

## CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

### NOTICE OF MEETING

You are invited to attend a Meeting of the

### PENSION FUND COMMITTEE

**At:** Committee Room 5, Guildhall, Swansea

**On:** Thursday, 17 December 2015

**Time:** 11.00 am

**Chair:** Councillor Rob Stewart

---

#### **Membership:**

Councillors: P Downing, C E Lloyd, J Newbury, D G Sullivan and M Thomas

Neath Port Talbot Co-opted Member: Councillor P Rees

Independent Investment Co-advisors: V Furniss, N Mills

### AGENDA

	Page No.
<b>1 Apologies for Absence.</b>	
<b>2 Disclosures of Personal and Prejudicial Interests.</b> <a href="http://www.swansea.gov.uk/DisclosuresofInterests">http://www.swansea.gov.uk/DisclosuresofInterests</a>	
<b>3 Minutes.</b> To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the previous Pension Fund Committee meeting.	1 - 6
<b><u>Report(s) of the Section 151 Officer.</u></b>	
<b>4 Presentation - The Local Authority Pension Fund Forum - Membership.</b> <i>Presentation by Keith Bray.</i>	7 - 10
<b>5 Consultation on Investment Regulations.</b>	11 - 38
<b>6 Admitted Body - Rathbone Training. Application for Second 'Admitted Body' Status of Rathbone Training Ltd to the City &amp; County of Swansea Pension Fund.</b>	39 - 41
<b>7 Admitted Body - Westward Heating.</b>	42 - 44
<b>8 Investment Reform Criteria and Guidance. (For Information)</b>	45 - 71

- 9 Exclusion of the Public. 72 - 75  
*Report of the Monitoring Officer.*
- 10 Review of the Current Abatement Policy. 76 - 100  
*Report of the Section 151 Officer.*
- 11 Presentation - Investment Strategy Review - Hymans Robertson Report. (For Information) 101 - 127  
*Report of the Independent Investment Co-advisors.*
- 12 Independent Investment Co- Advisors' Reports. 128 - 141  
*Report of the Section 151 Officer.*
- 13 Investment Summary. (For Information) 142 - 155  
*Presentation - Fund Managers.*
- 14 Harbourvest – Global Private Equity.

**Next Meeting:** Thursday, 10 March 2016 at 10.00 am



Patrick Arran  
Head of Legal and Democratic Services  
9 December 2015

---

Contact: Democratic Services: - 01792 636923

## CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

### MINUTES OF THE PENSION FUND COMMITTEE

HELD AT CHAMBER MEETING ROOM, CIVIC CENTRE, SWANSEA ON  
THURSDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2015 AT 10.00 AM

**PRESENT:** Councillor P Downing (Vice Chair) presided

<b>Councillor(s)</b>	<b>Councillor(s)</b>	<b>Councillor(s)</b>
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

P Downing	C E Lloyd	
-----------	-----------	--

**Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council Councillor:**

P A Rees

**Officers:**

M Hawes	-	Head of Finance and Delivery
J Dong	-	Chief Treasury and Technical Officer
S Williams	-	Principal Lawyer
J Parkhouse	-	Democratic Services Officer

**ALSO PRESENT:**

N Mills	-	Independent Investment Advisor
V Furniss	-	Independent Investment Advisor
R Nelson	-	Pricewaterhouse Coopers
I Lookey	-	Pricewaterhouse Coopers

13 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Newbury, R C Stewart, D G Sullivan and M Thomas.

14 **DISCLOSURES OF PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS.**

In accordance with the Code of Conduct adopted by the City and County of Swansea, the following interest was declared: -

Councillor P Downing - agenda as a whole - my brother works for the Council and contributes to the Pension Fund.

**NOTED** that Councillor P Downing had received dispensation from the Standards Committee in this respect.

15 **MINUTES.**

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Pension Fund Committee Meeting held on 2 July 2015 be approved as a correct record.

16 **AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS - ISA 260 REPORT.**

R Nelson and I Lookey, PricewaterhouseCoopers presented the Audit of Financial Statements ISA 260 report. The report set out the matters arising from the audit of the financial statements of the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund, for 2014-15, that required reporting under ISA 260. The External Auditors were therefore reporting the more significant issues arising from the audit, which they believed must be considered prior to the approval of the financial statements.

It was stated that subject to the satisfactory completion of the outstanding audit work, it was the Auditor General's intention to issue an unqualified audit report on the financial statements once the Authority had provided a Letter of Representation based on that set out in Appendix 1. The Review of the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund Annual Report (once it was provided) and subsequent events review further to the provision of the Annual Report were the areas of Audit work to be completed.

It was added that there were no misstatements identified in the financial statements, which remained uncorrected. There was a misstatement that had been corrected by management, but which the External Auditors considered should be drawn to the attention of the Authority due to its relevance to the responsibilities of the Council over the financial reporting process. Details were provided at Appendix 2.

There were no other significant issues arising from the audit and the recommendations arising from the financial audit work were set out at Appendix 3.

Progress was noted regarding the issue identified during the course of the prior year audit in relation to the Powys College Transfer In.

Details of significant issues arising from the audit were provided and included no uncorrected misstatements within the audit, significant risks, including those identified at planning stage, risk of fraud and the auditors not identifying any material weaknesses in the internal controls but providing some recommendations to enhance the control environment.

The Committee asked questions of the PricewaterhouseCoopers representatives who responded accordingly.

**RESOLVED** that the contents of the report be noted.

17 **CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA PENSION FUND - STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS 2014/15.**

The Section 151 Officer presented the statement of accounts for the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund. The City & County of Swansea Pension Fund Statement of Accounts 2014/15 were attached at Appendix 1.

**RESOLVED** that the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund Statement of Accounts 2014/15 be approved.

18 **ALL WALES COLLABORATION REPORT.**

The Section 151 Officer presented the report by Mercers commissioned by the Society of Welsh Treasurers Sub Group regarding Collaboration in the Welsh LGPS which sought approval to jointly procure a single passive index manager for all 8 Welsh LGPS funds.

It was added that the consensus and the feedback from the Local Government Association was that the government was leaning towards a pooling of investments approach. As such, the Society of Welsh Treasurers Pension Sub Group (SWTPSG) commissioned some work by the consultants Mercers regarding how best to implement this on an All Wales basis.

The final report (May 2015) was attached at Appendix 1.

The key points of the report were outlined as follows: -

- Spend time to develop a share set of principles for collaboration.
- Pursue a more collaborative approach in order to avail the key benefits which included economies of scale and lower costs, increased consistencies, enhanced governance and operational management across the Welsh Funds.
- Select a single provider for passive assets to obtain immediate cost savings. A pooling structure would not be required to achieve these gains.
- Establish a pooling framework to extend on collaboration beyond passive assets.
- Adopt a regulated (pooling) vehicle along with a model that supports leveraging the infrastructure of a third party provider (rather than building such infrastructure internally).
- Consider framing the new collaborative framework as optional for each Welsh Fund but target mandates that were common to all to ensure strong uptake and an engaged and simple approach.
- Consider active equity as the immediate mandate to commence under the new collaborative framework. The analysis conducted highlights that mandates offer the greatest potential for cost savings and improved net

of fees returns.

- Agree a set of next steps to take forward the project, including a workshop / training session and development of a project plan, including the potential tender process to assess suitable partners / providers to support the new collaborative framework.

