

N.B. Items specific only to NYCC matters have been removed

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE

4 February 2020

TREASURY MANAGEMENT

ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY

1.0 Investment policy – management of risk

1.1 -

1.2 The County Council's investment policy has regard to the following: -

- MHCLG's Guidance on Local Government Investments ("the Guidance");
- CIPFA Treasury Management in Public Services Code of Practice and Cross Sectoral Guidance Notes 2017 ("the Code"); and
- CIPFA Treasury Management Guidance Notes 2018.

The County Council's investment priorities will be security first, portfolio liquidity second and then yield, (return).

1.3 The above guidance from the MHCLG and CIPFA place a high priority on the management of risk. The County Council has adopted a prudent approach to managing risk and defines its risk appetite by the following means: -

- a) minimum acceptable credit criteria are applied in order to generate a list of highly creditworthy counterparties. This also enables diversification and thus avoidance of concentration risk. The key ratings used to monitor counterparties are the short term and long-term ratings;
- b) other information: ratings will not be the sole determinant of the quality of an institution; it is important to continually assess and monitor the financial sector on both a micro and macro basis and in relation to the economic and political environments in which institutions operate. The assessment will also take account of information that reflects the opinion of the markets. To achieve this consideration, the County Council will engage with its advisors to maintain a monitor on market pricing such as "credit default swaps" and overlay that information on top of the credit ratings;
- c) other information sources used will include the financial press, share price and other such information pertaining to the financial sector in order to establish the most robust scrutiny process on the suitability of potential investment counterparties;

- d) the County Council has defined the list of types of investment instruments that the treasury management team are authorised to use:-
- **Specified investments** are those with a high level of credit quality and subject to a maturity limit of one year.
 - **Non-specified investments** are those with less high credit quality, may be for periods in excess of one year, and/or are more complex instruments which require greater consideration by members and officers before being authorised for use. Once an investment is classed as non-specified, it remains non-specified all the way through to maturity i.e. an 18 month deposit would still be non-specified even if it has only 11 months left until maturity.
- e) **Non-specified investments limit.** The County Council has determined that it will limit the maximum total exposure to non-specified investments as being 20% of the total investment portfolio, (£40m);
- f) **Lending limits**, (amounts and maturity), for each counterparty will be set;
- g) the County Council will set a limit for the amount of its investments which are invested for **longer than 365 days**;
- h) investments will only be placed with counterparties from countries with a specified minimum **sovereign rating**;
- i) the County Council has engaged **external consultants**, to provide expert advice on how to optimise an appropriate balance of security, liquidity and yield, given the risk appetite of the County Council in the context of the expected level of cash balances and need for liquidity throughout the year;
- j) all investments will be denominated in **sterling**; and
- k) as a result of the change in accounting standards for 2019/20 under IFRS 9, the County Council will consider the implications of investment instruments which could result in an adverse movement in the value of the amount invested and resultant charges at the end of the year to the General Fund. (In November 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, [MHCLG], concluded a consultation for a temporary override to allow English local authorities time to adjust their portfolio of all pooled investments by announcing a statutory override to delay implementation of IFRS 9 for five years commencing from 1.4.18.)

1.4 However, the County Council will also pursue value for money in treasury management and will monitor the yield from investment income against appropriate benchmarks for investment performance. Regular monitoring of investment performance will be carried out during the year.

2.0 Changes in risk management policy from last year

2.1 The above criteria are unchanged from last year.

3.0 Creditworthiness policy

3.1 The County Council applies the creditworthiness service provided by Link Asset Services. This service employs a sophisticated modelling approach utilising credit ratings from the three main credit rating agencies - Fitch, Moody's and Standard & Poor's. The credit ratings of counterparties are supplemented with the following overlays:

- “watches” and “outlooks” from credit rating agencies;
- CDS spreads that may give early warning of likely changes in credit ratings;
- sovereign ratings to select counterparties from only the most creditworthy countries.

This modelling approach combines credit ratings, and any assigned Watches and Outlooks in a weighted scoring system which is then combined with an overlay of CDS spreads. The end product of this is a series of colour coded bands which indicate the relative creditworthiness of counterparties. These colour codes are used by the County Council to determine the suggested duration for investments.

