

**APPENDIX E**

Resources Policy Development Group  
12 January 2009

**MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION**

Report by the Director of Resources

Introduction

1. The Council, at its meeting on 27 June 2008, resolved that the Council's policy for minimum revenue provision ( MRP ) for 2009/10 be developed in consultation with the Resources PDG and with the Council's external auditor and proposed to the Council in February 2009.
2. This report proposes a policy for minimum revenue provision for the PDG's consideration. The Council's external auditor is also being consulted. The policy will need to be considered by the Executive and by the Council in February. In future, the Council is required to approve a policy for MRP each year.

Background

3. Most councils borrow to fund capital spending. They are required to set aside some of their revenues each year as a provision for debt repayment. The requirement has been that a minimum provision should be calculated as 4% of a council's capital financing requirement – essentially its total debt outstanding.
4. New regulations set a duty for a council to set a minimum revenue provision which “ it considers prudent.”

Statutory guidance which accompanies the regulations provides options for calculating MRP. The aim is to ensure that debt is repaid over a period reasonably commensurate with the period over which the capital expenditure funded by borrowing provides benefits.

The Council must select and apply one of these options.

MRP options

5. The regulations distinguish between “supported” and “unsupported” borrowing in relation to the options. “Supported” borrowing is borrowing which, theoretically, attracts government support for debt repayment through revenue support grant. “Unsupported” borrowing is funded wholly by individual councils.

The options are described below.

#### Capital financing requirement method

- MRP is calculated as 4% of the Council's capital financing requirement.
- This method can be applied only to “supported” borrowing.

#### Depreciation method

- MRP is based on depreciation of the assets acquired
- But may cease to be charged when the total provision made equals the amount borrowed.
- Either the depreciation method or the average life method must be applied to “unsupported” borrowing.

#### Average life method

- MRP is made in equal instalments over the estimated life of the assets acquired through borrowing.

6. It is proposed to adopt the average life method for the reasons set out below.

The capital financing requirement method can be applied only to “supported” borrowing. It would therefore need to be combined with one of the other methods for “unsupported” borrowing. The Council uses both “supported” and “unsupported” borrowing and the distinction between the two types has no relevance for the Council. It would be simpler to apply one calculation method for the whole of the Council's borrowing.

7. The depreciation method, whilst theoretically attractive, introduces some complications. For example, assets must be valued in the Council's balance sheet at current value and the valuations are updated regularly. MRP provision would change as assets are revalued. Depreciation is not normally applied to land. However, some provision for the repayment of borrowing for the acquisition of land would be necessary. Therefore the depreciation method would need to be combined with the asset life method for land acquisition. It would also be necessary to keep individual accounting records for each item of capital expenditure which would be a substantial additional workload.

8. The average life method is simpler than the depreciation method and is the only method that can be applied to the whole of the Council's borrowing. It provides a stable and predictable MRP provision which will assist the Council's budgeting. It is a prudent approach with annual provision for the repayment of debt related directly and clearly to the useful life of the assets acquired through borrowing.

### Asset lives

9. The proposed method requires estimates to be made for asset lives. The table below proposes the bases for estimation.

Type of asset	Estimated asset life in years
New capital spending :	
Land	50
Buildings	40
Roads	40
Capital maintenance - buildings	20
Capital maintenance – roads	20
Integrated transport	20
Equipment and vehicles	4
Previous capital spending	25

### Impact on the Council's spending

10. The MRP must be charged as part of the Council's revenue spending each year. It may therefore impact on the Council's finances.

The existing provision in the Council's budget is based on a MRP of 4% equivalent to charges made over 25 years.

11. The new annual MRP charges resulting from the proposed policy are likely to be close to this. The average life of assets in the 2007/08 and 2008/09 capital programmes is 24.7 years and 27.2 years respectively. It is also proposed to base MRP on an average asset life of 25 years for past capital spending.

The MRP should therefore be met within existing budget proposals.

12. It should also be noted that the MRP is a minimum provision. The Council may, if it wishes, make additional repayments.

### Recommendation

The Policy Development Group is asked to support the proposal to adopt the average life method for calculating minimum revenue provision.

This page is intentionally left blank