

Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy

Mid-year Review Report 2018/19

1 Background

The Council operates a balanced budget, which broadly means cash raised during the year will meet its cash expenditure. Part of the treasury management operations ensure this cash flow is adequately planned, with surplus monies being invested in low risk counterparties, providing adequate liquidity initially before considering optimising investment return.

The second main function of the treasury management service is the funding of the Council's capital plans. These capital plans provide a guide to the borrowing need of the Council, essentially the longer term cash flow planning to ensure the Council can meet its capital spending operations. This management of longer term cash may involve arranging long or short term loans, or using longer term cash flow surpluses, and on occasion any debt previously drawn may be restructured to meet Council risk or cost objectives.

Accordingly, treasury management is defined as:

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

2 Introduction

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) Code of Practice on Treasury Management (revised 2011) was adopted by this Council on 20th February 2012.

The primary requirements of the Code are as follows:

1. Creation and maintenance of a Treasury Management Policy Statement which sets out the policies and objectives of the Council's treasury management activities.
2. Creation and maintenance of Treasury Management Practices which set out the manner in which the Council will seek to achieve those policies and objectives.
3. Receipt by the full council of an annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement - including the Annual Investment Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision Policy - for the year ahead, a **Mid-year Review Report** and an Annual Report (stewardship report) covering activities during the previous year.
4. Delegation by the Council of responsibilities for implementing and monitoring treasury management policies and practices and for the execution and administration of treasury management decisions.
5. Delegation by the Council of the role of scrutiny of treasury management strategy and policies to a specific named body. For this Council the delegated body is the Executive, Resources and Contracts PDS Committee:

This mid-year report has been prepared in compliance with CIPFA's Code of Practice on Treasury Management, and covers the following:

- An economic update for the first part of the 2018/19 financial year;

- A review of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy;
- The Council's capital expenditure (prudential indicators);
- A review of the Council's investment portfolio for 2018/19;
- A review of the Council's borrowing strategy for 2018/19;
- A review of any debt rescheduling undertaken during 2018/19;
- A review of compliance with Treasury and Prudential Limits for 2018/19.

Key Changes to the Treasury and Capital Strategies

As detailed in section 3.5.2 of the covering report, it is proposed that the Investment Strategy be amended in order to comply with Money Market Fund Reforms and the classification changes.

3 Economic update (provided by Link Asset Services)

GLOBAL OUTLOOK. World growth has been doing reasonably well, aided by strong growth in the US. However, US growth is likely to fall back in 2019 and, together with weakening economic activity in China, overall world growth is likely to weaken.

Inflation has been weak during 2018 but, at long last, unemployment falling to remarkably low levels in the US and UK has led to a marked acceleration of wage inflation which is likely to prompt central banks into a series of increases in central rates. The EU is probably about a year behind in a similar progression.

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. 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 also encouraged investors into a search for yield and into investing in riskier assets such as equities. Consequently, prices in both bond and equity markets rose to historically high valuation levels simultaneously. This now means that both asset categories are vulnerable to a sharp downward 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, conversely, 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.**

The world economy also needs to adjust to a sharp change in **liquidity creation** over the last five years where the US has moved from boosting liquidity by QE purchases to reducing its holdings of debt. In addition, the European Central Bank has cut back its QE purchases substantially and is likely to end them completely by the end of 2018.

UK. The first half of 2018/19 has seen UK **economic growth** post only a modest performance. However, after an adverse weather depressed performance in quarter 1, growth has been recovering pace and the latest 3 month rolling average came in at a healthy 0.7%. The positive run of economic statistics was sufficiently robust for the Monetary Policy Committee, (MPC), to unanimously (9-0) vote to increase **Bank Rate** on 2nd August from 0.5% to 0.75%. Although growth looks as if it will only be modest overall at around 1.5% in 2018, the Bank of England's August Quarterly Inflation Report forecast that growth will pick up to 1.8% in 2019, albeit there were several caveats – mainly related to whether or not the UK achieves an orderly withdrawal from the European Union in March 2019.

Some MPC members have expressed concerns about a build-up of **inflationary pressures**, particularly with the pound falling in value again against both the US dollar and the Euro. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) measure of inflation came in at 2.4% in September and is expected to fall back to the 2% inflation target over the next two years given a scenario of minimal increases in Bank Rate. The MPC has indicated Bank Rate would need to be in the region of 1.5% by March 2021 for inflation to stay on track. Financial markets are currently pricing in the next increase in Bank Rate for the second half of 2019.

