

Good Governance: Phase 3 Report to SAB

February 2021

Contents

Good Governance: Phase 3

Report to SAB

Page

Introduction	1
Further Discussion on Recommendations	4
A General	4
B Conflicts of Interest	8
C Representation	10
D Skills and training	11
E Service delivery for the LGPS Function	14
F Compliance and Improvement	18

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Senior officer organisational structures	
Appendix 2 - Governance compliance statement	
Appendix 3 - KPI Reporting	
Appendix 4 - Summary of the Independent Governance Review	

Introduction

The Scheme Advisory Board accepted the proposals in the Good Governance report Phase 2 on 3 February 2020 and requested that the project team and working groups provide further detail on the implementation of these proposals. The project has suffered delays as a result of COVID and the requirement for key stakeholders in their main roles to focus on and prioritise the response to the pandemic. However, some meetings were held early in 2020 and working papers and notes have been circulated over the last months to collate feedback and reflect the wide range of views from the group.

We considered that some proposals from Phase 2 didn't need further detail in order to progress with implementation and focussed on the proposals which needed further analysis or consideration ahead of implementation. We have provided additional details on these proposals for the consideration of the SAB. This paper should be read in conjunction with the paper from Phase 2.

For reference, all the proposals from Phase 2 are listed below and we have indicated with a * the proposals addressed further in this report.

Area	Proposal
A. General	* A.1 MHCLG will produce statutory guidance to establish new governance requirements for funds to effectively implement the proposals below. ("the Guidance").
	* A.2 Each administering authority must have a single named officer who is responsible for the delivery of all LGPS related activity for that fund. ("the LGPS senior officer").
	A.3 Each administering authority must publish an annual governance compliance statement that sets out how they comply with the governance requirements for LGPS funds as set out in the Guidance. This statement must be co-signed by the LGPS senior officer and S151.
B. Conflicts of interest	* B.1 Each fund must produce and publish a conflicts of interest policy which includes details of how actual, potential and perceived conflicts are addressed within the governance of the fund, with specific reference to key conflicts identified in the Guidance.
	* B.2 The Guidance should refer all those involved in the management of the LGPS, and in particular those on decision making committees, to the guide on statutory and fiduciary duty which will be produced by the SAB – now updated*
C. Representation	* C.1 Each fund must produce and publish a policy on the representation of scheme members and non-administering authority employers on its committees, explaining its approach to voting rights for each party.
D. Knowledge and understanding	* D.1 Introduce a requirement in the Guidance for key individuals within the LGPS, including LGPS officers and pensions committees, to have the appropriate level of knowledge and understanding to carry out their duties effectively.
	* D.2 Introduce a requirement for s151 officers to carry out LGPS relevant training as part of CPD requirements to ensure good levels of knowledge and understanding.
	* D.3 Administering authorities must publish a policy setting out their approach to the delivery, assessment and recording of training plans to meet these requirements.
	* D.4 CIPFA should be asked to produce appropriate guidance and training modules for s151 officers.
E. Service Delivery for the LGPS Function	E.1 Each administering authority must document key roles and responsibilities relating to the LGPS and publish a roles and responsibilities matrix setting out how key decisions are reached. The matrix should reflect the host authority's scheme of

	delegation and constitution and be consistent with role descriptions and business processes.
	*E.2 Each administering authority must publish an administration strategy.
	*E.3 Each administering authority must report the fund's performance against an agreed set of indicators designed to measure standards of service.
	*E.4 Each administering authority must ensure their committee is included in the business planning process. Both the committee and LGPS senior officer must be satisfied with the resource and budget allocated to deliver the LGPS service over the next financial year.
F. Compliance and improvement	*F.1 Each administering authority must undergo a biennial Independent Governance Review and, if applicable, produce the required improvement plan to address any issues identified. IGR reports to be assessed by a SAB panel of experts.
	F.2 LGA to consider establishing a peer review process for LGPS Funds.

Atypical administering authorities

This report has been drafted largely using terminology relevant to the majority of administering authorities who are local authorities. However, it is recognised that there are some administering authorities which do not fit this model. In taking forward any of the proposals outlined in this report it will be necessary to ensure that principles can be applied universally to LGPS funds and that any guidance recognises the unique position of some funds.

Use of terms

Throughout this document the following terms have a specific meaning unless the context makes clear that another meaning is intended;

Administering authority refers to a body listed in part 1 of Schedule 3 to the LGPS Regulations 2013 that is required to maintain an LGPS pension fund. In particular the term is used here when such a body is carrying out LGPS specific functions.

For example "Each administering authority must publish an annual report".

Committee a committee formed under s101 of the Local Government Act 1972 to which the administering authority delegates LGPS responsibilities and decision making powers. Alternatively, can refer to an advisory committee or panel which makes recommendations on LGPS matters to an individual to whom the administering authority has delegated LGPS decision making responsibility.

For example "The pensions committee should have a role in developing the business plan".

Host authority refers to a council or other body that is also an administering authority but is used to refer to that body when it is carrying out wider non-LGPS specific functions.

For example "Delivery of the LGPS function must be consistent with and comply with the constitution of the host authority"

The fund carries a more general meaning and is used to refer to the various activities and functions that are necessary in order to administer the LGPS.

For example "Taking this course of action will improve the fund's administration".

Alternatively, the term is used in the context of the scheme members and employers who contribute to the LGPS arrangements of a specific administering authority.

For example “The number of fund employers has increased in recent years”.

Further Discussion on Recommendations

A General

A.1 MHCLG will produce statutory guidance to establish new governance requirements for funds to effectively implement the proposals below. (“the Guidance”).

