**Consultation on the Prudential Code for Capital Finance**

**Response Sheet**

February 2017

This response sheet will be regarded as on the public record and may be published on the CIPFA website unless confidentiality is specifically requested on the response form. If you require your response to be treated as confidential please indicate this clearly on the response itself.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name |  |
| Organisation |  |
| Do you wish this response to be considered as confidential? |  |
| Please enter your contact details if you are happy to be contacted about your response. |

Responses are required by 21 April 2017 and may be sent to mandy.bretherton@cipfa.org.

**Consultation Questions**

|  |
| --- |
| **Objectives of the Prudential Code** |
| Q1. | Do you consider the four objectives of the Prudential Code are still relevant? | Yes / No / No comment |
| Q1a. | If not, please list the objectives which you feel are no longer relevant and why. |
| Q2. | Do you consider that the Prudential Code achieves these four objectives? | Yes / No / No comment |
| Q2a. | If not, please list the objectives which are not achieved and why. |
| Q3. | Do you consider that there are any areas which are not fully covered by these objectives? | Yes / No / No comment |
| Q3a. | If yes, please expand, describing how these areas could be covered within the objectives. |
| **Scope** |
| Q4. | Do you agree that the scope of the Prudential Code should be extended to cover mayoral combined authorities? | Yes / No / No comment |
| Q4a. | If not, please provide your reasons. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Q5. | Do you foresee any practical implementation issues with extending the scope of the Prudential Code to cover mayoral combined authorities? | Yes / No / No comment |
| Q5a. | If yes, please detail the potential issues along with any suggestions you may have for overcoming them. |
| **Group Entities** |
| Q6. | Do you agree that, in principle, the scope of the Prudential Code should be extended to cover group entities to ensure that any associated risks are transparent and managed? | Yes / No / No comment |
| Q6a. | If not, please explain why. |
| Q7. | Which areas of the Prudential Code could best be applied group entities and do you foresee any practical implementation issues with extending the scope of the Prudential Code to cover group entities? | Yes / No / No comment |
| Q7a. | If yes, please detailed the potential issues, along with any suggestions you may have for overcoming them. |
| **Commercialisation** |
| Q8. | How do you suggest the Prudential Code can be strengthened to encompass the risks associated with local authorities’ increasing commercial activities? |

|  |
| --- |
| **Long term implications of decision making** |
| Q9. | How do you suggest the strategic planning elements of the Prudential Code can be strengthened to demonstrate that capital investment is sustainable and that risks are appropriately identified? |
| **Prudential Indicators** |
| Q10. | Please detail any suggestions for how the prudential indicators could be improved in order that the assurance they provide is enhanced, including details of any indicators which you consider no longer fully serve their intended purpose. Please explain your reasoning. |
| Q11. | If you use local indicators, please provide details including the calculation and how you use the indicator(s). |
| **Treasury Risk Management Toolkit for Local Authorities** |
| Q12. | How do you suggest that the Prudential Code can be strengthened to incorporate the concept of the liability benchmark? |
| Treasury Management in the Public Services: Guidance Notes for Local Authorities |
| Q13. | Do you consider that the balance of indicators between the Prudential Code and the *Treasury Management in the Public Services: Guidance Notes for Local Authorities* iscorrect?  | Yes / No / No comment |
| Q13a. | If not, please explain why. |