It was recommended in the Mercer report and agreed by the SWTPSG to jointly procure a passive index manager for all 8 Welsh funds which would result in fee savings for all 8 Welsh funds.

A report outlining the approach to be adopted and agreed by all 8 Welsh funds was attached at Appendix 2. This report would be presented at all 8 Welsh pension fund decision making bodies for approval.

The Committee considered the information provided within the report.

**RESOLVED** that: -

- 1) The report by Mercers in Appendix 1 be noted;
- 2) The joint procurement exercise outlined in Appendix 2 to collaboratively procure a single passive index manager on behalf of all 8 Welsh LGPS be approved.

19 **RENEWAL OF 'ADMITTED BODY' STATUS OF CELTIC COMMUNITY LEISURE (BY NEATH PORT TALBOT COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL) TO THE CITY & COUNTY OF SWANSEA PENSION FUND.**

The Chief Treasury Officer presented a report which requested approval to renew Celtic Community Leisure as an Admitted Body in the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund. This was to ensure compliance with the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 (as amended).

It was outlined that negotiations between Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council and Celtic Community Leisure had been finalised with a new 10 year contract due to commence with effect from 1 October 2015, with the option to extend for a further 5 years.

Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council had therefore requested that the Admitted Body status be renewed for 10 years from the commencement of the contract, with the option to extend for a further 5 years subject to completion of an admission agreement.

It was added that Celtic Community Leisure intended to close the scheme to new members.

**RESOLVED** that the application of Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council to renew the Admitted Body status of Celtic Community Leisure, subject to completing an agreed Admission Agreement, be approved.

20 **APPLICATION FOR 'ADMITTED BODY' STATUS OF RATHBONE TRAINING LTD TO THE CITY & COUNTY OF SWANSEA PENSION FUND.**

The Chief Treasury Officer presented a report which requested approval, in principle, to admit Rathbone Training Ltd. as an Admitted Body in the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund. This was to ensure compliance with the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 (as amended).

It was outlined that Rathbone Training Ltd was awarded a contract for the Government's Work Based Learning 4 in Wales from Gower College on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015, resulting in 8 staff TUPE transferring to Rathbone Training Ltd with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015.

Rathbone Training Ltd. had subsequently applied for admitted body status as a closed scheme employer in the City and County of Swansea Pension Fund.

**RESOLVED** that the application of Rathbone Training Ltd., as an admitted body to the City and County of Swansea Pension Fund, subject to Actuarial risk assessment and completion of admission agreement, be approved in principle.

21 **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC.**

The Committee was requested to exclude the public from the meeting during consideration of the item(s) of business identified in the recommendation(s) to the report on the grounds that it/they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as set out in the exclusion paragraph of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007 relevant to the item(s) of business set out in the report.

The Committee considered the Public Interest Test in deciding whether to exclude the public from the meeting for the items of business where the Public Interest Test was relevant as set out in the report.

**RESOLVED** that the public be excluded for the following items of business.

**(CLOSED SESSION)**

22 **TO COMMISSION AN INVESTMENT STRATEGY REVIEW- AWARD.**

The Chief Treasury Officer presented a 'for information' report that informed the Committee of the successful tenderer to commission an investment strategy review.

23 **TO DIRECT CURRENT FOREIGN EXCHANGE (FX) TRADES THROUGH THE LGPS FX PLATFORM.**

The Chief Treasury Officer which sought approval of the implementation of foreign exchange Trades through the Fund appointed custodian's LGPS fx trading platform, saving on transaction costs.

**RESOLVED** that the appointed fund custodian, HSBC implements foreign exchange trades via the LGPS platform for appropriate foreign exchange transactions for the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund.

24 **REPORTS OF THE INDEPENDENT CO- ADVISORS.**

The report presented the economic update and market commentary from the perspective of the appointed Independent Investment Advisors. Mr N Mills provided an economic and market update and Mr V Furniss provided an investment report for the quarter ended 30 June 2015.

The content of each report was noted by the Committee and the Independent Advisors were thanked for their reports.

25 **PRESENTATION OF FUND MANAGERS.**

- 1) A joint presentation was provided by Emma Dean and Jason Smith on behalf of Goldman Sachs.

Questions in relation to the content of the presentation were asked at the end of each presentation by the Committee and responses were provided by the respective Fund Managers.

The contents of the presentations were noted and the Chair thanked each of the Fund Managers for attending the meeting.

26 **INVESTMENT SUMMARY.**

The Chief Treasury and Technical Officer provided a “for information” report which presented the investment performance for the quarter year ended 30 June 2015. Attached at Appendix A of the report were the Quarterly Investment Summaries for the Pension Fund for the quarter ended 30 June 2015.

The meeting ended at 12.07 pm

**CHAIR**



## Report of the Section 151 Officer

Pension Fund Committee – 17 December 2015

### THE LOCAL AUTHORITY PENSION FUND FORUM - MEMBERSHIP

<b>Purpose:</b>	To approve the membership and annual subscription to the Local Authority Pension Fund Forum.
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	None
<b>Reason for Decision:</b>	To assist the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund in delivering its responsibilities as a Responsible Investor.
<b>Consultation:</b>	Legal, Finance & Delivery and Access to Services.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	It is recommended that:  1) The City & County of Swansea Pension Fund takes out full annual membership to the Local Authority Pension Fund Forum.
<b>Report Author:</b>	Jeff Dong
<b>Finance Officer:</b>	Mike Hawes
<b>Legal Officer:</b>	Stephanie Williams
<b>Access to Services Officer:</b>	Sherill Hopkins

#### 1 Background

1.1 It is now widely accepted that it is in all shareholders' interests to promote high standards of corporate governance and corporate social responsibility. The City & County of Swansea Pension Fund has for many years been supportive in promoting good corporate governance through its fund managers. Corporate governance can be defined *narrowly* as the relationship of a company with its shareholders and how it governs its activities, or more *broadly* as its relationship to society on environmental, social and governance (ESG) issues.

1.2 The Cadbury Report on Corporate Governance in 1992 defined corporate governance as

*" the system by which companies are directed and controlled. Boards of directors are responsible for the governance of their companies, while shareholders' role in governance is to appoint the directors and auditors and to satisfy themselves that a proper governance structure is in place. "*

or as the Financial Times put it “*Corporate governance can be defined narrowly as the relationship of a company with its shareholders or more broadly, as its relationship to society*”

## **2 CIPFA Guidance**

2.1 The Myners Principles were updated in 2008 when the original ten principles were distilled down to six principles. Principle 5 relates to Responsible Ownership and in this context the *CIPFA Guide to the application of the revised Myners Principles* says:-

*“Authorities may wish to consider seeking alliances with either other pension funds in general, or a group of local authority pension funds, to benefit from collective size where there is a common interest to influence companies to take action on environmental, social and governance issues. For example, the Local Authority Pension Fund Forum (LAPFF) exists to promote the investment interests of local authority pension funds, and to maximise their influence as shareholders while promoting corporate social responsibility and high standards of corporate governance among the companies in which they invest.”*

## **3 The Local Authority Pension Fund Forum**

3.1 The Local Authority Pension Fund Forum (LAPFF) is a voluntary association of local authority pension funds and membership is open to all Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) funds. The Forum

- Seeks to protect and enhance the value of members shareholdings by optimising LA pension funds’ influence as shareholders on ESG (environmental, social and governance issues) and thereby to promote Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and high standards of Corporate Governance
- Facilitates commissioning of research and policy analysis of issues more effectively than individual members
- Provides a forum for consultation on shareholder initiatives
- Provides a forum for information exchange and discussion about any investment issues
- Provides a forum to consider issues of common interest to all pension fund administrators and trustees.