The intention throughout this review has been that any SAB recommendations should be enacted via the introduction of new statutory governance guidance which will supersede current guidance¹. It was felt that this approach would be quicker and more responsive than relying on changes to secondary legislation. The LGPS regulations contain a provision² that allows the secretary of state to issue guidance on the administration and management of the scheme.

We have noted that the outcome of The Supreme Court’s judgment on LGPS boycotts (The Palestinian Case)³ may impact the extent to which future changes are enacted through guidance rather than changes to legislation.

A.2 Each administering authority must have a single named officer who is responsible for the delivery of all LGPS related activity for that fund. (“the LGPS senior officer”).

This is one of the core recommendations in Phase 2 report and we have provided further detail on the proposal below, including details on the core requirements of the role, organisational guidelines and personal competencies for individuals.

Core Requirements

The role of the LGPS senior officer is to lead and take responsibility for the delivery of the LGPS function. The core requirements include but are not limited to:

- Following appropriate advice, developing the fund’s strategic approach to funding, investment, administration, governance and communication;
- Ensuring that there is a robust LGPS specific risk management framework in place which embeds risk management into the culture of the fund and identifies, assesses and mitigates the risks facing the fund;
- Ensuring the pension fund is organised and structured in such a way as to deliver its statutory responsibilities and compliance with The Pensions Regulator’s codes of practice;
- Managing delivery of the LGPS function to meet service level agreements;
- Providing advice to members of committees that have a delegated decision-making responsibility in respect of LGPS matters;
- Providing advice and information to members of local pensions board to assist them in carrying out their responsibilities;
- Ensuring that the role of the pension fund and LGPS matters are understood and represented at the local authority’s senior leadership level;

¹ [LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSION SCHEME GOVERNANCE COMPLIANCE STATEMENTS STATUTORY GUIDANCE – NOVEMBER 200](#)

² See Regulation 2(3A)

³ [R \(on the application of Palestine Solidarity Campaign Ltd and another\) \(Appellants\) v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government \(Respondent\)](#)

- Working with partner funds and the pool company (if appropriate) to ensure effective governance in respect of investment pooling arrangements;
- Where the LGPS Senior Officer is not themselves the local authority's s151 officer, support the s151 officer to ensure the proper administration of the fund's financial affairs; and
- Acting with the highest integrity in the interests of the fund's members and employers.

Underpinning principles and characteristics

This section considers what needs to be in place for an LGPS senior officer to successfully deliver the role. It is split into the organisation principles that the administering authority should consider when drawing up the role of Senior Officer as well as the personal characteristics and competencies that the individual should exhibit.

Organisational Principles

In appointing a LGPS senior officer, administering authorities should have consideration of the following organisational principles.

Representing the fund at a senior level. The Senior Officer should be of sufficient seniority to ensure that pension issues can be brought the attention of the senior leadership team as necessary. This also ensures that the Senior Officer is close enough to the strategic direction of the host organisation and able to influence decisions where they impact on the management of the fund. It is unlikely that the Senior Officer role could be carried out effectively by an individual lower than third tier in the organisation.

Capacity. The role of Senior Officer is demanding and those undertaking it should be able to give it the necessary attention. While the Senior Officer might have some other responsibilities within the organisation, these should not be of a scale that they impact adversely on the ability to ensure the effective delivery of the LGPS function. When considering capacity, it would be appropriate to consider both the Senior Officer role and the capacity and seniority of their direct reports working in the LGPS.

Reporting Lines. As the individual with responsibility for delivering the LGPS function, it is appropriate that those with key LGPS functions come under a reporting structure which falls under the Senior Officer's supervision.

From time to time the fund will employ resource and expertise from other areas of the authority, for example project management, IT or legal services. It is not the intention that all that all of these functions should fall under the Senior Officer, however the expectation is that key functions such as investment, administration, employer liaison, communications, fund accounting etc do.

Resourcing. The senior officer is responsible for the delivery of the LGPS function and as such must be able to ensure that they run an operation that is sufficiently resourced. The intention is that the Senior Officer is responsible for drawing up the fund's budget and agreeing it with the Pension Committee.

In doing so the Senior Officer needs to be cognisant of the need to maximise the value of any spend from the public purse.

Personal Competencies

The following are the personal and professional attributes that should be embodied by the LGPS Senior Officer.

An ability to build strong relationships and influence. The Senior officer will be expected to influence matters at the highest levels of the organisation. They should be comfortable dealing with elected members and understand the requirements of working in a political environment.

The Senior Officer will need to build and maintain strong relationships with employers within the Fund as well as partners within the investment pool.

The Senior Officer will also need the ability to build strong relationships with professional advisers, including challenging them when appropriate and work to enable the effective operation of the pension board

The Senior Officer will also be expected to represent the fund at a national level.

Strong technical skills. There is no requirement for an LGPS senior officer to have a specific professional qualification, although a relevant qualification (accounting, investment, actuarial, pensions management, legal) may be advantageous. They should have a strong understanding of all aspects of the LGPS. The Senior Officer should have a good grasp of the funding, investment and regulatory matters that impact the fund. They should also be able to explain and simplify difficult concepts to non-technical audiences.

Strategic thinking. It is the role of the Senior Officer to set the strategic direction of the fund. This requires an individual who can synthesise information from a broad range of sources, learn from experiences and bring new ideas to the table. The LGPS senior officer should develop a strong idea of how the delivery of the service will change over time and how the fund can be ready to meet new challenges.

