a result of increased demand for exports. It has helped that growth in the EU, our main trading partner, has improved significantly over the last year while robust world growth has also been supportive. However, this sector only accounts for around 10% of GDP so expansion in this sector will have a much more muted effect on the overall GDP growth figure for the UK economy as a whole.

While the Bank of England is expected to give forward guidance to prepare financial markets for gradual changes in policy, the Monetary Policy Committee, (MPC), meeting of 14 September 2017 managed to shock financial markets and forecasters by suddenly switching to a much more aggressive tone in terms of its words around warning that Bank Rate will need to rise soon. The Bank of England Inflation Reports during 2017 have clearly flagged up that it expected CPI inflation to peak at just under 3% in 2017, before falling back to near to its
target rate of 2% in two years’ time. The Bank revised its forecast for the peak to just over 3% at the 14 September meeting. (Inflation actually came in at 3.0% in both September and October so that might prove now to be the peak.) This marginal revision in the Bank’s forecast can hardly justify why the MPC became so aggressive with its wording; rather, the focus was on an emerging view that with unemployment having already fallen to only 4.3%, the lowest level since 1975, and improvements in productivity being so weak, that the amount of spare capacity in the economy was significantly diminishing towards a point at which they now needed to take action. In addition, the MPC took a more tolerant view of low wage inflation as this now looks like a common factor in nearly all western economies as a result of automation and globalisation. However, the Bank was also concerned that the withdrawal of the UK from the EU would effectively lead to a decrease in such globalisation pressures in the UK, and so this would cause additional inflationary pressure over the next few years.

At Its 2 November meeting, the MPC duly delivered a 0.25% increase in Bank Rate. It also gave forward guidance that they expected to increase Bank Rate only twice more in the next three years to reach 1.0% by 2020. This is, therefore, not quite the ‘one and done’ scenario but is, nevertheless, a very relaxed rate of increase prediction in Bank Rate in line with previous statements that Bank Rate would only go up very gradually and to a limited extent.

However, some forecasters are flagging up that they expect growth to accelerate significantly towards the end of 2017 and then into 2018. This view is based primarily on the coming fall in inflation, (as the effect of the effective devaluation of sterling after the EU referendum drops out of the CPI statistics), which will bring to an end the negative impact on consumer spending power. In addition, a strong export performance will compensate for weak services sector growth. If this scenario was indeed to materialise, then the MPC would be likely to accelerate its pace of increases in Bank Rate during 2018 and onwards.

It is also worth noting the contradiction within the Bank of England between action in 2016 and in 2017 by two of its committees. After the shock result of the EU referendum, the Monetary Policy Committee (MPC) voted in August 2016 for emergency action to cut Bank Rate from 0.50% to 0.25%, restarting £70bn of QE purchases, and also providing UK banks with £100bn of cheap financing. The aim of this was to lower borrowing costs, stimulate demand for borrowing and thereby increase expenditure and demand in the economy. The MPC felt this was necessary in order to ward off their expectation that there would be a sharp slowdown in economic growth. Instead, the economy grew robustly, although the Governor of the Bank of England strongly maintained that this was because the MPC took that action. However, other commentators regard this emergency action by the MPC as being proven by events to be a mistake. Then in 2017, we had the Financial Policy Committee (FPC) of the Bank of England taking action in June and September over its concerns that cheap borrowing rates, and easy availability of consumer credit, had resulted in too rapid a rate of growth in consumer borrowing and in the size of total borrowing, especially of unsecured borrowing. It, therefore, took punitive action to clamp down on the ability of the main banks to extend such credit! Indeed, a PWC report in October 2017 warned that credit card, car and personal loans and student debt will hit the equivalent of an average of £12,500 per household by 2020. However, averages belie wide variations in levels of debt with much higher exposure being biased towards younger people, especially the 25 -34 year old band, reflecting their lower levels of real income and asset ownership.

One key area of risk is that consumers may have become used to cheap rates since 2008 for borrowing, especially for mortgages. It is a major concern that some consumers may have over extended their borrowing and have become complacent about interest rates going up after Bank Rate had been unchanged at 0.50% since March 2009 until falling further to 0.25% in August 2016. This is why forward guidance from the Bank of England continues to emphasise slow and gradual increases in Bank Rate in the coming years. However, consumer borrowing is a particularly vulnerable area in terms of the Monetary Policy Committee getting
the pace and strength of Bank Rate increases right - without causing a sudden shock to consumer demand, confidence and thereby to the pace of economic growth.

Moreover, while there is so much uncertainty around the Brexit negotiations, consumer confidence, and business confidence to spend on investing, it is far too early to be confident about how the next two to three years will actually pan out.

**EZ.** Economic growth in the eurozone (EZ), (the UK’s biggest trading partner), had been lack lustre for several years after the financial crisis despite the ECB eventually cutting its main rate to -0.4% and embarking on a massive programme of QE. However, growth picked up in 2016 and has now gathered substantial strength and momentum thanks to this stimulus. GDP growth was 0.6% in quarter 1 (2.0% y/y), 0.7% in quarter 2 (2.3% y/y) and +0.6% in quarter 3 (2.5% y/y). However, despite providing massive monetary stimulus, the European Central Bank is still struggling to get inflation up to its 2% target and in October inflation was 1.4%. It is therefore unlikely to start on an upswing in rates until possibly 2019. It has, however, announced that it will slow down its monthly QE purchases of debt from €60bn to €30bn from January 2018 and continue to at least September 2018.

**USA.** Growth in the American economy was notably erratic and volatile in 2015 and 2016. 2017 is following that path again with quarter 1 coming in at only 1.2% but quarter 2 rebounding to 3.1% and quarter 3 coming in at 3.0%. Unemployment in the US has also fallen to the lowest level for many years, reaching 4.1%, while wage inflation pressures, and inflationary pressures in general, have been building. The Fed has started on a gradual upswing in rates with four increases in all and three increases since December 2016; and there could be one more rate rise in 2017, which would then lift the central rate to 1.25 – 1.50%. There could then be another four increases in 2018. At its September meeting, the Fed said it would start in October to gradually unwind its $4.5 trillion balance sheet holdings of bonds and mortgage backed securities by reducing its reinvestment of maturing holdings.

**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 credit systems.

**JAPAN.** has been struggling to stimulate consistent significant 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.

**Brexit timetable and process**

- March 2017: UK government notifies the European Council of its intention to leave under the Treaty on European Union Article 50
- March 2019: initial two-year negotiation period on the terms of exit. In her Florence speech in September 2017, the Prime Minister proposed a two year transitional period after March 2019.
- UK continues as a full EU member until March 2019 with access to the single market and tariff free trade between the EU and UK. Different sectors of the UK economy will leave the single market and tariff free trade at different times during the two year transitional period.
- The UK and EU would attempt to negotiate, among other agreements, a bi-lateral trade agreement over that period.
The UK would aim for a negotiated agreed withdrawal from the EU, although the UK could also exit without any such agreements in the event of a breakdown of negotiations.

If the UK exits without an agreed deal with the EU, World Trade Organisation rules and tariffs could apply to trade between the UK and EU - but this is not certain.

On full exit from the EU: the UK parliament would repeal the 1972 European Communities Act.

The UK will then no longer participate in matters reserved for EU members, such as changes to the EU’s budget, voting allocations and policies.
### INTEREST RATE FORECAST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Rate</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr PWLB Rate</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10yr PWLB View</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25yr PWLB View</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50yr PWLB Rate</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>