3.2 The Forum has 4 business meetings a year plus an AGM and an annual conference with each member fund having one vote at meetings. LAPFF contracts PIRC (Pensions Investment Research Consultants) to supply technical research, advice and assistance on all matters relating to best practice in corporate governance and corporate social responsibility. It also employs a part-time Forum Officer (a former City/County Treasurer) to assist with the promotion of its activities.

3.3 The Forum currently has 66 local authority members including 25 English counties; 20 London authorities (including the City of London Corporation); 7 English metropolitan/ unitary authorities; **7 Welsh authorities**; 4 Scottish authorities; NILGOSC (the Northern Ireland Local Government Officers Superannuation Committee) and 2 passenger transport authorities. LAPFF member funds now control assets of around £165 billion. The annual cost of membership would be the annual subscription of £8,460 or £8,250 pa fixed for a three year membership. (This subscription has been held at the same level for the past six years as more funds have joined the Forum – LAPFF membership has increased by 160% since 2003. In view of the current date there would be no subscription payable for 2015/16 but the fund would secure all the benefits of membership immediately including the right to attend and vote at the next quarterly LAPFF meeting and AGM in January.

3.4 Benefits of membership would include:-

- Supporting shareholder value through engagement and activism on issues relating to ESG issues.
- Strength in numbers when engaging with companies at the highest level (i.e. Chairperson or other senior board members)
- Collective and more cost effective approach to research
- Saving of officer time and cost in researching issues
- Sharing research costs with 66 Forum member funds
- Providing a Forum for discussion of any related local government pension fund issue
- Quarterly newsletter
- Opportunities for networking with colleagues from all parts of UK and all types of authority
- Facilitating collaboration with other major institutional investor groups both nationally and internationally.
- The Forum's aims are to provide a customised, cost effective vehicle for local authority pension funds to make their compliance with Myners principle 5 (responsible ownership) more effective.

3.5 Membership of LAPFF would further demonstrate the Fund's commitment to socially responsible investment and the promotion of high standards of corporate social responsibility (on environmental, social and governance issues etc) and re-enforce our aim to maximise shareholder value.

## **5 Financial Implications**

5.1 The cost of membership is currently £8,460 p.a.

## **6 Legal Implications**

6.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report

## **7 Equality Impact Implications**

7.1 An EIA Screening has been undertaken and no E&EIs have been identified

**Background Papers:** None.

**Appendices:** None.

## Report of the Section 151 Officer

Pension Fund Committee – 17 December 2015

### CONSULTATION ON INVESTMENT REGULATIONS

<b>Purpose:</b>	To formulate a response to consultation on Investment Regulations
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	None
<b>Reason for Decision:</b>	To assist DCLG to ensure an appropriate set of Investment Regulations are implemented .
<b>Consultation:</b>	Legal, Finance & Delivery and Access to Services.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	It is recommended that:  1) The Section 151 Officer is delegated to formulate the response having consulted with LGPS colleagues in Wales via the Society of Welsh Treasurers and circulates the response to Pension Fund Committee members for information prior to submission
<b>Report Author:</b>	Jeff Dong
<b>Finance Officer:</b>	Mike Hawes
<b>Legal Officer:</b>	Stephanie Williams
<b>Access to Services Officer:</b>	Sherill Hopkins

#### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Government is seeking consultation on planned reforms to the Investment Regulation governing the LGPS in England and Wales
- 1.2 This consultation proposes to revoke and replace the Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2009 with the draft regulations described in this paper. There are two main areas of reform:
  - A package of reforms that propose to remove some of the existing prescribed means of securing a diversified investment strategy and instead place the onus on authorities to determine the balance of their investments and take account of risk.
  - The introduction of safeguards to ensure that the more flexible legislation proposed is used appropriately and that the guidance on pooling assets is adhered to. This includes a suggested

power to allow the Secretary of State to intervene in the investment function of an administering authority when necessary

Views are sought on:

- Whether the proposed revisions to the investment regulations will give authorities the flexibility to determine a suitable investment strategy that appropriately takes account of risk.
- Whether the proposals to introduce the power of intervention as a safeguard will enable the Secretary of State to intervene, when appropriate, to ensure that authorities take advantage of the benefits of scale offered by pooling and deliver investment strategies that adhere to regulation and guidance.

Attached at Appendix 1 is a copy of the Consultation. Consultation responses are required by 19<sup>th</sup> February 2016

## **2 Recommendation**

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Section 151 Officer is delegated to formulate the response having consulted with LGPS colleagues in Wales via the Society of Welsh Treasurers and circulates to Pension Fund Committee members for information prior to submission

## **3 Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications arising out

## **4 Legal Implications**

- 4.1 There are no legal implications arising out of this report

## **5 Equality Impact Implications**

- 5.1 An EIA Screening has been undertaken and no E&EIs have been identified

**Background Papers:** None.

**Appendices:** Appendix 1- Consultation.



Department for  
Communities and  
Local Government

# Local Government Pension Scheme: Revoking and replacing the Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2009

Consultation



© Crown copyright, 2015

*Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.*

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

This document/publication is also available on our website at [www.gov.uk/dclg](http://www.gov.uk/dclg)

If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, complete the form at <http://forms.communities.gov.uk/> or write to us at:

Department for Communities and Local Government  
Fry Building  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF  
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/CommunitiesUK>

November 2015

ISBN: 978-1-4098-4731-1



# Contents

<b>About this consultation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The consultation process and how to respond</b>	<b>5</b>
Scope of the consultation	5
Basic Information	6
Background	7
<b>Introduction and Background</b>	<b>9</b>
Introduction	9
Background	9
<b>Getting to this stage</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Proposal 1: Adopting a local approach to investment</b>	<b>16</b>
Deregulating and adopting a local approach to investment	16
Investment strategy statement	17
Non-financial factors	18
Investment	18
<b>Proposal 2: Introducing a safeguard - Secretary of State power of intervention</b>	<b>20</b>
Summary of the proposal	20
<b>Summary of the draft regulations</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex A: Members of the Investment Regulation Review Group</b>	<b>26</b>

# About this consultation

This consultation document and consultation process have been planned to adhere to the Consultation Principles issued by the Cabinet Office.

Representative groups are asked to give a summary of the people and organisations they represent, and where relevant who else they have consulted in reaching their conclusions when they respond.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department for Communities and Local Government will process your personal data in accordance with DPA and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Individual responses will not be acknowledged unless specifically requested.

Your opinions are valuable to us. Thank you for taking the time to read this document and respond.

Are you satisfied that this consultation has followed the Consultation Principles? If not or you have any other observations about how we can improve the process please contact DCLG Consultation Co-ordinator.