Operational effectiveness. The Senior Officer should be leader with the ability to drive improvement within the organisation and motivate others to buy into their vision. They will need to put plans in place to deliver effective services yet be flexible enough to deal with a volatile pensions landscape.

Strong ethical standards. The LGPS environment can produce the potential for conflicts of interest to arise. The Senior officer should be an individual who embodies the highest ethical standards and acts in the interests of the fund's members and employers. They demonstrate and positively promote the seven principles of public life.

Organisational Structure

Appendix 1 contains examples of how the Senior officer role could be incorporated into various organisational structures.

A.3 Each administering authority must publish an annual governance compliance statement that sets out how they comply with the governance requirements for LGPS funds as set out in the Guidance. This statement must be signed by the LGPS senior officer and, where different, co-signed by the S151 officer.

In order to improve the transparency and auditability of governance arrangements, each fund must produce an enhanced annual governance compliance statement, in accordance with the statutory governance guidance, which sets out details of how each fund has addressed key areas of fund governance. The preparation and sign off of this statement will be the responsibility of the LGPS senior officer and it must be co-signed by the host authority's s151 officer, where that person is not also the LGPS senior officer. The expectation will also be that committees and local pension boards would be appropriately involved in the process.

It should be noted that the current LGPS regulations⁴ require that administering authorities publish an annual governance compliance statement concerning matters relating to delegation and representation on pension committees. We recommend that amendments are made such that all requirements are incorporated into a single governance compliance statement.

⁴ See Regulation 55 “Administering Authorities: Governance Compliance Statement”

B Conflicts of Interest

B.1 Each fund must produce and publish a conflicts of interest policy which includes details of how actual, potential and perceived conflicts are addressed within the governance of the fund, including reference to key conflicts identified in the Guidance.

One of the key objectives of the Good Governance Review was to consider how potential conflicts of interest manifest themselves within current LGPS set up and to suggest how those potential conflicts can be managed to ensure that they do not become actual conflicts. In doing so, the SAB was of the view that the democratically accountable nature of the LGPS be maintained.

Since almost all LGPS funds are rooted in local authority law and practice, those elected members who serving on pension committees are subject to local authority member codes of conduct⁵. These will require members to register existing conflicts and to recognise when conflicts arise during the course of their duties and how to deal with them. Elected members must also comply with the Seven Principles of Public Life (often referred to as the Nolan Principles). Non-elected members sitting on committees and local pension boards should be subject to the same codes and principles.

There are, however, specific conflicts that can arise as a result of managing a pension fund within the local authority environment. The intention of this recommendation is that all administering authorities publish a specific LGPS conflicts of interest policy. This should include information on how it identifies, monitors and manages conflicts, including areas of potential conflict that are specific to the LGPS and will be listed in The Guidance. The expectation is that the areas covered will include:

- Any commercial relationships between the administering authority or host authority and other employers in the fund/or other parties which may impact decisions made in the best interests of the fund. These may include shared service arrangements which impact the fund operations directly but will also include outsourcing relationship and companies related to or wholly owned by the Council, which do not relate to pension fund operations;
- Contribution setting for the administering and other employers;
- Cross charging for services or shared resourcing between the administering authority and the fund and ensuring the service quality is appropriate for the fund;
- Dual role of the administering authority as an owner and client of a pool;
- Investment decisions about local infrastructure; and
- How the pension fund appropriately responds to Council decisions or policies on global issues such as climate change.
- Any other roles within the Council being carried out by committee members or officers which may result in a conflict either in the time available to dedicate to the fund or in decision making or oversight. For example, some roles on other finance committees, audit or health committees or cabinet should be disclosed.

⁵ **Similar codes apply for non-local authority administering authorities.**

Each administering authority's policy should address:

- How potential conflicts of interest are identified and managed;
- How officers, employer and scheme member representatives, elected members, members of the local pension board and advisers and contractors understand their responsibilities in respect of ensuring that conflicts of interest are properly managed;
- Systems, controls and processes, including maintaining records, for managing and mitigating potential conflicts of interest effectively such that they never become actual conflicts;
- How the effectiveness of its conflict of interest policy is reviewed and updated as required;
- How a culture which supports transparency and the management and mitigation of conflicts of interest is embedded; and
- How the specific conflicts that arise from its dual role as both an employer participating in the Fund and the administering authority responsible for delivering the LGPS for that fund are managed.

In putting together such a policy it is recognised that membership of the LGPS is not, in and of itself, a conflict of interest.

The Guidance should require each fund to make public its conflicts of interest policy.

B.2 The Guidance should include reference to the latest available legal opinion on how statutory and fiduciary duties impact on all those involved in the management of the LGPS, and in particular those on decision making committees.

There are no immediate plans for SAB to opine on or publish a statement on fiduciary duty given the conflict between Nigel Giffin's opinion and those of the Supreme Court in the Palestine case. Therefore, this recommendation has been updated.

C Representation

C.1 Each fund must produce and publish a policy on the representation of scheme members and non-administering authority employers on its committees, explaining its approach to representation and voting rights for each party.

One of the key principles of the Good Governance Review is the recognition that each administering authority knows its own situation best and that The Guidance should avoid being overly prescriptive and limiting. In the matters of delegating responsibilities and appointing members to committees, most administering authorities must comply with the Local Government Act 1972. Nothing within The Guidance can, or should, override or limit the provisions of the 1972 Act. The intention behind this recommendation is simply that administering authorities prepare, maintain and publish their policy on representation and to require that they provide:

- the rationale for their approach to representation for non-administering authority employers and local authority and non-local authority scheme members on any relevant committees; and
- the rationale as to whether those representatives have voting rights or not.