3.2 The Link Asset Services' creditworthiness service uses a wider array of information other than just primary ratings. Furthermore, by using a risk weighted scoring system, it does not give undue preponderance to just one agency's ratings.

3.3 Typically, the minimum credit ratings criteria the County Council use will be a short term rating (Fitch or equivalents) of F1 and a long term rating of A-. There may be occasions when the counterparty ratings from one rating agency are marginally lower than these ratings but may still be used. In these instances, consideration will be given to the whole range of ratings available, or other topical market information, to support their use.

3.4 All credit ratings will be monitored daily. The County Council is alerted to changes to ratings of all three agencies through its use of the Link Asset Services' creditworthiness service

3.5 If a downgrade results in the counterparty / investment scheme no longer meeting the County Council's minimum criteria, its further use as a new investment will be withdrawn immediately.

3.6 In addition to the use of credit ratings the County Council will be advised of information in movements in Credit Default Swap spreads against the iTraxx European Financials benchmark and other market data on a daily basis via its Passport website, provided exclusively to it by Link Asset Services. Extreme market movements may result in downgrade of an institution or removal from the County Council's lending list.

3.7 Sole reliance will not be placed on the use of this external service. In addition, the County Council will also use market data and market information, as well as information on any external support for banks to help support its decision making process.

4.0 UK banks – ring fencing

4.1 The largest UK banks, (those with more than £25bn of retail / Small and Medium-sized Enterprise (SME) deposits), are required, by UK law, to separate core retail banking services from their investment and international banking activities by 1st January 2019. This is known as “ring-fencing”. Whilst smaller banks with less than £25bn in deposits are

exempt, they can choose to opt up. Several banks are very close to the threshold already and so may come into scope in the future regardless.

- 4.2 Ring-fencing is a regulatory initiative created in response to the global financial crisis. It mandates the separation of retail and SME deposits from investment banking, in order to improve the resilience and resolvability of banks by changing their structure. In general, simpler activities offered from within a ring-fenced bank, (RFB), will be focused on lower risk, day-to-day core transactions, whilst more complex and “riskier” activities are required to be housed in a separate entity, a non-ring-fenced bank, (NRFB). This is intended to ensure that an entity’s core activities are not adversely affected by the acts or omissions of other members of its group.
- 4.3 While the structure of the banks included within this process may have changed, the fundamentals of credit assessment have not. The County Council will continue to assess the new-formed entities in the same way that it does others and those with sufficiently high ratings, (and any other metrics considered), will be considered for investment purposes.

5.0 Country limits

- 5.1 Due care will be taken to consider the exposure of the County Council’s total investment portfolio to non-specified investments, countries, groups and sectors.
- 5.2 **Non-specified investment limit.** The County Council has determined that it will limit the maximum total exposure to non-specified investments as being 20% of the total investment portfolio.
- 5.3 **Country limit.** The County Council has determined that it will only use approved counterparties from the UK and from countries with a minimum sovereign credit rating of AA- from Fitch. The list of countries that qualify using these credit criteria as at the date of this report are shown in **Schedule 6**. This list will be added to, or deducted from, by officers should ratings change in accordance with this policy.

6.0 Investment strategy

- 6.1 **In-house funds.** Investments will be made with reference to the core balance and cash flow requirements and the outlook for short-term interest rates (i.e. rates for investments up to 12 months). Greater returns are usually obtainable by investing for longer periods. While most cash balances are required in order to manage daily cash flow requirements, where cash sums can be identified that could be invested for longer periods, the value to be obtained from longer term investments will be carefully assessed: -
- if it is thought that Bank Rate is likely to rise significantly within the time horizon being considered, then consideration will be given to keeping most investments as being short term or variable;
 - conversely, if it is thought that Bank Rate is likely to fall within that time period, consideration will be given to locking in higher rates currently obtainable, for longer periods.

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

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

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

Year	Budget %
2019/20	0.90
2020/21	0.95
2021/22	1.15
2022/23	1.35
2023/24	1.40
2024/25	1.40

6.3 The overall balance of risks to economic growth in the UK is probably to the downside due to the weight of all the uncertainties over Brexit, as well as a softening global economic picture. The balance of risks to increases in Bank Rate and shorter term PWLB rates are broadly similarly to the downside. In the event that a Brexit deal is agreed with the EU and approved by Parliament, the balance of risks to economic growth and to increases in Bank Rate is likely to change to the upside.