Department for Communities and Local Government  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF

or by e-mail to: [consultationcoordinator@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:consultationcoordinator@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

# The consultation process and how to respond

## Scope of the consultation

<p><b>Topic of this consultation:</b></p>	<p>This consultation proposes to revoke and replace the Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2009 with the draft regulations described in this paper. There are two main areas of reform:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A package of reforms that propose to remove some of the existing prescribed means of securing a diversified investment strategy and instead place the onus on authorities to determine the balance of their investments and take account of risk.</li> <li>2. The introduction of safeguards to ensure that the more flexible legislation proposed is used appropriately and that the guidance on pooling assets is adhered to. This includes a suggested power to allow the Secretary of State to intervene in the investment function of an administering authority when necessary.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Scope of this consultation:</b></p>	<p>Views are sought on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether the proposed revisions to the investment regulations will give authorities the flexibility to determine a suitable investment strategy that appropriately takes account of risk.</li> <li>2. Whether the proposals to introduce the power of intervention as a safeguard will enable the Secretary of State to intervene, when appropriate, to ensure that authorities take advantage of the benefits of scale offered by pooling and deliver investment strategies that adhere to regulation and guidance.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Geographical scope:</b></p>	<p>This consultation applies to England and Wales.</p>
<p><b>Impact Assessment:</b></p>	<p>The proposed interventions affect the investment of assets by local government pension scheme administering authorities. These authorities are all public sector organisations, so no impact assessment is required.</p>

## Basic Information

<b>To:</b>	The consultation is aimed at all parties with an interest in the Local Government Pension Scheme (the Scheme) and in particular those listed on the Government's website: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-pension-scheme-regulations-information-on-who-should-be-consulted">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-pension-scheme-regulations-information-on-who-should-be-consulted</a>
<b>Body/bodies responsible for the consultation:</b>	Secretary of State, Department for Communities and Local Government.  The consultation will be administered by the Workforce, Pay and Pensions Division.
<b>Duration:</b>	25 November 2015 to 19 February 2016
<b>Enquiries:</b>	Enquires should be sent to Victoria Edwards. Please email <a href="mailto:LGPSReform@communities.gsi.gov.uk">LGPSReform@communities.gsi.gov.uk</a> or call 0303 444 4057.
<b>How to respond:</b>	Responses to this consultation should be submitted to <a href="mailto:LGPSReform@communities.gsi.gov.uk">LGPSReform@communities.gsi.gov.uk</a> by <b>19 February 2016</b> .  Electronic responses are preferred. However, you can also write to:  LGPS Reform Department for Communities and Local Government 2/SE Quarter, Fry Building 2 Marsham Street London SW1P 4DF
<b>Additional ways to become involved:</b>	If you would like to discuss the proposals, please email <a href="mailto:LGPSReform@communities.gsi.gov.uk">LGPSReform@communities.gsi.gov.uk</a>
<b>After the consultation:</b>	All consultation responses will be reviewed and analysed. A Government response will then be published within three months, and subject to the outcome of this consultation, the resulting regulations laid in Parliament.
<b>Compatibility with the Consultation Principles:</b>	This consultation has been drafted in accordance with the Consultation Principles.

## Background

<p><b>Getting to this stage:</b></p>	<p>The proposals in this consultation are the culmination of work looking into Local Government Pension Scheme investments that began in early 2013. It has been developed in response to the May 2014 consultation, <i>Opportunities for collaboration, cost savings and efficiencies</i>, which considered whether savings might be delivered through collective investment and greater use of passive fund management. A copy of the consultation and the Government's response is available on the Government's website: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-government-pension-scheme-opportunities-for-collaboration-cost-savings-and-efficiencies">https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-government-pension-scheme-opportunities-for-collaboration-cost-savings-and-efficiencies</a>.</p> <p>The consultation responses called for a voluntary approach to reform, opposing the introduction of a single, national model of pooling. The Government has therefore invited authorities to develop their own proposals for pooling, subject to common criteria and guidance. The criteria for reform have been developed using the consultation responses and following a series of workshops and conversations with authorities and the fund management industry since the July Budget 2015.</p> <p>Some respondents to the May 2014 consultation also suggested that amendments were required to the investment regulations in order to facilitate greater investment in pooled vehicles. In addition, prior to that consultation, authorities and the fund management industry had called for wider reform. A small working group, whose participants are listed in Annex A, was established to look at whether the approach to risk management and diversification in the existing regulations was still appropriate. They recommended moving towards the "prudential person" approach that governs trust based pension schemes. The group also sought clarity as to whether certain types of investment were possible, such as the use of derivatives in risk management. The work of that group has informed the development of this consultation.</p> <p>In relaxing the regulatory framework for scheme investments, it is important to introduce safeguards to ensure that the less prescriptive approach is used appropriately. The July Budget 2015 announcement also indicated that measures should be introduced to ensure that those authorities who do not bring forward ambitious proposals for pooling, in keeping with the criteria, should be required to pool. This consultation therefore sets out how the Secretary of State might intervene to ensure that authorities take advantage of the benefits of scale offered by pooling and deliver investment strategies that adhere to regulation and guidance.</p>
--------------------------------------	--

<p><b>Previous engagement:</b></p>	<p>The proposed changes in this consultation are the result of a programme of engagement that began in summer 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Round table event, 16 May 2013. Representatives of administering authorities, employers, trade unions, the actuarial profession and academia discussed the potential for increased cooperation within the Scheme.</li> <li>• A call for evidence, run with the Local Government Association, June to September 2013. This gave anyone with an interest in the Scheme the opportunity to inform the Government's thinking on potential structural reform. The results were shared with the Shadow Scheme Advisory Board, which provided the Minister for Local Government with their analysis of the responses.</li> <li>• Consultation, <i>Opportunities for collaboration, cost savings and efficiencies</i>, May to June 2014. The consultation set out how savings of £470-660m a year could be achieved by collective investment and greater use of passive fund management. It also sought views as to how these reforms might best be implemented. The Government's response is available online:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-government-pension-scheme-opportunities-for-collaboration-cost-savings-and-efficiencies">https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-government-pension-scheme-opportunities-for-collaboration-cost-savings-and-efficiencies</a>.</li> <li>• Informal engagement, July to November, 2015. Since the July Budget 2015 announcement, officials have attended over 25 workshops and bi-lateral meetings with administering authorities and the fund management industry. These discussions have been used to develop the criteria for reform and inform how the proposed power of the Secretary of State to intervene might work.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the Investment Regulation Review Group was formed in 2012 to consider potential amendments to the investment regulations. The group included representatives from administering authorities, actuarial firms, pension lawyers and the fund management industry. An initial proposal for reform was prepared that has also informed the development of the draft regulations that are the subject of this consultation.</p>
------------------------------------	---

# Introduction and Background

## Introduction

1.1 In May 2014 the Government published a consultation which set out how savings of up to £660m a year might be achieved through greater use of passive management and pooled investment. Investing collectively can help authorities to drive down costs and access the benefits of scale, and also enables them to develop the capacity and capability to invest more cost effectively in illiquid asset classes such as infrastructure. The Government has therefore invited authorities to develop ambitious proposals for pooling assets that meet published criteria. More information about the criteria and process of reform is available on the Government's website:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-pension-scheme-investment-reform-criteria-and-guidance>.

1.2 This consultation complements that invitation, recognising that the existing regulations place restrictions on certain investments that may constrain authorities considering how best to pool their assets. It therefore proposes to move to a prudential approach to securing a diversified investment strategy that appropriately takes account of risk. In so doing, and to ensure that authorities take advantage of the benefits of scale, the Government proposes to introduce a power to allow the Secretary of State to intervene to ensure that authorities take advantage of the benefits of scale offered by pooling and deliver investment strategies that adhere to regulation and guidance.

1.3 This paper sets out the purpose and rationale of the suggested amendments to the investment regulations, and seeks views as to whether the proposed approach would best deliver those stated aims.