The SAB's view is that **it would expect** scheme managers to have the involvement employers and member representatives on any relevant committees.

In addition to representation on committees, administering authorities should state other ways in which they engage their wider employer and Scheme membership

The Guidance should also acknowledge the important principle that administering authorities may wish to retain a majority vote on decision making bodies in order to reflect their statutory responsibilities for maintaining the fund.

D Skills and training

D.1 Introduce a requirement in the Guidance for key individuals within the LGPS, including LGPS officers and pensions committee members, to have the appropriate level of knowledge and understanding to carry out their duties effectively.

There was widespread agreement throughout the Good Governance Review process that those making decisions about billions of pounds of public money and the pension provision of millions of members should be properly trained to carry out the responsibilities of their role. The level of knowledge and understanding of technical pensions topics will vary according to role.

The Guidance should require the Administering Authority to identify training requirements for key individuals having regard for:

- topics identified in relevant frameworks or in publications by relevant bodies (e.g. CIPFA, TPR etc)
- the workplan of the Administering Authority; and
- current or topical issues.

The Administering Authority should develop a training plan to ensure these training requirements are met and maintain training records of key individuals against the training plan. These records should be published in the Governance Compliance Statement.

Pension Committees

The private sector has seen an increasing move towards the professionalisation of trustees and the introduction in to the LGPS in recent years of TPR, local pension boards and MIFID have made knowledge and skills for committees and boards a greater focus.

The membership of committees typically includes some or all of the following:

- administering authority elected members;
- other local authority elected members;
- other employer representatives; and
- scheme member representatives.

Training requirements for pensions committees apply to all members.

The Guidance should clarify that the expectation is that the TPR requirements that apply to Local Pension Boards should equally apply to pension committees. As a minimum those sitting on pension committees or the equivalent should comply with the requirements of MiFID II opt-up to act as a professional client but the expectation is that a higher level and broader range of knowledge will be required.

At committee, knowledge should be considered at a collective level and it should be recognised that new members will require a grace period over which to attain the requisite knowledge.

A pension committee member is not being asked to be a subject matter expert or act operationally. Instead the role involves receiving, filtering and analysing professional advice in order to make informed decisions.

A pension committee member should put aside political considerations, act in the interest of all employers and members and act within a regulatory framework.

When considering what training is appropriate for committee members, it might help to consider how pension committee operate and what makes an effective committee. To carry out the role effectively a committee member must have the following;

- An ability to focus on the issues that make the most difference and produce the most value and not be distracted by lower order issues;
- Access expert professional advice in the form of external advisers and administering authority officers; and
- An ability to seek reassurance, challenge the information provided and bring their own experiences to bear in decision making.

D.2 Introduce a requirement for s151 officers to carry out LGPS relevant training as part of their CPD requirements to ensure good levels of knowledge and understanding.

Treasury Guidance⁶ requires that all government departments should have professional finance directors and that “It is good practice for all other public sector organisations to do the same, and to operate to the same standards”.

Professionally qualified in this context refers to both being a qualified member of one of the five bodies comprising the Consultative Committee of Accounting Bodies (CCAB) in the UK and Ireland; and having relevant prior experience of financial management in either the private or the public sector.

The intention behind this recommendation is that an understanding of the LGPS should be a requirement for s151 officers (or those aspiring to the role). During the Good Governance project itself the view was put forward by some the profession that requiring an element of LGPS training could form part of an individual’s ongoing continuous professional development requirements. This would have the advantage of ensuring the topics covered remain current and relevant.

The expectation would be that an appropriate level of LGPS knowledge must be attained by S151 officers of an administering authority. A level of LGPS knowledge should also be attained by S151 officers of other public bodies participating in the LGPS in order that they can understand issues relating to the participation of their own organisation, although it is not expected that that they should have the depth and breadth of knowledge required of the S151 officer of an administering authority.

D.3 Administering authorities must publish a policy setting out their approach to the delivery, assessment and recording of training plans to meet these requirements.

Many funds already publish training strategies which set out training strategies which establish how members of the Pension Committee, Pension Board and fund officers will attain the knowledge and understanding they need to be effective and to challenge and effectively carry out their decision making responsibilities. The intention is that all LGPS funds should produce a strategy which should set out how those involved with the fund will:

- have their knowledge measured and assessed;
- receive appropriate training to fill any knowledge gaps identified;
- ensure that knowledge is maintained; and
- evidence the training that is taking place

⁶ See *Managing Public Money (July 2013), Annex 4.1*

D.4 CIPFA and other relevant professional bodies should be asked to produce appropriate guidance and training modules for s151 officers and to consider including LGPS training within their training qualification syllabus.

The intention is that SAB engage with the professional accountancy bodies to develop LGPS training modules for accountancy professionals operating within local authorities.

E Service delivery for the LGPS Function

E.2 Each administering authority must publish an administration strategy.

This proposal has been progressed by the Cost Management, Benefit Design and Administration subcommittee to the SAB. When it met on the 6th January 2020 the following proposals were discussed:

- Changing the status of Regulation 59 from discretionary to mandatory and introduce the requirement for Pension Administration Strategy statements to be prepared and maintained in accordance with new statutory guidance
- Reviewing the remainder of Regulations 59 and 70 to identify whether any additional changes should be made;
- Exploring the scope for empowering administering authorities to penalise inefficient scheme employers in a more effective way;
- Recommending that MHCLG publishes new statutory guidance including :-
 - Minimum standards of performance;
 - Assessment of inefficiency costs;
 - Timescales for submitting scheme data
- Extending Regulation 80 to include a duty on all scheme employers to comply with the new Pension Administration Strategy statements.
- Changing the name of the statement to make it clear that it is wholly relevant to scheme employers.