As for the **labour market**, unemployment has continued at a 43 year low of 4% on the Independent Labour Organisation measure. A combination of job vacancies hitting an all-time high in July, together with

negligible growth in total employment numbers, indicates that employers are now having major difficulties filling job vacancies with suitable staff. It was therefore unsurprising that wage inflation picked up to 3.1%, (3 month average regular pay, excluding bonuses). This meant that in real terms, (i.e. wage rates higher than CPI inflation), earnings grew by about 0.4%, near to the joint high of 0.5% since 2009. (The previous high point was in July 2015.) Given the UK economy is very much services sector driven, an increase in household spending power is likely to feed through into providing some support to the overall rate of economic growth in the coming months. This tends to confirm that the MPC were right to start on a cautious increase in Bank Rate in August as it views wage inflation in excess of 3% as increasing inflationary pressures within the UK economy. However, the MPC will need to tread cautiously before increasing Bank Rate again, especially given all the uncertainties around Brexit.

In the **political arena**, there is a risk that the current Conservative minority government may be unable to muster a majority in the Commons over Brexit. However, our central position is that Prime Minister May's government will endure, despite various setbacks, along the route to reaching an orderly Brexit in March 2019. If, however, the UK faces a general election in the next 12 months, this could result in a potential loosening of monetary policy and therefore medium to longer dated gilt yields could rise on the expectation of a weak pound and concerns around inflation picking up.

USA. President Trump's massive easing of fiscal policy is fuelling a, (temporary), boost in consumption which has generated an upturn in the rate of strong growth which rose from 2.2%, (annualised rate), in quarter 1 to 4.2% in quarter 2 and 3.5%, (3.0% y/y), in quarter 3, but also an upturn in inflationary pressures. With inflation in danger of moving towards 3%, the Fed increased rates another 0.25% in September to between 2.00% and 2.25%, this being four increases in 2018. They also indicated that they expected to increase rates four more times by the end of 2019. The dilemma, however, is what to do when the temporary boost to consumption wanes, particularly as the recent imposition of tariffs on a number of countries' exports to the US, (China in particular), could see a switch to US production of some of those goods, but at higher prices. Such a scenario would invariably make any easing of monetary policy harder for the Fed in the second half of 2019. However, a combination of an expected four increases in rates of 0.25% by the end of 2019, together with a waning of the boost to economic growth from the fiscal stimulus in 2018, could combine to depress growth below its potential rate, i.e. monetary policy may prove to be too aggressive and lead to a reverse of policy.

The tariff war between the US and China has been generating a lot of heat during 2018, but it is not expected that the current level of actual action would have much in the way of a significant effect on US or world growth. However, there is a risk of escalation.

Eurozone. Growth was 0.4% in quarters 1 and 2 but fell back to 0.2% in quarter 3, though this is probably a temporary dip. In particular, data from Germany has been mixed and it could be negatively impacted by US tariffs on a significant part of manufacturing exports e.g. cars. For that reason, although growth is still expected to be in the region of nearly 2% for 2018, the horizon is less clear than it seemed just a short while ago. Having halved its quantitative easing purchases of debt in October 2018 to €15bn per month, the European Central Bank has indicated it is likely to end all further purchases in December 2018. Inflationary pressures are starting to build gently so it is expected that the ECB will start to increase rates towards the end of 2019.

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. Progress has been made in reducing the rate of credit creation, particularly from the shadow banking sector, which is feeding through into lower economic growth. There are concerns that official economic statistics are inflating the published rate of growth.

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. It is likely that loose monetary policy will endure for some years yet to try to stimulate growth and modest inflation.

Emerging countries. Argentina and Turkey are currently experiencing major headwinds

and are facing challenges in external financing requirements well in excess of their reserves of foreign exchange. However, these countries are small in terms of the overall world economy, (around 1% each), so the fallout from the expected recessions in these countries will be minimal.

INTEREST RATE FORECASTS

The interest rate forecasts provided by Link Asset Services in paragraph 3.3 are predicated on an assumption of an agreement being reached on Brexit between the UK and the EU. 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 effect 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. It is also possible that the government could act to protect economic growth by implementing fiscal stimulus.