## Background

1.4 With assets of £178bn at its last valuation on 31 March 2013, the Local Government Pension Scheme is one of the largest funded pension schemes in Europe. Several thousand employers participate in the Scheme, which has a total of 4.68 million active, deferred and pensioner members.<sup>1</sup> The Department for Communities and Local Government is responsible for the regulatory framework governing the Scheme in England and Wales.

1.5 The Scheme is managed through 90 administering authorities which broadly correspond to the county councils following the 1974 local government reorganisation as well as each of the 33 London boroughs. In most cases, the administering authorities are upper tier local authorities such as county or unitary councils, but there are also some authorities established specifically to manage their pension liabilities, for example the London Pension Fund Authority and the Environment Agency Pension Fund. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Scheme asset value and membership figures taken from Department for Communities and Local Government statistical data set - Local government pension scheme funds summary data: 2012 to 2013 <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/local-government-pension-scheme-funds-summary-data-2012-to-2013>

administering authorities have individual governance and working arrangements. Each has its own funding level, cash-flow and balance of active, deferred and pensioner members. Authorities take these circumstances into account when preparing their investment strategies, which are normally agreed by the councillors on each authority's pension committee. The Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2009 set the legal framework for the development of these investment strategies and the investments carried out by administering authorities. This consultation proposes that the Government revokes and replaces those regulations.

1.6 Under the Public Service Pensions Act 2013, there is a requirement for a national scheme advisory board, as well as a local board for each of the 90 funds. In 2013, Scheme employers and the trade unions established a shadow board, which has been considering a number of issues connected with the Scheme, including its efficient management and administration. Appointments have now been made to the national scheme advisory board and the Chair is expected to be appointed shortly.



# Getting to this stage

- 2.1 The consultation is formed of two main proposals:
1. A package of reforms that propose to remove some the existing prescribed means of securing a diversified investment strategy and instead place the onus on authorities to determine the balance of their investments and take account of risk. The changes proposed would move towards the “prudent person” approach to investment that applies to trust based pension schemes.
  2. The introduction of safeguards to ensure that the more flexible legislation proposed is used appropriately, and that the guidance on pooling assets is adhered to, including a power to allow the Secretary of State to intervene in the investment function of an administering authority when necessary.

## Pooling assets to deliver the benefits of scale

2.2 The proposals set out in this consultation are the culmination of work carried out over the last two and a half years to explore how to reform the way the Scheme makes its investments in order to achieve the benefits of scale and drive efficiencies.

2.3 In summer 2013, the coalition government launched a call for evidence to explore how the Scheme might be made more sustainable and affordable in the long term. 133 responses were received, many of which took the opportunity to discuss whether collective investment and greater collaboration might deliver savings for the Scheme.

2.4 Following the call for evidence, the Minister for the Cabinet Office and Minister for Local Government commissioned a cost-benefits analysis from Hymans Robertson on a range of proposals. Hymans Robertson’s report explored three areas:

- **The cost of investment:** Many of the costs associated with investment are not transparent and so difficult to capture. The costs of managing and administering the Scheme were reported as being £536 million in 2012-13.<sup>2</sup> However, Hymans Robertson found that the actual cost was likely to be rather higher; with investment costs alone estimated as in excess of £790 million a year.<sup>3</sup>
- **Approaches to collaboration:** Hymans Robertson was asked to examine the costs and benefits of three options for reform: merging the authorities into 5-10 funds, creating 5-10 collective investment vehicles, or establishing just 1-2 collective investment vehicles. They found that the net present value of savings over ten years was highest with a small number of vehicles, while merging funds offered the lowest benefit.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Local government pension scheme funds summary data: 2012 to 2013

<sup>3</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government: Local Government Pension Scheme structure analysis, Hymans Robertson pp. 10-11. <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-government-pension-scheme-opportunities-for-collaboration-cost-savings-and-efficiencies>

<sup>4</sup> Hymans Robertson, p.6

- **The aggregate performance of the scheme:** The report found that the Scheme as a whole had been achieving the market rate of return in each of the main equity markets over the ten years to March 2013. If the Scheme's investments in bonds and equities had been managed passively instead of actively, authorities could have saved at least £230m a year in management fees without affecting overall investment returns.<sup>5</sup>

2.5 Drawing on the Hymans Robertson report and the call for evidence, the coalition government published a consultation in May 2014 entitled *Opportunities for collaboration, cost savings and efficiencies*. This set out how the Scheme could save up to £660m a year by using collective investment vehicles and making greater use of passive management for listed assets like bonds and equities. The consultation sought views on these proposals, and how they might be most effectively implemented. Respondents were broadly in favour of pooling assets, but felt that any reform should be voluntary and led by administering authorities. While many recognised a role for passive management in an investment strategy, most also felt that some active management should be retained.

2.6 At the July Budget 2015, Ministers having reflected on the consultation responses, the Chancellor announced the Government's intention to invite administering authorities to bring forward proposals for pooling local government pension scheme investments. Authorities' proposals would be assessed against published criteria, designed to encourage ambition in the pursuit of efficiencies and the benefits of scale. These criteria have now been published and are available online at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-pension-scheme-investment-reform-criteria-and-guidance>.

## Updating the investment regulations

2.7 When considering the implications of creating asset pools amongst authorities, some respondents to the May 2014 consultation took the opportunity to call for a review of the existing investment regulations. At their introduction in 2009, the regulations sought to ensure that authorities established a balanced and diversified portfolio by placing restrictions on the proportion of their assets that could be invested in different vehicles. For example, deposits with a single bank, institution or person, (other than the National Savings Bank), were restricted to 10% of an authority's assets. These restrictions have been kept under regular review and have been subject to change following representations from the investment sector and pension fund authorities.

2.8 Some respondents to the consultation suggested that the current limits on investments would prevent authorities from making meaningful allocations to a collective investment vehicle, one of the leading options for asset pooling, as the allocation to particular types of vehicle is capped at 35%. Participants in the London Boroughs' collective investment vehicle and the collaboration between the London Pension Fund Authority and Lancashire County Council also wrote to the Department encouraging reform in this area.

---

<sup>5</sup> Hymans Robertson, p.12

2.9 While the proposals for collective investment in the May 2014 consultation prompted encouragement to review the investment regulations, the idea of reform was not new. In 2012, following representations from the investment sector, the Government formed a small working group to revisit and examine the investment regulations with input from actuaries, fund managers and administering authorities. This group, whose membership is set out in Annex A, recommended that a more permissive approach should be taken to the legislative framework, similar to the “prudent person” model that applies to trust based pension schemes. This approach places the onus on the pension fund to determine a suitable balance of investments to meet its liabilities, which are clearly articulated in an investment strategy. The group also felt that the existing regulations introduced uncertainty for some authorities as to what constituted a permitted investment, as some asset classes were explicitly referenced but others were not. In particular, concern has been expressed as to whether or not pension fund authorities are permitted to invest in vehicles such as derivatives, hedge funds and forward currency contracts.

2.10 The proposals in this consultation paper therefore seek to address these issues, placing the onus on authorities to determine a diversified investment strategy that appropriately takes risk into account.

2.11 However, in relaxing the regulatory framework for scheme investments, it is also important to introduce safeguards to ensure that the less prescriptive approach proposed is used appropriately. Similarly, the July Budget 2015 announcement stated that draft regulations would be introduced to require an authority to pool its investments if it did not bring forward ambitious proposals that met the Government’s criteria. This consultation therefore sets out how the Secretary of State might intervene to ensure that authorities take advantage of the benefits of scale offered by pooling and deliver investment strategies that adhere to regulation and guidance.