E.3 Each administering authority must report the fund's performance against an agreed set of indicators designed to measure standards of service.

The working group considered this and recommend that rather than attempting to define a universal set of standards for administration across the LGPS. the KPIs should focus on ensuring that each fund has defined service standards, and has the governance in place to monitor their service standards and to benchmark those standards against other funds where appropriate.

Governance KPIs

Subject Area	KPI	Notes
Breadth of representation	1. Percentage make-up (employer/member) on committee and board and number of LPB representation	
	2. Average attendance level at meetings (percentage) – split between absence and vacancies	<i>1. and 2. may be incorporated in the Governance Compliance Statement (GCS) by including a clear statement of committee members and their attendance at meetings</i>
Training and expertise	3. Hours of relevant training undertaken across panel/board in last year	
	4. Relevant experience across senior management team	A qualitative statement on the LGPS Senior Officer and their direct reports (or other senior pensions staff) to include professional qualifications and financial services/pension/LGPS experience. Also include % time spent on pension fund business by each person
Compliance/Risk	5. Number of times risk register reviewed annually – number of times on agenda at committee/board.	This is not measuring the quality of the register but the expectation that it will be viewed regularly at the committee should also improve quality.
	6. Number of times carried out business continuity testing and/or cyber security penetration testing	<i>Key focus of TPR</i>
Appropriate governance time spent on key areas	7. Split of committee/board spent on administration/governance/investment	How should this be measured, is it just by number of items on the agenda keeping in mind it needs to be auditable?

Administration KPIs

		Notes
Data quality	1. Common/conditional data score, in line with TPR expectations	
	2. Annual Benefit Statement percentage as at 31 August	<i>Include explanation where less than 100%.</i>
Service standards/SLAs	3. Number and percentage of pension set-ups (new retirements) within disclosure requirement timeframe	
	4. Does the Fund monitor and report its own standards?	Y/N
	5. Percentage of calls to customer helpline answered and resolved at first point of contact	
Engagement and communication – capabilities and take-up	6. Specify which online services are available to members/employers	<i>Measuring services provided by Fund online, perhaps against an agreed standardised list.</i>
	7. Percentage of members registered for the fund's online services and the percentage that have logged onto the service in the last 12 months split by status	<i>Measuring take up of services</i>
	8. Number of employer engagement events and/or briefings held in last 12 month and percentage take-up	<i>Percentage take-up could be weighted to size of employer.</i>
Customer satisfaction	9. Percentage of members (or employers if appropriate) satisfied with the service provided by their LGPS fund (this could be obtained via a simple questionnaire of no more than 5 questions).	<i>Members and employers should be measured separately, and funds should also report the number completing the questionnaire to ensure appropriate coverage. For consistency in comparison we suggest a general question is drafted and Funds told to incorporate into their surveys – e.g. “The service was excellent – Strongly Disagree/Disagree/Agree/Strongly Agree.”</i>

E.4 Each administering authority must ensure their committee is included in the business planning process. Both the committee and LGPS senior officer must be satisfied with the resource and budget allocated to deliver the LGPS service over the next financial year.

Each Administering Authority has a specific legal responsibility to administer the LGPS within their geographical region and to maintain a specific reserve for that purpose. It is important therefore that the fund's budget is set and managed separately from the expenditure of the host authority.

Budgets for pension fund functions should be sufficient to meet all statutory requirements, the expectations of regulatory bodies and provide a good service to Scheme members and employers. The budget setting process should be one initiated and managed by the fund's officers and the pension committee and assisted by the local pension board.

Required expenditure should be based on the fund's business plan and deliverables for the forthcoming year. The practice should not simply be to uprate last year's budget by an inflationary measure or specify an "available" budget and work back to what level of service that budget can deliver.

The body or individual with delegated responsibility for delivering the LGPS service should have a role in setting that budget. Typically, this will involve the pension committee being satisfied that the proposed budget is appropriate to deliver the fund's business plan, but it is recognised that other governance models exist within the LGPS. Whichever approach is used, it should be clearly set out in the roles and responsibilities matrix and be consistent with the host authority's scheme of delegation and constitution.

Where a proposed budget is approved, the senior LGPS officer will confirm in the governance compliance statement that the administering authority has approved the budget required to deliver the pensions function to the required standard.

If the budget is not approved, the senior LGPS officer will declare that in the governance compliance statement, including the impact of that on service delivery as expressed in a reduced business plan.

These statements in the governance compliance statement will be co-signed by the S151 officer where this is not the same person as the senior LGPS officer.

F Compliance and Improvement

F.1 Each administering authority must undergo a biennial Independent Governance Review and, if applicable, produce the required improvement plan to address any issues identified.


IGR reports to be assessed by a SAB panel of experts.

The Phase 2 report sets out the key features required in the Independent Governance Review. A sample outline for further discussion is included in Appendix 3.

Appendix 1 - Senior officer organisational structures


The following organisational structure charts show where the LGPS senior officer role may sit.

Example 1




In this structure the LGPS Senior Officer is the Director of Pensions. As a tier 2 officer in the organisation the Director of Pensions will have the appropriate seniority for the role and with only LGPS responsibilities they will have the capacity to focus solely on delivery of the LGPS function.