The balance of risks to the UK

- The overall balance of risks to economic growth in the UK is probably neutral.
- The balance of risks to increases in Bank Rate and shorter term PWLB rates, are probably also even and are broadly dependent on how strong GDP growth turns out, how slowly inflation pressures subside, and how quickly the Brexit negotiations move forward positively.

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 for ten years 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 over or under do increases in central interest rates.

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

- **Brexit** – if it were to cause significant economic disruption and a major downturn in the rate of growth.
- **Bank of England monetary policy** 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**, possibly **Italy**, due to its high level of government debt, low rate of economic growth and vulnerable banking system, and due to the election in March of a government which has made a lot of anti-austerity noise. At the time of writing, the EU has rejected the proposed Italian budget and has demanded cuts in government spending which the Italian government has refused. The rating agencies have started on downgrading Italian debt to one notch above junk level. If Italian debt were to fall below investment grade, many investors would be unable to hold Italian debt. Unsurprisingly, investors are becoming increasingly concerned by the actions of the Italian government and consequently, Italian bond yields have risen sharply – at a time when the government faces having to refinance large amounts of debt maturing in 2019.
- Weak capitalisation of some **European banks**. Italian banks are particularly vulnerable; one factor is that they hold a high level of Italian government debt - debt which is falling in value. This is therefore undermining their capital ratios and raises the question of whether they will need to raise fresh capital to plug the gap.
- **German minority government**. In the German general election of September 2017, Angela Merkel's CDU party was left in a vulnerable minority position dependent on the fractious support of the SPD party, as a result of the rise in popularity of the anti-immigration AfD party. Then in October 2018, the results of the Bavarian and Hesse state elections radically undermined the SPD party and showed a sharp fall in support for the CDU. As a result, the SPD is reviewing whether it can continue to support a coalition that is so damaging to its electoral popularity. After the result of the Hesse state election, Angela Merkel announced that she would not stand for re-election as CDU party leader at her party's convention in December 2018. However, this makes little practical difference as she is still expected to aim to continue for now as the Chancellor. However, there are five more state elections coming up in 2019 and

EU parliamentary elections in May/June; these could result in a further loss of electoral support for both the CDU and SPD which could also undermine her leadership.

- **Other minority eurozone governments.** Spain, Portugal, Netherlands and Belgium all have vulnerable minority governments dependent on coalitions which could prove fragile. Sweden is also struggling to form a government due to the anti-immigration party holding the balance of power, and which no other party is willing to form a coalition with.
- **Austria, the Czech Republic and Hungary** now form a strongly anti-immigration bloc within the EU while **Italy**, this year, has also elected a strongly anti-immigration government. Elections to the EU parliament are due in May/June 2019.
- Further increases in interest rates in the US could spark a **sudden flight of investment funds** from more risky assets e.g. shares, into bonds yielding a much improved yield. In October 2018, we have seen a sharp fall in equity markets but this has been limited, as yet. Emerging countries which have borrowed heavily in dollar denominated debt, could be particularly exposed to this risk of an investor flight to safe havens e.g. UK gilts.
- There are concerns around the level of **US corporate debt** which has swollen massively during the period of low borrowing rates in order to finance mergers and acquisitions. This has resulted in the debt of many large corporations being downgraded to a BBB credit rating, close to junk status. Indeed, 48% of total investment grade corporate debt is now rated at BBB. If such corporations fail to generate profits and cash flow to reduce their debt levels as expected, this could tip their debt into junk ratings which will increase their cost of financing and further negatively impact profits and cash flow.
- **Geopolitical risks**, especially North Korea, but also in Europe and the Middle East, which could lead to increasing safe haven flows.

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

- **Brexit** – if both sides were to agree a compromise that removed all threats of economic and political disruption.
- **The Fed causing a sudden shock in financial markets** through misjudging the pace and strength of increases in its Fed. Funds Rate and in the pace and strength of reversal of QE, which then leads to a fundamental reassessment by investors of the relative risks of holding bonds, as opposed to equities. This could lead to a major flight from bonds to equities and a sharp increase in bond yields in the US, which could then spill over into impacting bond yields around the world.
- The **Bank of England is too slow** in its pace and strength of increases in Bank Rate and, therefore, allows inflation 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.

4 Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy update

The Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) for 2018/19 was approved by this Council on 26th February 2018. Revisions approved by Council on 26th June 2017 and 11th December 2017, were acknowledged in the 2018/19 Strategy update in February 2018, but no further revisions were proposed.