7.0 Investment performance / risk benchmarking

7.1 The County Council will use an investment benchmark to assess the investment performance of its investment portfolio of Bank of England Base Rate.

8.0 End of year investment report

8.1 At the end of the financial year, the County Council will report on its investment activity as part of its Annual Treasury Report.

SCHEDULES

1. Treasury Management Policy Statement
2. Prudential Indicators Update for 2020/21 to 2022/23
3. Economic background
4. Specified and Non Specified Investments
5. Approved Lending List
6. Approved countries for investments

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY STATEMENT****1.0 BACKGROUND**

1.1 The County Council has adopted the **CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management in the Public Services** as updated in 2017. This Code sets out a framework of operating procedures to reduce treasury risk and improve understanding and accountability regarding the Treasury position of the County Council.

1.2 The CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management requires the County Council to adopt the following four clauses of intent:

- a) the County Council will create and maintain as the cornerstone for effective Treasury Management
 - i. a strategic **Treasury Management Policy Statement** (TMPS) stating the policies, objectives and approach to risk management of the County Council to its treasury management activities;
 - ii. a framework of suitable **Treasury Management Practices** (TMPs) setting out the manner in which the County Council will seek to achieve those policies and objectives, and prescribing how it will manage and control those activities. The Code recommends 12 TMPs;
- b) the County Council delegates responsibility for the implementation and regular monitoring of its Treasury Management policies and practices to the Executive and for the execution and administration of Treasury Management decisions to the Corporate Director – Strategic Resources who will act in accordance with the Council's TMPS, TMPs, as well as CIPFA's Standard of Professional Practice on Treasury Management;
- c) the County Council nominates the Audit Committee to be responsible for ensuring effective scrutiny of the Treasury Management Strategies and Policies; and
- d) the County Council nominates the Audit Committee to be responsible for ensuring effective scrutiny of the Treasury Management Strategies and Policies.

1.3 The **CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities** (updated in 2017) and the terms of the **Local Government Act 2003**, together with 'statutory' Government Guidance, establish further requirements in relation to treasury management matters, namely

- a) the approval, on an annual basis, of a set of **Prudential Indicators**; and
- b) approval, on an annual basis, of an **Annual Treasury Management Strategy**, an **Annual Investment Strategy**, an annual **Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP)**

policy statement and a **Capital Strategy** with an associated requirement that each is monitored on a regular basis with a provision to report as necessary both in-year and at the financial year end.

1.4 This current Treasury Management Policy Statement (TMPS) was approved by County Council on 19 February 2020.

2.0 **TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY STATEMENT (TMPS)**

2.1 Based on the requirements detailed above a TMPS stating the policies and objectives of the treasury management activities of the County Council is set out below.

2.2 The County Council defines the policies and objectives of the treasury management activities of the County Council as follows: -

- a) the management of the County Council'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;
- b) the identification, monitoring and control of risk will be the prime criteria by which the effectiveness of the treasury management activities will be measured. Accordingly, the analysis and reporting of treasury management activities will focus on their risk implications for the County Council and any financial instrument entered into to manage these risks; and
- c) effective treasury management will provide support towards the achievement of the business and service objectives of the County Council as expressed in the Council Plan. The County Council is 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.

2.3 As emphasised in the Treasury Management Code of Practice, responsibility for risk management and control of Treasury Management activities lies wholly with the County Council and all officers involved in Treasury Management activities are explicitly required to follow Treasury Management policies and procedures.

3.0 **TREASURY MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (TMPs)**

3.1 –

4.0 **PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS**

4.1 –

5.0 **ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY**

- 5.1 A further implication of the Local Government Act 2003 is the requirement for the County Council to set out its Treasury Management Strategy for borrowing and to approve an Annual Investment Strategy (which sets out the County Council's policies for managing its investments and for giving priority to the security and liquidity of those investments).
- 5.2 The Government's guidance on the Annual Investment Strategy, updated in February 2018, states that authorities can combine the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy into one report. The County Council has adopted this combined approach.
- 5.3 Further statutory Government guidance, last updated with effect from February 2018, is in relation to an authority's charge to its Revenue Budget each year for debt repayment. A Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy statement must be prepared each year and submitted to the full Council for approval before the start of the financial year.
- 5.4 The County Council will approve this combined Annual Strategy alongside the annual Revenue Budget/Medium Term Financial Strategy at its February meeting each year.