Example 2




In this model the LGPS Senior Officer is a Tier 2 Director with significant other responsibilities. The diagram shows the LGPS Senior Officer as the Director of Resources and s151 officer, but a similar situation could arise if pension responsibilities lay within another Directorate, for example under a director with responsibility for legal/governance (in which case the LGPS Senior Officer would likely be the monitoring officer as well). Although the Senior officer has other responsibilities in this scenario, they are supported by a senior team of assistant directors, who are themselves tier 3 officers. The strength of the management team in this case is likely to mean that the LGPS Senior Officer has the ability to delegate aspects of LGPS delivery to an appropriately senior team, while retaining the ability to influence the strategic direction of the fund.

Example 3




Under this structure the Head of Pensions is a Tier 3 officer reporting to the S151 officer.

Example 4



Under this structure the Head of Pensions sits at tier 4 with a reporting line that runs through the Head of Finance, Director of Resources (s151) and to the Chief Executive. As long as the reporting lines are clear and there is sufficient support for the Head of Pensions from senior officers this structure may provide an appropriate level of seniority and capacity for the Senior officer. However, some members of the working group expressed the view that in order to manage the scope and exert the required influence, the LGPS Senior Officer role should be held by an individual no lower than Tier 3.

Example 5



In this structure it becomes difficult to identify where the LGPS Snr officer should sit. While the investment and accounting functions sit within the function at tier 4, the administration of the fund is delivered by a fourth tier officer in the corporate services directorate who reports to the Head of HR. such an arrangement makes it difficult to for any one person to have full sight of all LGPS functions. Separate reporting lines in this fashion militate against a joined strategy and decision making for the fund.

Appendix 2 - Governance compliance statement

The following is an example of a governance compliance statement. It is recognised that under the current LGPS regulations, administering authorities must prepare, publish and maintain a statement on the following matters;

- (a) whether the authority delegates its functions, or part of its functions under the LGPS regulations to a committee, a sub-committee or an officer of the authority;
- (b) if the authority does so-
 - (i) the terms, structure and operational procedures of the delegation,
 - (ii) the frequency of any committee or sub-committee meetings,
 - (iii) whether such a committee or sub-committee includes representatives of Scheme employers or members, and if so, whether those representatives have voting rights;
- (c) the extent to which a delegation, or the absence of a delegation, complies with guidance given by the Secretary of State and, to the extent that it does not so comply, the reasons for not complying; and
- (d) details of the terms, structure and operational procedures relating to the local pension board established under regulation 106 (local pension boards: establishment).

These matters should continue to form part of each administering authority's governance compliance statement.

It is recommended that the new governance compliance statement incorporates the existing requirements alongside the recommendations arising from this review.

A Conflicts of interest

A1. Conflicts of Interest Policy

The Fund has published a conflict of interest policy which sets out:

- How it identifies potential conflicts of interest (including those set out in recommendation B1)
- How it ensures that understand their responsibilities in respect of ensuring that conflicts of interest are properly managed;
- That the policy applies to officers, elected members, members of the local pension board and advisers and contractors;
- Systems, controls and processes for managing and mitigating conflicts of interest effectively;
- How it reviews the effectiveness of its conflict of interest policy and updates it as required;
- How it embeds a culture which supports the management and mitigation of conflicts of interest.

The Governance Compliance Statement includes a link to this policy.

A2. Conflicts of Interest Process

The fund embeds the management of conflicts of interest into its everyday processes. This includes:

- Providing regular training to members of the pension committee, pension board and officers on identifying and managing potential conflicts of interest;
- Ensuring a record is kept of situations where the Conflict of Interest Policy has been applied to mitigate or manage a potential conflict situation;
- Ensuring that a declaration of interests forms part of the agenda for all pension committee and pension board meetings and that an annual declaration of interests is completed;
- Ensuring actual and potential conflicts of interest are considered during procurement processes; and
- Ensuring that conflicts of interest form part of the Fund's suite of policies for example the Funding Strategy Statement and Administration Strategy.

A3. The Council as administering authority and employer

The Council recognises that its dual role as both an employer participating in the Fund and the body legally tasked with its management can produce the potential for conflicts of interest. It is important that these potential conflicts are managed in order to ensure that no actual or perceived conflict of interest arises and that all of the Fund's employers and scheme members are treated fairly and equitably.

The Fund achieves this in the following ways:

- The Funding Strategy Statement sets out the Fund's approach to all funding related matters including the setting of contribution rates. This policy is set with regard to the advice of the Fund actuary and is opened to consultation with all Fund employers before being formally adopted by the Pension Committee. The approach to contribution setting is based on specific employer characteristics such as its time horizon, strength of covenant and risk profile. This approach ensures a consistency across all employers and removes the possibility of any employer receiving more, or less, favourable treatment.
- The Fund also has an admissions policy which details its approach to admitting new employers to the Fund. This includes its approach to the use of guarantors, bonds and the setting of a fixed contribution rate for some employers. This policy, in conjunction with the Funding Strategy Statement, ensures a consistent approach when new employers are admitted in to the Fund.
- The Fund's administration strategy sets out the way in which the Fund works with its employers and the mutual service standards that are expected. The policy details how the Fund will assist employers to ensure that they are best placed to meet their statutory LGPS obligations. On occasions where an employer's failure to comply with required processes and standards has led to the Fund incurring additional cost, the policy also provides for that cost to be recovered from the employer in question. This policy has been opened to consultation with all the Fund's employers and is operated in a consistent fashion across all of the employer base.
- The pension fund is run for the benefit of its members and on behalf of all its employers. It is important therefore that the Fund's budget is set and managed separately from the expenditure of the Council. Decisions regarding pension fund resource are taken to the Pension Committee who then make recommendation to the S151 officer.

B Clarity of Roles and Responsibilities

B.1 Clear decision making

The Council's constitution and scheme of delegation set out the terms of reference for the Pension Committee.