As outlined in paragraph 3.5.2 of the covering report, new regulations coming into effect reforming Money Market Funds mean there will be classification changes, which includes the introduction of Low Volatility Net Asset Value (LVNAV) funds. As a result the Council must update the Treasury Management Strategy in line with these Money Market Fund classification changes.

As the classification of Constant Net Asset Value (CNAV) funds now only apply to funds mainly consisting of low yielding government debt, the Councils existing Money Market Funds will convert into the new LVNAV category. It is proposed that the Treasury Management Strategy is amended to the following

“The Council may invest in AAA rated Money Market Funds, including Constant Net Asset Value (CNAV) Funds, Low Volatility Net Asset Value (LVNAV) funds and Variable Net Asset value (VNAV) funds. The total invested in each of the CNAV and LVNAV Funds must not exceed £15m at any time and £10m for VNAV funds. This includes the Payden Sterling Reserve Fund for which a limit of £15m is also applied. No more than £25m in total may be invested in VNAV funds at any time.”

5 Investment Portfolio

In accordance with the Code, it is the Council's priority to ensure security of capital and liquidity, and to obtain an appropriate level of return which is consistent with the Council's risk appetite. As shown by forecasts in section 3, it is a very difficult investment market in terms of earning the level of interest rates commonly seen in previous decades as rates are very low and in line with the current 0.75% Bank Rate. The continuing potential for a re-emergence of a Eurozone sovereign debt crisis, and its impact on banks, prompts a low risk and short term strategy. Given this risk environment and the fact that increases in Bank Rate are likely to be gradual and unlikely to return to the levels seen in previous decades, investment returns are likely to remain low.

Details of the Council's investment activity during the first six months of 2018/19 are provided in sections 3.2.2 to 3.4.5 of the covering report and lists of current investments are provided in Appendices 2 (in maturity date order) and 3 (by counterparty). The Council held £309.5m of investments as at 30th September 2018 (£303.6m as at 30th June 2018).

The Director of Finance confirms that the approved limits within the Annual Investment Strategy were not breached during the first six months of 2018/19.

The Council's budget for interest on investments in 2018/19 is £3.491m, which is based on an assumed interest rate of 1% for new investments. As a result of the higher interest rates being earned on new investments made on recent investments as well as higher levels of balances available for investment, a surplus of £350k is currently projected for the 2018/19 financial year.

Investment Counterparty criteria

The current investment counterparty criteria selection approved in the TMSS is meeting the requirement of the treasury management function.

6 Borrowing

The Council's capital financing requirement (CFR) for 2018/19 is £1.6m. The CFR denotes the Council's underlying need to borrow for capital purposes. If the CFR is positive the Council may borrow from the PWLB or the market (external borrowing) or from internal balances on a temporary basis (internal borrowing). The Council does not currently borrow to finance its capital expenditure and has, in recent years, only had to borrow short-term (for cashflow purposes) on very few occasions.

No borrowing is currently anticipated during this financial year, but it is possible that some may be required in future years to fund the property purchases related to Opportunity Site G, which would be repaid from the capital receipts from the scheme.

Prudential and Treasury Indicators – Mid-Year Review 2018/19

The old capital control system was replaced in April 2004 by a prudential system based largely on self-regulation by local authorities themselves. At the heart of the system is The Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities, developed by CIPFA. The Code requires the Council to set a number of prudential indicators designed to monitor and control capital expenditure, financing and borrowing. The indicators for 2018/19 were approved by Council in February 2018 and this Annex sets out the actual performance against those indicators in the first six months, updating them where necessary. Prudential and Treasury Indicators are relevant for the purposes of setting an integrated treasury management strategy.

The Council is required to indicate if it has adopted the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management. This original 2001 Code was adopted by the full Council in February 2002 and the revised 2011 Code was initially adopted by full Council in February 2012.

Prudential Indicators for Capital Expenditure

This table shows the revised estimates for capital expenditure and the changes since the Capital Programme for 2018/19 was agreed in March 2018. The decrease in the latest estimate for 2018/19 is mainly the result of slippage in expenditure originally planned for 2018/19 into future years, as highlighted in previous reports to the Executive and to PDS Committees.