6.0 REVIEW OF THIS POLICY STATEMENT

- 6.1 Under Financial Procedure Rule 14, the Corporate Director – Strategic Resources is required to periodically review this Policy Statement and all associated documentation. A review of this Statement, together with the associated annual strategies, will therefore be undertaken annually as part of the Revenue Budget process, together with a mid year review as part of the Quarterly Treasury Management reporting process and at such other times during the financial year as considered necessary by the Corporate Director – Strategic Resources.

Approved by County Council
19 February 2020

ECONOMIC BACKGROUND**1.0 The UK.**

- 1.1 2019 has been a year of political change as Theresa May resigned as Prime Minister to be replaced by Boris Johnson on a platform of the UK leaving the EU on 31 October 2019, with or without a deal. However, MPs blocked leaving on that date and the EU agreed an extension to 31 January 2020. In late October, MPs approved an outline of a Brexit deal to enable the UK to leave the EU on 31 January. Now that the Conservative Government has gained a large overall majority in the general election on 12 December, this outline deal will be passed by Parliament by that date. However, there will still be much uncertainty as the detail of a trade deal will need to be negotiated by the current end of the transition period in December 2020, which the Prime Minister has pledged he will not extend. This could prove to be an unrealistically short timetable for such major negotiations that leaves open two possibilities; one, the need for an extension of negotiations, probably two years, or, a no deal Brexit in December 2020.
- 1.2 As a result of the uncertainties of where the UK will be after the general election, the Bank made a change in their Brexit assumptions to now include a deal being eventually passed. There were increased concerns among MPC members around weak global economic growth and the potential for Brexit uncertainties to become entrenched and so delay UK economic recovery. Consequently, the MPC voted 7-2 to maintain Bank Rate at 0.75% but two members were sufficiently concerned to vote for an immediate Bank Rate cut to 0.5%. The MPC warned that if global growth does not pick up or Brexit uncertainties intensify, then a rate cut was now more likely. Conversely, if risks do recede, then a more rapid recovery of growth will require gradual and limited rate rises. The speed of recovery will depend on the extent to which uncertainty dissipates over the final terms for trade between the UK and EU and by how much global growth rates pick up.
- 1.3 The Bank revised its inflation forecasts down to 1.25% in 2019, 1.5% in 2020, and 2.0% in 2021.
- 1.4 The MPC meeting of 19 December repeated the previous month's vote of 7-2 to keep Bank Rate on hold. Their key view was that there was currently 'no evidence about the extent to which policy uncertainties among companies and households had declined' The two members who voted for a cut were concerned that the labour market was faltering.
- 1.5 If economic growth were to weaken considerably, the MPC has relatively little room to make a big impact with Bank Rate still only at 0.75%. It would therefore, probably suggest that it would be up to the Chancellor to provide help to support growth by way of a fiscal boost by e.g. tax cuts, increases in the annual expenditure budgets of government departments and services and expenditure on infrastructure projects, to boost the economy. The Government has already made moves in this direction and it made significant promises in its election manifesto to increase government spending by up to £20bn p.a., (this would add about 1% to GDP growth rates), by investing

primarily in infrastructure. This is likely to be announced in the next Budget, probably in February 2020. The Chancellor has also amended the fiscal rules in November to allow for an increase in government expenditure.