## Response to the Law Commission’s Review of Fiduciary Duty

2.12 The Kay Review on Fiduciary Duty published its final report in July 2012. In addition to making a number of recommendations to address the excessive focus on short-term performance in equity investment markets, it recommended that the Government ask the Law Commission to review the fiduciary duties of investment intermediaries amid concerns that these common law duties were being interpreted by some pension schemes as a requirement to focus solely on short-term financial returns.

2.13 In their report, published in July 2014, the Law Commission called on the Department to review:

- Whether the Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2009 should transpose article 18(1) of the Institutions for Occupational Retirement Provision (IORP) Directive, and
- Those aspects of Regulation 9 of the 2009 Regulations which require investment managers to be appointed on a short-term basis and reviewed every three months.

2.14 These recommendations were supported by the Government's progress report on the implementation of the Kay Review published in October 2014 by the Department for Business Innovation and Skills.

2.15 Article 18(1) of the IORP Directive requires assets to be invested in the best interests of members and beneficiaries and, in the event of a conflict of interest, in the sole interests of members and beneficiaries.

2.16 Regulation 4 of The Occupational Pension Schemes (Investment) Regulations 2005 (SI 2005 No 3378) transposed Article 18(1):

"4. (1) The trustees of a trust scheme must exercise their powers of investment, and any fund manager to whom any discretion has been delegated under section 34 of the 1995 Act (power of investment and delegation) must exercise the discretion, in accordance with the following provisions of this regulation

(2) The assets must be invested:

- (a) In the best interests of members and beneficiaries; and
- (b) In the case of a potential conflict of interest, in the sole interest of members and beneficiaries."

2.17 The Local Government Pension Scheme is a statutory scheme made under section 1 of the Public Service Pensions Act 2013 and previously under The Superannuation Act 1972. It is not subject to trust law and those responsible for making investment decisions in the Scheme are not therefore required to comply with Regulation 4 of the 2005 Regulations.

2.18 However, this does nothing to change the general legal principles governing the administration of Scheme investments and how those responsible for such decisions should exercise their duties and powers under the Scheme's investment regulations.

2.19 In a circular issued by the then Department of the Environment in 1983 (No 24), the Secretary of State took the view that administering authorities should pay due regard to the principle contained in the case of *Roberts v Hopwood* [1925] A.C. 578 p. 595:

"A body charged with the administration for definite purposes of funds contributed in whole or in part by persons other than members of that body owes, in my view, a duty to those latter persons to conduct that administration in a fairly business-like manner with reasonable care, skill and caution, and with a due and alert regard to the interest of those contributors who are not members of the body. Towards these latter persons, the body stands somewhat in the position of trustees or managers of the property of others."

2.20 Those in local government responsible for making investment decisions must also act in accordance with ordinary public law principles, in particular, the ordinary public law principles of reasonableness. They risk challenge if a decision they make is so unreasonable that no reasonable person acting reasonably could have made it.

2.21 Having considered fully the recommendation made by the Kay Review and supported by both the Law Commission and the Government, Ministers are satisfied that the Scheme is consistent with the national legislative framework governing the duties placed on those responsible for making investment decisions. The position at common law

is also indistinguishable from that produced by the 2005 Regulations applicable in respect of trust-based schemes.

2.22 We do, however, propose to remove the requirement for the performance of investment managers to be reviewed once every three months from the regulations.

# Proposal 1: Adopting a local approach to investment

## Deregulating and adopting a local approach to investment

3.1 In developing these draft regulations, the Government has sought, where appropriate, to deregulate and simplify the regulations that have governed the management and investment of funds since 2009. Some of the existing provisions have not been carried forward into the draft 2016 Regulations in the expectation that they would be effectively maintained by general law provisions and so specific regulation is no longer needed. For example, those making investment decisions are still required to act prudently, and there remains a statutory requirement to take and act on proper advice. Some of the provisions in the 2009 Regulations which have not been carried forward on this basis include:

- Stock lending arrangements under Regulation 3(8) and (9) of the 2009 regulations. The view is taken that the definition of “investment” in draft Regulation 3 is sufficient given that a stock lending arrangement can only be used if it falls within the ordinary meaning of an “investment”.
- Regulation 8(5) of the 2009 regulations ensures that funds are managed by an adequate number of investment managers and that, where there is more than one investment manager, the value of the fund money managed by them is not disproportionate. Here, the view is taken that administering authorities should be responsible for managing their own affairs and making decisions of this kind based on prudent and proper advice.
- There are many provisions in the 2009 Regulations which impose conditions on the choice and terms of appointments of investment managers. Since the activities of investment managers are governed by the contracts under which they are appointed, the view is taken that making similar provision in the 2016 Regulations would be unnecessary duplication. Examples include the requirement for investment managers to comply with an administering authority’s instructions and the power to terminate the appointment by not more than one month’s notice.
- Regulation 12(3) of the 2009 Regulations requires administering authorities to state the extent to which they comply with guidance given by the Secretary of State on the Myners principles for investment decision making. As part of the wider deregulation, the draft regulations make no provision to report against these principles, although authorities should still have regard to the guidance.

3.2 These examples of deregulation are for illustrative purposes only. It is not an exhaustive list of provisions which the Government proposes to remove. Consultees are asked to look carefully at the full extent of deregulation and comment on any particular case that raises concerns about the impact such an omission might have on the effective management and investment of funds.

## Investment strategy statement

3.3 As part of this deregulation, the draft regulations also propose to remove the existing schedule of limitations on investments. Instead authorities will be expected to take a prudential approach, demonstrating that they have given consideration to the suitability of different types of investment, have ensured an appropriately diverse portfolio of assets and have ensured an appropriate approach to managing risk.

3.4 Key to this will be the investment strategy statement, which authorities will be required to prepare, having taken proper advice, and publish. The statement must cover:

- A requirement to use a wide variety of investments.
- The authority's assessment of the suitability of particular investments and types of investments.
- The authority's approach to risk, including how it will be measured and managed.
- The authority's approach to collaborative investment, including the use of collective investment vehicles and shared services.
- The authority's environmental, social and corporate governance policy.
- The authority's policy on the exercise of rights, including voting rights, attached to its investments.

### Transitional arrangements

3.5 Draft regulation seven proposes to require authorities to publish an investment strategy statement no later than six months after the regulations come into force (this is currently drafted as 1 October 2016, in case the draft regulations come into effect on 1 April 2016). However, the draft regulations would also revoke the existing 2009 Regulations when they come into effect. Transitional arrangements are therefore required to ensure that an authority's investments and investment strategy are regulated between the draft regulations coming into effect and the publication of an authority's new investment strategy statement. The transitional arrangements proposed in draft regulation 12 would mean that the following regulations in the 2009 Regulations would remain in place until the authority publishes an investment strategy or six months lapses from the date that the regulations come into effect:

- 11 (investment policy and investment of pension fund money)
- 14 (restrictions on investments)
- 15 (requirements for increased limits)
- Schedule 1 (table of limits on investments)

### Statement of Investment Principles

3.6 We do not propose to carry forward the existing requirement under regulation 12 of the 2009 Regulations to maintain a Statement of Investment Principles. However, the main elements, such as risk, diversification, corporate governance and suitability, will instead be carried forward as part of the reporting requirements of the new investment strategy

statement. Administering authorities will still be required to maintain their funding strategy statements under Regulation 58 of the 2013 regulations.