Capital Expenditure by Portfolio	2018/19 Original Estimate £m	2018/19 Revised Estimate £m
Children & Families	25.3	16.0
Adult Care & Health	5.1	6.9
Environment & Community	10.9	14.2
Public Protection & Enforcement	0.0	0.0
Renewal Recreation & Housing	14.9	11.1
Resources, Commissioning & Contracts	20.4	1.5
Less: estimated slippage	-15.0	-5.0
Total	61.6	44.7

Changes to the Financing of the Capital Programme

The table below draws together the main strategy elements of the capital expenditure plans (above), highlighting the original supported and unsupported elements of the capital programme, and the expected financing arrangements of this capital expenditure.

Capital Expenditure	2018/19 Original Estimate £m	2018/19 Revised Estimate £m
Supported	61.6	44.7
Unsupported	-	-
Total spend	61.6	44.7
Financed by:		
Capital receipts	18.2	2.0
Capital grants/contributions	39.0	36.7
General Fund	-	-
Revenue contributions	4.4	6.0
Total financing	61.6	44.7
Borrowing need	-	-

Changes to the Prudential Indicators for the Capital Financing Requirement, External Debt and the Operational Boundary

It is a statutory duty for the Council to determine and keep under review the “Affordable Borrowing Limits”, which comprise external / internal borrowing and other long-term liabilities, mainly finance leases. The Council’s approved Treasury and Capital Prudential Indicators (affordability limits) are outlined in the approved TMSS. The table below shows the expected “worst case” debt position over the period. This is termed the Operational Boundary. Bromley has an operational “borrowing” limit (Operational Boundary) of £30m, although in practice, this limit is never in danger of being breached.

The Authorised Limit, which represents the limit beyond which borrowing is prohibited, is another of the prudential indicators and needs to be set and revised by Members. It reflects the level of borrowing which, while not desired, could be afforded in the short term, but is not sustainable in the longer term. It is the expected maximum borrowing need with some headroom for unexpected movements. This is the statutory limit determined under section 3 (1) of the Local Government Act 2003 and, for Bromley, this figure has been set at £60m.

The table also shows the CFR, which is the underlying external need to incur borrowing for a capital purpose. The Council’s capital financing requirement (CFR) as at 31st March 2018 was £2.3m. If the CFR is positive, the Council may borrow from the PWLB or the market (external borrowing) or from internal balances on a temporary basis (internal borrowing). The Council’s CFR relates to liabilities arising from finance leases entered into in recent years in respect of various items of plant and equipment. The Council currently has no external borrowing as such.

Prudential Indicators	2018/19 Original Estimate £m	2018/19 Revised Estimate £m
CFR	1.6	1.5
Debt – Operational Boundary		
Borrowing	10.0	10.0
Other long-term liabilities	20.0	20.0
Total Operational Boundary	30.0	30.0
Debt – Authorised Boundary		
Borrowing	30.0	30.0
Other long-term liabilities	30.0	30.0
Total Operational Boundary	60.0	60.0

Other Prudential Indicators

Other indicators designed to control overall borrowing and exposures to interest rate movements are included in the summary table below, which will require the approval of full Council.

Prudential and Treasury Indicators - Summary

	2018/19	2018/19
	Original Estimate	Revised Estimate
Total Capital Expenditure	£61.6m	£44.7m
Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream	0.0%	0.0%
Net borrowing requirement (net investments for Bromley)		
brought forward 1 April	£256.0m	£284.8m
carried forward 31 March	£218.2m	£249.1m
in year borrowing requirement (reduction in net investments for Bromley)	-£.37.8	-£35.7m
Estimated CFR as at 31 March (finance lease liability) (NB. Actual CFR as at 31 March 2017 (finance lease liability) = £3.1m)	£1.6m	£1.5m
Annual change in Cap. Financing Requirement	-£0.7m	-£0.8m
Incremental impact of capital investment decisions	£ p	£ p
Increase in council tax (band D) per annum	-	-

TREASURY MANAGEMENT INDICATORS	2018/19	2018/19
	Original Estimate	Revised Estimate
Authorised Limit for external debt -		
Borrowing	£30.0m	£30.0m
other long term liabilities	£30.0m	£30.0m
TOTAL	£60.0m	£60.0m
Operational Boundary for external debt -		
borrowing	£10.0m	£10.0m
other long term liabilities	£20.0m	£20.0m
TOTAL	£30.0m	£30.0m
Upper limit for fixed interest rate exposure	100%	100%
Upper limit for variable rate exposure	20%	20%
Upper limit for total principal sums invested beyond year-end dates	£170.0m	£170.0m