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

The Global Economy

2.0 USA

- 2.1 President Trump's massive easing of fiscal policy in 2018 fuelled a temporary boost in consumption. Growth in 2019 has been falling after a strong start in quarter 1 and is expected to fall further. The strong growth in employment numbers during 2018 has weakened during 2019, indicating that the economy is cooling, while inflationary pressures are also weakening;
- 2.2 The Fed finished its series of increases in rates to 2.25 – 2.50% in December 2018. In July 2019, it cut rates by 0.25% as a 'midterm adjustment' but flagged up that this was not intended to be seen as the start of a series of cuts to ward off a downturn in growth. It also ended its programme of quantitative tightening in August, (reducing its holdings of treasuries etc). It then cut rates by 0.25% again in September and by another 0.25% in its October meeting to 1.50 – 1.75%. At its September meeting it also said it was going to start buying Treasuries again, although this was not to be seen as a resumption of quantitative easing but rather an exercise to relieve liquidity pressures in the repo market.
- 2.3 Investor confidence has been badly rattled by the progressive ramping up of increases in tariffs. President Trump has made on Chinese imports and China has responded with increases in tariffs on American imports. This trade war is seen as depressing US, Chinese and world growth. In the EU, it is also particularly impacting Germany as exports of goods and services are equivalent to 46% of total GDP. It will also impact developing countries dependent on exporting commodities to China.
- 2.4 However, in early November, a phase one deal was agreed between the US and China to roll back some of the tariffs which gives some hope of resolving this dispute.

3.0 EUROZONE

- 3.1 Growth has been slowing from +1.8 % during 2018 to around half of that in 2019. German GDP growth has been struggling to stay positive in 2019 and fell by -0.1% in quarter 2. Germany would be particularly vulnerable to a no deal Brexit depressing exports further and if President Trump imposes tariffs on EU produced cars.

3.2 The European Central Bank (ECB) ended its programme of quantitative easing purchases of debt in December 2018, which then meant that the central banks in the US, UK and EU had all ended the phase of post financial crisis expansion of liquidity supporting world financial markets by quantitative easing purchases of debt. However, the downturn in growth in the second half of 2018 and into 2019, together with inflation falling well under the upper limit of its target range of 0 to 2%,), has prompted the ECB to take new measures to stimulate growth. At its March meeting it said that it expected to leave interest rates at their present levels “at least through the end of 2019”.

4.0 CHINA

4.1 Economic growth has been weakening over successive years, despite repeated rounds of central bank stimulus; medium term risks are increasing. Major progress still needs to be made to eliminate excess industrial capacity and the stock of unsold property, and to address the level of non-performing loans in the banking and shadow banking systems. In addition, there still needs to be a greater switch from investment in industrial capacity, property construction and infrastructure to consumer goods production.

5.0 JAPAN

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

6.0 WORLD GROWTH

6.1 Until recent years, world growth has been boosted by increasing globalisation i.e. countries specialising in producing goods and commodities in which they have an economic advantage and which they then trade with the rest of the world. This has boosted worldwide productivity and growth, and, by lowering costs, has also depressed inflation. However, the rise of China as an economic superpower over the last thirty years, which now accounts for nearly 20% of total world GDP, has unbalanced the world economy. The Chinese government has targeted achieving major world positions in specific key sectors and products, especially high tech areas and production of rare earth minerals used in high tech products. It is achieving this by massive financial support (i.e. subsidies) to state owned firms, government directions to other firms, technology theft, restrictions on market access by foreign firms and informal targets for the domestic market share of Chinese producers in the selected sectors. This is regarded as being unfair competition that is putting western firms at an unfair disadvantage or even putting some out of business. The current trade war between the US and China therefore needs to be seen against that backdrop. It is, therefore, likely that we are heading into a period where there will be a reversal of world globalisation and a reduction of western countries dependence on China to supply products. This is likely to produce a backdrop in the coming years of weak global growth and so weak inflation. Central banks are, therefore, likely to come under more pressure to support growth by looser monetary policy measures and this will militate against central banks increasing interest rates.

6.2 The trade war between the US and China is a major concern to financial markets. There are also concerns about how much distortion of financial markets has already occurred with the current levels of quantitative easing purchases of debt by central banks and the use of negative central bank rates in some countries.

7.0 INTEREST RATE FORECASTS

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

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

8.0 The balance of risks to the UK

- The overall balance of risks to economic growth in the UK is probably to the downside due to the weight of all the uncertainties over Brexit, as well as a softening global economic picture.
- The balance of risks to increases in Bank Rate and shorter term PWLB rates are broadly similarly to the downside.
- In the event that a Brexit deal was agreed with the EU and approved by Parliament, the balance of risks to economic growth and to increases in Bank Rate is likely to change to the upside.