The Pension Board's terms of reference and the membership and terms of reference for any sub-committees are also published.

The scheme of delegation is supported by:

- clearly documented role and responsibilities for the LGPS Senior Officer, S151 and pension fund officers / Head of Pension Fund; and
- a decision matrix which sets out the key decisions that are required to be made in the management of the Fund and the role that the main decision makers have in those decisions. The matrix sets out when an individual or body is responsible for a decision, accountable for a decision or where they must be consulted or informed of a decision.

On a regular basis the Fund's business processes are referenced against the decision matrix, to ensure that they properly reflect the correct responsibility and accountability.

The terms of references for the Committee & Board are publicly available and should be reviewed on a regular basis.

C Sufficiency of resources for service planning and delivery

In order to ensure that the Fund has the appropriate resource to deliver its statutory obligations it has adopted a 3 stage approach.

C.1 Business planning and budget setting

The Fund operates a 3 year business plan which sets out the priorities for the Fund's services. It is comprehensively reviewed, updated and agreed by the Pension Committee before the start of each financial year. If necessary, the plan is reviewed and updated on a more frequent basis. The business plan is publicly available.

The business plan takes into account the risks facing the Fund, performance of the Fund (including backlogs of work) and anticipated regulatory changes.

The business plan also includes the Fund's budget. Resource requirements (including staff recruitment, procurement and other specialist services) are determined by the requirements of the Fund's business plan.

The business plan also sets out the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which will be used to monitor progress against the business plan.

Progress against the business plan, including actual spend, is monitored by the Pension Committee on a regular basis and published in the Fund's annual report and accounts.

C.2 Service delivery

The Fund publishes an administration strategy which sets out how it will deliver the administration of the Scheme. The strategy includes:

- details of the structures and processes in place for the delivery of the pension administration function;
- expected levels of performance for the delivery of key Fund and employer functions;
- the Fund's approach to training and development of staff;

- the Fund's approach to the use of technology in pension administration.

C.3 Monitoring delivery and Control environment

The Fund recognises the importance of monitoring and reporting how it delivers progress against the business plan. This is done on the following ways:

- Performance against KPIs is reported to the Pension Committee and Pension Board on a regular and agreed basis. KPI performance is reported in the Fund's annual report. Plans to address any backlogs added to business planning process above-
- Every year the Fund's internal auditors carry out reviews to provide assurance that the Fund's processes and systems are appropriate for managing risks. The areas for review are agreed in advance with the Pension Committee and findings are reported to them.
- This year the internal audit also included an assessment of the Fund's performance against the requirements of The Pension Regulator's Code of Practice 14. The assessment recognised that the Fund is fully compliant in most areas but did make a number of suggestions about how the Fund could improve its internal controls for managing data. These suggestions have been adopted into the Fund's data improvement plan.
- Last year the Pension Board assisted the committee by undertaking an independent review of the sufficiency and appropriateness of the Fund's governance and operational resources. The review found that the Fund was for the most part properly resourced although the use of regular staff to tackle a backlog of aggregation cases was causing the backlog project to fall behind and having an adverse impact on business as usual. The review suggested procuring additional temporary resource in order to address the backlog issue.
- The Fund also participates in national benchmarking exercises which provides information on how costs, resource levels and quality of service compare with other LGPS funds and private sector schemes. The benchmarking did not identify any significant areas of concern.

D. Representation and engagement

The Fund has published a Policy on representation and engagement.

D.1 Representation on the main decision making body

The policy recognises all scheme members and employers should be appropriately represented in the running in the Fund while at the same time ensuring that the Council, as the body with ultimate responsibility for running the Fund, maintains a majority position on the key governance bodies. To this end the Fund's representation policy and the Council's constitution specify that the Council shall maintain a majority of voting members on the Pension Committee. The present Pension Committee is constituted as follows;

Pensions Committee – Membership and Meeting Attendance (Governance KPIs 1 and 2)

	Administering Authority / Employer / Member representative / Other	Meeting Date				Attendance (%)
		MM/YY	MM/YY	MM/YY	MM/YY	
Voting Members						
Cllr A (chair)	Administering Authority	Y	N	Y	Y	75%
Cllr B (vice-chair)	Administering Authority	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%
Cllr C	Administering Authority	Y	N	Y	Y	75%
Cllr D	Administering Authority	N	Y	Y	N	50%
Cllr E	Administering Authority	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%
F	Employer representative	Y	Y	N	Y	75%
G	Member representative	N	Y	Y	Y	75%
Vacancy		N	N	N	N	0%
Average attendance (including vacancies) %						78%
Average attendance (excluding vacancies) %						69%
Proportion of voting members not from the Administering Authority						2 out of 7 (28%)
Non-Voting Members						
H	Member representative	Y	Y	Y	N	75%
I	Member representative	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%

D.2 Membership of the Local Pension Board

The Local Pension Board is constituted as follows;

- 4 employer representatives comprising;
 - 2 elected members of the Council
 - 1 elected member of the District Council
 - 1 member representing all other employers
- 4 scheme member representatives comprising;
 - 1 member appointed by trade unions
 - 3 members representing active, deferred and pensioner Scheme members (to be appointed by an open election process)
- 1 independent chair

With the exception of the Chair, all members are full voting members.

The Pension Board has an independent adviser.

