

The Consultation Process and How to Respond

Scope of the consultation

Topic of this consultation:	Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Cross Pool Information Forum
Scope of this consultation:	This consultation seeks responses from Chairs of LGPS pension committees on the remit, membership and frequency of the proposed forum.
Geographical scope:	England & Wales

Basic Information

To:	This consultation is aimed at Chairs of LGPS pension committees.
Body responsible for the consultation:	LGPS Advisory Board
Duration:	17 th July 2017 to 29 th September 2017 (10 weeks)

Background

Getting to this stage:	At the meeting of the Scheme Advisory Board on the 26th June, it was agreed in principle that an elected member led Cross Pool Information Forum should be established to share and disseminate information on the pooling of LGPS assets. It was also agreed that the Chairs of LGPS pension committees should be consulted on the remit, membership and frequency of the proposed forum.
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Help with queries

Questions about this consultation should be sent to the email addresses given below.

Who this consultation is aimed at?

The following consultation is aimed at **LGPS Chairs of Pension Committees**. The consultation is available via the Scheme Advisory Board's website www.lgpsboard.org.

The Board has issued the consultation to the following contacts directly:

- LGPS Chairs of Pension Committees
- LGPS Fund Investment Contacts

How to respond

You should respond to this consultation by **29th September 2017**.

You can respond by email to Liam.Robson@local.gov.uk and Robert.Holloway@local.gov.uk. Email responses are preferred.

When responding, please ensure you have the words “LGPS Cross Pool Information Forum” in the email subject line.

Alternately you can write to:

Bob Holloway, Pension Secretary
LGPS Cross Pool Information Forum Consultation
Scheme Advisory Board Secretariat
Local Government Association
Layden House, 76-86 Turnmill Street,
London, EC1 M 5LG

When responding, please state whether you are responding as an individual or representing the views of the Pension Committee.

Consultation

Introduction

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Scheme Advisory Board on the 26th June, it was agreed in principle that an elected member led Cross Pool Information Forum should be established to share and disseminate information on the pooling of LGPS assets. It was also agreed that the Chairs of LGPS pension committees should be consulted on the remit, membership and frequency of the proposed forum.
- 1.2 The same consultation should also seek views on whether a one off open session on progress towards pooling should be organised with an invitation going to all chairs of pension committees and local pension boards.
- 1.3 **The closing date for responses is 29th September 2017.**

Part 1 - Cross Pool Information Forum (CPF)

- 1.4 It is **not** proposed that the CPF be a decision making body nor would its content be technical in nature. It is proposed that its remit would be to receive, share and disseminate information across the pools as well as providing a platform to exchange best practice and items of cross pool interest.
- 1.5 Do you agree that the remit of the CPF should be limited to receiving, sharing and disseminating information as described above?
No **[Please select your response]**
- 1.6 **If you answer “no”, please describe below what you think the remit of the CPF should be.**

Any wider remit and it becomes yet another “body” representing the LGPS. However, the remit must define how this forum will sit within the existing governance arrangements of the LGPS and specifically what will it do with the information it receives. Would interact with the SAB or with its respective pool?

The creation of another body within the LGPS family gives rise to potential for mixed messages which will need to be managed; this may be more difficult now that each pool has developed a model that is appropriate to the needs of the underlying funds and therefore pools may have differing views. Where LGPS pools can work in concert to adopt and promote best practice, to improve cost transparency for example, collaboration will occur at the operational level led by officers and pool operators.

The consultation does not set out the value that this forum will add to the pooling; sharing information and best practice is already in place across pools. In Brunel, we continuously inform our members through newsletters and member engagement days. As the pool develops we intend to replicate these events in the future as needed.

If there is a need for a more consistent briefing from SAB to Committee and Board Chairs as to progress and vice versa, the most appropriate mechanism could be through the existing SAB committee structure, together with the Cross Pool Collaboration Group. It would be resource efficient and leverage off the already successful working arrangements in place. It may be that

better communications are needed to ensure all information is properly disseminated to all the pools/funds.

- 1.7 It is proposed that membership of the CPF would be open to a maximum of three nominations from the member administering authorities of each pool. The nominations may all be elected members or include a mixture of elected members and others.
- 1.8 In line with the SAB's previously published statement on pool representation the determination of nominees should include the consideration of the provision of direct representation for scheme members.
- 1.9 Do you agree that membership should be as set out above?
No

If you answer "no", please describe below how you think membership should be structured.

The Forum is for the pools. Therefore it should be at the discretion of each pool as to their representatives; there should not be a specific "allocation" to any particular type of representative. This would not restrict pools with scheme member or other representation on their governing body putting them forward as a representative on the Forum. We would be concerned by the resource/support implications required to support 3 representatives.

To ensure the size of the forum is manageable and effective, an option would be to restrict the number to one representative from each pool and have a limited number of scheme representatives representing all scheme members.

- 1.10 It is proposed that the CPF should meet at least quarterly.
- 1.11 Do you agree that meetings should be held at least quarterly?

No

If you answer "no", please explain below how often you think the CPF should meet.

As the remit is currently stated, to exchange and share information and best practice, meeting quarterly is too frequent. It is difficult to envisage significant information etc. arising quarterly now that the pools are largely established.

Members of our governing body (the Oversight Board) have expressed their reservation about quarterly meetings; they would find it very difficult to find time for further meetings given their current commitment to the Oversight Board and local pensions committees.

A maximum of 2 meetings a year should be adequate for sharing of information.

- 1.12 It is proposed that the Chair of the CPF should be selected from amongst the forum's membership. Do you agree?
No

If you answer "no", please explain below how you think the Chair should be selected.

An Independent Chair would be preferred

1.13 Given the proposed remit of the CPF as a non-decision making body, it is not proposed to include in its remit any arrangements with respect to voting.

1.14 Do you agree that voting arrangements should not be included in the remit?

Yes

If you answer “no”, please explain below why you think voting arrangements should be included.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

1.15 It is further proposed that the Scheme Advisory Board’s Secretariat should support the administration of the CPF in terms of arranging meetings, venues, etc.

1.16 Do you agree that the Secretariat should support the CPF in this way?

Yes

If you answer “no”, please explain below how you think administration of the CPF should be supported.

There is no other alternative resource. However the costs will have to be funded by the funds so serious consideration must be given to whether this Forum will add any value to the funds.

Part 2 - Open Session

1.17 In order to better enable the open and wide dissemination of information, it is proposed that a session for all chairs of pension committees and local pension boards on the progress towards pooling should be organised.

1.18 Do you agree that an open session of this type would be helpful?
Yes

Please use the space below if you wish to expand on your response.

This would be useful for them to get an understanding of national progress; however, there have been many conferences covering pooling that chairs have/can attend. Within Brunel we have prioritised pool wide member engagement days at various stages of the project and will continue to do so now that BPP Ltd is a separate entity.

1.19 If no, please explain that you would change or add and why.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Part 3 – Respondent details

1.20 Please complete the table below with administrating authority and contact details.

Administering Authority:	Bath & North East Somerset Council
Contact name:	Liz Woodyard
Email address:	Liz_woodyard@bathnes.gov.uk