## Non-financial factors

3.7 The Secretary of State has made clear that using pensions and procurement policies to pursue boycotts, divestments and sanctions against foreign nations and the UK defence industry are inappropriate, other than where formal legal sanctions, embargoes and restrictions have been put in place by the Government. The Secretary of State has said, “Divisive policies undermine good community relations, and harm the economic security of families by pushing up council tax. We need to challenge and prevent the politics of division.”

3.8 The Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2009 already require administering authorities to publish and follow a statement of investment principles, which must comply with guidance issued by the Secretary of State. The draft replacement Regulations include provision for administering authorities to publish their policies on the extent to which environmental, social and corporate governance matters are taken into account in the selection, retention and realisation of investments. Guidance on how these policies should reflect foreign policy and related issues will be published ahead of the new Regulations coming into force. This will make clear to authorities that in formulating these policies their predominant concern should be the pursuit of a financial return on their investments, including over the longer term, and that, reflecting the position set out in the paragraph above, they should not pursue policies which run contrary to UK foreign policy.

## Investment

3.9 A few definitions and some aspects of regulation 3, which describes what constitutes an investment for the purpose of these regulations, have been updated to take account of changing terminology and technical changes since the regulations were last issued in 2009. For example, the reference to the London International Financial Futures Exchange (LIFFE) has been removed as it now operates as a clearing house and so is covered by the approved stock exchange definition.

3.10 Some additional information has been included to make clear that certain investments, such as derivatives, may be used where appropriate. The Government expects that having considered the appropriateness of an investment in their investment strategy statement, authorities would only use derivatives as a means of managing risk, and so has not explicitly stated that this should be the case.

## Questions

1. Does the proposed deregulation achieve the intended policy aim of removing any unnecessary regulation while still ensuring that authorities' investments are made prudently and having taken advice?
2. Are there any specific issues that should be reinstated? Please explain why.



3. Is six months the appropriate period for the transitional arrangements to remain in place?
4. Should the regulation be explicit that derivatives should only be used as a risk management tool? Are there any other circumstances in which the use of derivatives would be appropriate?

# Proposal 2: Introducing a safeguard - Secretary of State power of intervention

## Summary of the proposal

4.1 The first part of this consultation lifts some of the existing restrictions on administering authorities' investments in order to make it easier for them to pool their investments and access the benefits of scale. To ensure that this new flexibility is used appropriately, the consultation also proposes to introduce a power to intervene in the investment function of an administering authority if the Secretary of State believes that it has not had regard to guidance and regulations. The consultation sets out the evidence that the Secretary of State may draw on before deciding to intervene, and makes clear that any direction will need to be proportionate. The power proposed in this consultation is intended to allow the Secretary of State to act if best practice or regulation is being ignored, which will help to ensure that authorities continue to pursue more efficient means of investment.

4.2 The July Budget 2015 announcement set out the Government's intention to introduce "backstop" legislation to require those authorities who do not bring forward sufficiently ambitious plans to pool their investments. It also explained that authorities' proposals would need to meet common criteria, which have been published with draft guidance alongside this consultation. The draft power to intervene discussed in this paper could be used to address authorities that do not bring forward proposals for pooling their assets in line with the published criteria and guidance. The guidance will be kept under review, and will be revised as circumstances change and authorities' asset pools evolve.

4.3 The following sections set out the process for intervention described in draft regulation 8.

## Determining to intervene

4.4 The draft regulations propose to give the Secretary of State the power to intervene in the investment function an administering authority, if the Secretary of State has determined that the administering authority has failed to have regard to the regulations governing their investments or guidance issued under draft regulation 7(1). In reaching that conclusion, the Secretary of State will consider the available evidence, which might include:

- Evidence that an administering authority is ignoring information on best practice, for example, by not responding to advice provided by the scheme advisory board to local pension boards.
- Evidence that an administering authority is not following the investment regulations or has not had regard to guidance published by the Secretary of State under draft Regulation 7 (1). For example, this might include failing to participate in one of the large asset pools described in the existing draft guidance, or proposing a pooling arrangement that does not adhere to the criteria and guidance.

- Evidence that an administering authority is carrying out another pension-related function poorly, such as an unsatisfactory report under section 13(4) of the Public Service Pensions Act 2013, or another periodic reporting mechanism. (Section 13(4) of the 2013 Act requires a person appointed by the Secretary of State to report on whether the actuarial valuation of a fund has been carried out in accordance with Scheme regulations, in a way that is consistent with other authorities' valuations, and so that employer contribution rates are set to ensure the solvency and long term cost efficiency of the fund.)

4.5 If the Secretary of State has some indication to suggest that intervention might be necessary, the draft regulations propose that he may order a further investigation to provide him with the analysis required to make a decision. If additional evidence is sought, draft regulation 8(5) would allow the Secretary of State to carry out such inquiries as he considers appropriate, including seeking advice from external experts if needed. In this circumstance, the administering authority would be obliged to provide any data that was deemed necessary to determine whether intervention is required. The authority would also be invited to participate in the review and would have the opportunity to present evidence in support of its existing or proposed investment strategy.

## The process of intervention

4.6 If the Secretary of State is satisfied that an intervention is required, he would then need to determine the appropriate extent of intervention in the authority's investment function. The draft regulations propose to allow the Secretary of State to draw on external advice to determine what the specific intervention should be if necessary.

4.7 Draft regulation 8(2) describes the interventions that the Secretary of State may make. The power has been left intentionally broad to ensure that a tailored and measured course of action is applied, based on the circumstances of each case. For example, in some cases it may be appropriate to apply the intervention just to certain parts of an investment strategy, whereas in particularly concerning cases, more substantial action might be required. The proposed intervention might include, but is not limited to:

- Requiring an administering authority to develop a new investment strategy statement that follows guidance published under draft Regulation 7(1).
- Directing an administering authority to invest all or a portion of its assets in a particular way that more closely adheres to the criteria and guidance, for instance through a pooled vehicle.
- Requiring that the investment functions of the administering authority are exercised by the Secretary of State or his nominee.
- Directing the implementation of the investment strategy of the administering authority to be undertaken by another body.

4.8 The Secretary of State will write to the authority outlining the proposed intervention. As a minimum, this proposal will include:

- A detailed explanation of why the Secretary of State is intervening and the evidence used to arrive at their determination.

- A clear description of the proposed intervention and how it will be implemented and monitored.
- The timetable for the intervention, including the period of time until the intervention is formally reviewed.
- The circumstances under which the intervention might be lifted prior to review.

4.9 The authority will then be given time to consider the proposal and present its argument for any changes that it thinks should be made. If, at the end of that period an intervention is issued, any resulting costs, charges and expenses incurred in administering the fund would be met by the pension fund assets.

## Review

4.10 As set out above, each intervention will be subject to a formal review period which will be set by the Secretary of State but may coincide with other cyclical events such as the preparation of an annual report or a triennial valuation. At the end of that period, progress will be assessed and the Secretary of State will decide whether to end, modify or maintain the current terms of the intervention, and will notify the authority of the outcome. The authority will also have the opportunity to make representations to the Secretary of State if it feels a different course of action should be followed. Throughout this period of intervention, the authority will be supported to improve its investment function, so that it is well placed to bring the intervention to an end at the first opportunity.