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

2008. Central banks could therefore either over or under do increases in central interest rates.

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

- Brexit – if it were to cause significant economic disruption and a major downturn in the rate of growth.
- Bank of England takes action too quickly, or too far, over the next three years to raise Bank Rate and causes UK economic growth, and increases in inflation, to be weaker than we currently anticipate.
- A resurgence of the Eurozone sovereign debt crisis.
- Weak capitalisation of some European banks, particularly Italian banks.
- Minority EU governments in Germany, Austria, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Netherlands and Belgium are dependent on coalitions which could prove fragile.
- In October 2019, the IMF issued a report on the World Economic Outlook which flagged up a synchronised slowdown in world growth. However, it also flagged up that there was potential for a rerun of the 2008 financial crisis, but this time centred on the huge debt binge accumulated by corporations during the decade of low interest rates.
- Geopolitical risks, for example in North Korea, but also in Europe and the Middle East, which could lead to increasing safe haven flows.

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

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

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2020/21 – SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS

Investment	Security / Minimum Credit Rating	Circumstances of Use
Term Deposits with the UK Government or with UK Local Authorities (as per Local Government Act 2003) with maturities up to 1 year	High security as backed by UK Government	In-house
Term Deposits with credit rated deposit takers (Banks and Building Societies), including callable deposits with maturities less than 1 year	Organisations assessed as having “high credit quality” within the UK or from Countries with a minimum Sovereign rating of AA- for the country in which the organisation is domiciled	In-house
Certificate of Deposits issued by credit rated deposit takers (Banks and Building Societies) up to 1 year		Fund Manager or In-house “buy and hold” after consultation with Treasury Management Advisor
Forward deals with credit rated Banks and Building Societies less than 1 year (i.e. negotiated deal plus period of deposit)		In-house
Term Deposits with Housing Associations less than 1 year		In-house
Money Market Funds i.e. collective investment scheme as defined in SI2004 No 534 (<i>These funds have no maturity date</i>)	Funds must be AAA rated	In-house After consultation with Treasury Management Advisor Limited to £20m
Gilts (with maturities of up to 1 year)	Government Backed	Fund Manager or In-house buy and hold after consultation with Treasury Management Advisor
Bonds issued by a financial institution that is guaranteed by the UK Government (as defined in SI 2004 No 534) with maturities under 12 months (<i>Custodial arrangements required prior to purchase</i>)	Government Backed	After consultation with Treasury Management Advisor

SCHEDULE 4

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2020/21 – NON-SPECIFIED INVESTMENTS

Investment	Security / Minimum Credit Rating	Circumstances of Use	Max % of total investments	Maximum investment with any one counterparty	Max. maturity period
Term Deposit with credit rated deposit takers (Banks & Building Societies), UK Government and other Local Authorities with maturities greater than 1 year	Organisations assessed as having “high credit quality” under the Credit Worthiness Policy	In-house	100% of agreed maximum proportion of Core Cash funds (£40m)	£5m	5 years
Certificate of Deposit with credit rated deposit takers (Banks & Building Societies) with maturities greater than 1 year Custodial arrangements prior to purchase	Organisations assessed as having “high credit quality” under the Credit Worthiness Policy	Fund Manager or In-house “buy & hold” after consultation with Treasury Management Advisor	100% of agreed maximum proportion of Core Cash funds (£40m)	£5m	5 years
Callable Deposits with credit rated deposit takers (Banks & Building Societies) with maturities greater than 1 year	Organisations assessed as having “high credit quality” under the Credit Worthiness Policy	In-house	50% of agreed maximum proportion of Core Cash funds (£20m)	£5m	5 years
Term Deposits with Housing Associations with maturities greater than 1 year	Organisations assessed as having “high credit quality” under the Credit Worthiness Policy	In-house	25% of agreed maximum proportion of Core Cash funds (£10m)	£5m	5 years
Forward Deposits with a credit rated Bank or Building Society > 1 year (i.e. negotiated deal period plus period of deposit)	Organisations assessed as having “high credit quality” under the Credit Worthiness Policy	In-house	25% of agreed maximum proportion of Core Cash funds (£10m)	£5m	5 years