D.3 Engagement with employers

The Fund carries out a range of activities that are designed to engage employers. These are set out within the Fund's Communication strategy and include:

- An Annual Employer Forum which provides an opportunity for employers to receive an update on the performance of the Fund, provide feedback on the service and receive updates on the LGPS and related issues;

- The Fund engages and consults with employers during the actuarial valuation and specifically on key strategies such as the Funding Strategy Statement;
- A quarterly employer newsletter provides update on technical changes, process reminders and a calendar of key upcoming dates;
- Training sessions which can be provided on request covering the main areas of employer responsibility, for example year end returns, processing ill health cases and internal dispute resolution procedures; and
- The Fund is available to provide support on issues such as outsourcing services or workforce restructuring.

D.4 Engagement with members

The Fund's Communication Strategy sets out how it engages with active, deferred and pensioner scheme members including:

- The Fund maintains a website which provides general advice, information and updates including copies of all current policies.
- Members have secure online access to their own pension records in order to run retirement estimates.
- Member's annual benefit statements are available online or in writing (including large text) on request.
- Scheme members are able to arrange one to one appointments, by phone or at our offices, with members of the pension team to discuss specific matters.

E. Training

E.1 Training Strategy

The Fund has adopted a training strategy which establishes how members of the Pension Committee, Pension Board and Fund officers will attain the knowledge and understanding they need to be effective and to challenge and act effectively within the decision making responsibility placed upon them. The training strategy sets out how those involved with the Fund will:

- Have their knowledge assessed; and
- Receive appropriate training to fill any knowledge gaps identified.

The Fund will measure and report on progress against the training plans.

E.2 Evidencing standards of training

Details of the training undertaken by members of the Pension Committee and Pension Board are reported in the Fund's annual report and in this statement.

Committee and Board members' subject knowledge is assessed on an annual basis. The results are analysed and any gaps identified are addressed as part of the ongoing training plans.

Targeted training will also be provided that is timely and directly relevant to the Pension Committee and Board's activities as set out in the business plan.

Officers involved in the management and administration of the Fund are set annual objectives which will include an element of personal development. These objectives are monitored as part of each individual's annual appraisal.

The CIPFA requirement for continuous professional development for s151 officers now includes a regular LGPS element. This requirement applies to the s151 officer for the Council as well as the district and borough councils within the Fund. The fund has complied fully with this requirement.

Pensions Committee – Training for Financial Year YYYY/YY

Training Completed (hours)		Subject				Total (hours)
		Governance	Investment	Pensions Administration	Other (specify)	
Pensions Committee						
Cllr A (chair)		2	5	1	1	9
Cllr B (vice-chair)		2	4	1	1	8
Cllr C		4	5	2	2	13
Cllr D						
Cllr E						
F						
G						
Vacancy						
Sub-Total						130
Pensions Board						
R (chair)		2	5	1	1	9
S (vice-chair)		2	4	1	1	8
T		4	5	2	2	13
U						
V						
W						
X						
Sub-Total						100
Officers						
LGPS Senior Officer		6	8	3	4	9
X						
Y						
Z						

Appendix 3 - KPI Reporting

This appendix includes example tables for reporting committee structure and training KPIs.


Pensions Committee – Membership and Meeting Attendance (Governance KPIs 1 and 2)

	Administering Authority / Employer / Member representative / Other	Meeting Date				Attendance (%)
		MM/YY	MM/YY	MM/YY	MM/YY	
Voting Members						
Cllr A (chair)	Administering Authority	Y	N	Y	Y	75%
Cllr B (vice-chair)	Administering Authority	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%
Cllr C	Administering Authority	Y	N	Y	Y	75%
Cllr D	Administering Authority	N	Y	Y	N	50%
Cllr E	Administering Authority	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%
F	Employer representative	Y	Y	N	Y	75%
G	Member representative	N	Y	Y	Y	75%
Vacancy		N	N	N	N	0%
Average attendance (including vacancies) %						78%
Average attendance (excluding vacancies) %						69%
Proportion of voting members not from the Administering Authority						2 out of 7 (28%)
Non-Voting Members						
H	Member representative	Y	Y	Y	N	75%
I	Member representative	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%

Pensions Committee – Meeting Content (Governance KPI 7)

			<i>Meeting Date</i>				Number of times item considered
			<i>MM/YY</i>	<i>MM/YY</i>	<i>MM/YY</i>	<i>MM/YY</i>	
Meeting duration (hours)			3.0	2.5	4.0	2.5	
Governance							
	Declaration of Conflicts of Interest		X	X	X	X	4
	Policies/Strategies			X	X		2
	Business Planning					X	1
	Budget setting					X	1
	Annual report and accounts			X			1
	Governance Compliance Statement			X			1
	Audit matters (internal/external)		X	X	X		3
	Risk Register		X	X	X	X	4
	Business Continuity			X			1
	Data Security				X		1
	Breaches		X	X	X	X	4
	Regulatory Update			X		X	2
	Update from Pension Board		X				1
	Pool Governance issues			X		X	2
	Review of Effectiveness		X				1
	Training		X		X		2
	Other [to be specified]						
Funding							
	Actuarial Valuations		X	X			2
	Funding Strategy Statement		X	X			2
	Interim Funding Update				X	X	2
	Other [to be specified]						
Investment							
	Strategy review				X		
	Policies/Strategy (Investment Strategy Statement, Responsible Investment)				X	X	
	Strategy implementation - Asset Pooling - Investment manager appointments		X		X	X	3
	Monitoring of investments - Market update - Investment managers - Performance		X	X	X	X	4
	Other [to be specified]						
Pensions Administration							
	Administration Strategy					X	1
	Communications Strategy						0
	Performance Indicators		X	X	X	X	4
	Updates on Projects			X		X	2
	Other [to be specified]						

Appendix 4 - Summary of the Independent Governance Review



This page is intentionally left blank