Investment	Security / Minimum Credit Rating	Circumstances of Use	Max % of total investments	Maximum investment with any one counterparty	Max. maturity period
Bonds issued by a financial institution that is guaranteed by the UK Government (as defined in SI2004 No534) with maturities in excess of 1 year <small>Custodial arrangements required prior to purchase</small>	AA or Government backed	Fund Manager or In-house “buy & hold” after consultation with Treasury Management Advisor	25% of agreed maximum proportion of Core Cash funds (£10m)	n/a	5 years
Bonds issued by Multilateral development banks (as defined in SI2004 No534) with maturities in excess of 1 year <small>Custodial arrangements required prior to purchase</small>	AA or Government backed	Fund Manager or In-house “buy & hold” after consultation with Treasury Management Advisor	25% of agreed maximum proportion of Core Cash funds (£10m)	£5m	5 years
UK Government Gilts with maturities in excess of 1 year <small>Custodial arrangements required prior to purchase</small>	Government backed	Fund Manager	25% of agreed maximum proportion of Core Cash funds (£10m)	n/a	5 years
Collateralised Deposit	UK Sovereign Rating	In-house	25% of agreed maximum proportion of Core Cash funds (£10m)	n/a	5 years
Property Funds	Organisations assessed as having “high credit quality”	In-house after consultation with Treasury Management Advisor	100% of agreed maximum proportion of Core Cash funds (£40m)	£5m	10 years

SCHEDULE 5
APPROVED LENDING LIST 2020/21

Maximum sum invested at any time (The overall total exposure figure covers both Specified and Non-Specified investments)

	Country	Specified Investments (up to 1 year)		Non-Specified Investments (> 1 year £40m limit)	
		Total Exposure £m	Time Limit *	Total Exposure £m	Time Limit *
UK "Nationalised" banks / UK banks with UK Central Government involvement					
Royal Bank of Scotland PLC (RFB)	GBR	75.0	365 days	-	-
National Westminster Bank PLC (RFB)	GBR				
UK "Clearing Banks", other UK based banks and Building Societies					
Santander UK PLC (includes Cater Allen)	GBR	60.0	6 months	-	-
Barclays Bank PLC (NRFB)	GBR	75.0	6 months	-	-
Barclays Bank UK PLC (RFB)	GBR				
Bank of Scotland PLC (RFB)	GBR	60.0	365 days	-	-
Lloyds Bank PLC (RFB)	GBR				
Lloyds Bank Corporate Markets PLC (NRFB)	GBR		6 months		
HSBC Bank PLC (NRFB)	GBR	30.0	365 days	-	-
HSBC UK Bank PLC (RFB)	GBR				
Goldman Sachs International Bank	GBR	60.0	6 months		
Sumitomo Mitsui	GBR	30.0	6 months		
Standard Chartered Bank	GBR	60.0	6 months		
Handelsbanken	GBR	40.0	365 days		
Nationwide Building Society	GBR	40.0	6 months	-	-
Leeds Building Society	GBR	20.0	3 months	-	-
High Quality Foreign Banks					
National Australia Bank	AUS	30.0	365 days	-	-
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	AUS	30.0	365 days		
Toronto-Dominion Bank	CAN	30.0	365 days		
Credit Industriel et Commercial	FRA	30.0	6 months	-	-
Landesbank Hessen-Thuringen Girozentrale (Helaba)	GER	30.0	365 days		
DBS (Singapore)	SING	30.0	365 days		
Local Authorities					
County / Unitary / Metropolitan / District Councils		20.0	365 days	5.0	5 years
Police / Fire Authorities		20.0	365 days	5.0	5 years
National Park Authorities		20.0	365 days	5.0	5 years
Other Deposit Takers					
Money Market Funds		20.0	365 days	5.0	5 years
Property Funds		5.0	365 days	5.0	10 years
UK Debt Management Account		100.0	365 days	5.0	5 years

APPROVED COUNTRIES FOR INVESTMENTS

This list is based on those countries which have sovereign ratings of AA- or higher, (we show the lowest rating from Fitch, Moody's and S&P) and also, (except - at the time of writing - for Hong Kong, Norway and Luxembourg), have banks operating in sterling markets

Sovereign Rating	Country
AAA	Australia Canada Denmark Germany Luxemburg Netherlands Norway Singapore Sweden Switzerland
AA+	Finland USA
AA	Abu Dhabi (UAE) France Hong Kong UK
AA-	Belgium Qatar