4.11 The Secretary of State's direction will include details about what is required of the authority in order to end the intervention, and how progress will be measured. Progress could, for example, be measured by creating a set of performance indicators to be monitored on an ongoing basis by Government officials, the local pension board, the scheme advisory board, or an independent body. A regime of regular formal reports to the Secretary of State could also be required.

4.12 The draft regulations also allow the Secretary of State to determine that sufficient improvement has been made to end the intervention before the review date. The administering authority may also make representations to the Secretary of State before that date, if it has clear evidence that the prescribed action is no longer appropriate.

## Questions

5. Are there any other sources of evidence that the Secretary of State might draw on to establish whether an intervention is required?
6. Does the intervention allow authorities sufficient scope and time to present evidence in favour of their existing arrangements when either determining an intervention in the first place, or reviewing whether one should remain in place?
7. Does the proposed approach allow the Secretary of State sufficient flexibility to ensure that he is able to introduce a proportionate intervention?

8. Do the proposals meet the objectives of the policy, which are to allow the Secretary of State to make a proportionate intervention in the investment function of an administering authority if it has not had regard to best practice, guidance or regulation?

# Summary of the draft regulations

## **(1) Citation, commencement and extent**

This details the citation and scope of the draft regulations, and gives the date at which they will come into force.

## **(2) Interpretation**

These provisions define terms used in the draft regulations with reference to legislation, and cite the legislation that gives administering authorities the powers that may be impacted by the draft regulations.

## **(3) Investment**

This draft regulation defines what is considered an investment for the purposes of the regulations. This definition includes futures, options, derivatives, limited partnerships and some types of insurance contracts. It also defines who a person with whom a contract of insurance can be entered into is.

## **(4) Management of a pension fund**

This draft regulation lists the monies that an administering authority must credit to its pension fund, including employer and employee contributions, interest, and investment capital and income. It also sets out the administering authority's responsibility to pay benefits entitled to members, and states that, except where prohibited by other regulations, costs of administering the fund can be paid by the fund.

## **(5) Restriction on power to borrow**

This proposed regulation outlines the limited circumstances under which an administering authority can borrow money that the pension fund is liable to repay.

## **(6) Separate bank account**

The draft regulation states that an administering authority must deposit all pension fund monies in a separate account, and lists those institutions that can act as a deposit taker. It also states that the deposit taker cannot use pension fund account to set-off any other account held by the administering authority or a connected party.

## **(7) Investment strategy statement**

This draft regulation places an obligation on the administering authority to consult on and publish an investment strategy statement, which must be in accordance with guidance from the Secretary of State. The statement should demonstrate that investments will be suitably diversified, and it should outline the administering authority's maximum allocations for different asset classes, as well as their approach to risk and responsible investing.

In many respects, the investment strategy statement replaces the list of restrictions given in Schedule 1 of the 2009 Regulations and enables the criteria to be determined at local

level. Schedule 1 of the 2009 Regulations will remain in force until such time that the new investment strategy statements have to be published.

Provision is made for authorities to publish their policy on the extent to which environmental, social and corporate governance factors are taken into account in the selection, retention and realisation of investments.

Separate guidance will be issued by the Secretary of State that will clarify how the Government's recent announcement on boycotts, sanctions and disinvestment will be exercised.

### **(8) Directions by the Secretary of State**

This provision would grant the Secretary of State the power to intervene in the investment function of an administering authority if he is satisfied that the authority is failing to have regard to regulation and guidance. He can also initiate inquiries to determine if an intervention is warranted, and must consult with the authority concerned. Once it is determined that an intervention is needed, the Secretary of State can intervene by directing the authority undertake a broad range of actions to remedy the situation.

### **(9) Investment managers**

This draft regulation details how an administering authority must appoint external investment managers.

### **(10) Investments under section 11(1) of the Trustee Investments Act 1961**

This draft regulation allows administering authorities to invest in Treasury-approved collective investment schemes.

### **(11) Consequential amendments**

This proposed regulation lists the prior regulations that are amended by the draft amendments.

### **(12) Revocations and transitional provisions**

The draft provision lists the regulations that would be revoked if the draft regulations come into effect. It also proposes transitional arrangements to ensure that the existing regulations governing the investment strategy remain in place until a new investment strategy statement is published by an authority under draft regulation seven. These transitional arrangements would apply for up to six months after the draft regulations came into effect.

# Annex A: Members of the Investment Regulation Review Group

Alison Hamilton	Barnet Waddingham
Bob Claxton	Wandsworth Pension Fund
Clifford Sims	Squire Patton Boggs
Dawn Turner	Environment Agency Pension Fund
Geoff Reader	Bedford Pension Fund
Graeme Russell	Greater Gwent Pension Fund
Guy Sears	Investment UK
Loretta Stowers	Greater Manchester Pension Fund
Nick Buckland	Dorset Pension Fund
Nigel Keogh	Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy
Paul Dale	Bromley Borough Council
Peter Morris	Greater Manchester Pension Fund



## Report of the Section 151 Officer

Pension Fund Committee – 17 December 2015

### APPLICATION FOR SECOND ‘ADMITTED BODY’ STATUS OF RATHBONE TRAINING LTD. TO THE CITY & COUNTY OF SWANSEA PENSION FUND

<b>Purpose:</b>	The report requests approval to admit Rathbone Training Ltd as an Admitted Body in the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund for a separate contract.
<b>Reason for Decision:</b>	To ensure compliance with the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 (as amended).
<b>Consultation:</b>	Legal, Finance
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	It is recommended that:  1) The Pension Fund Committee approves a second application of Rathbone Training Ltd. as an admitted body to the City and County of Swansea Pension Fund, from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2015 to 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2019.  2) That the admission is subject to an indemnity provided from City and County of Swansea or an Insurance bond in an approved form with an authorised insurer or relevant institution, being put in place to protect the Pension Fund.
<b>Report Author:</b>	Lynne Miller – Pensions Manager
<b>Finance Officer:</b>	Jeff Dong – Chief Treasury & Technical Officer
<b>Legal Officer:</b>	Stephanie Williams
<b>Access to Services Officer:</b>	N/A

#### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Local Government Pension Regulations 2013 permit an Administering Authority to make an admission agreement with

“a body which provides a public service in the United Kingdom which operates otherwise than for the purposes of gain and has sufficient links with a Scheme employer for the body and the Scheme employer to be regarded as having a community of interest”.

1.2 Approval was given at the previous Pension Fund Committee, on 24 September 2015, to award Rathbone Training Ltd admitted body status for the Government's Work Based Learning 4 in Wales on behalf of staff transferred from Gower College on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015.

1.3 It has subsequently been identified that staff also transferred to Rathbone Training Ltd. from the City and County of Swansea Employment Training Section from the same date.

1.4 The Regulations also specify

"If the admission body is exercising the functions of the Scheme employer in connection with more than one contract or other arrangement ... the administering authority and the admission body shall enter into a separate admission agreement in respect of each contract or arrangement".

Rathbone Training Ltd has therefore applied for a second admitted body status as a closed scheme employer in the City and County of Swansea Pension Fund for the staff transferred from the City and County of Swansea.

## **2.0**

2.1 Rathbone Training Ltd. is a UK-wide youth charity that provides access to training and qualifications to young people.

2.2 They form part of the Newcastle College Group (NCG), one of the largest education, training and employability groups in the UK and report directly to the Chief Executive of NCG. The NCG Board of Governors has the ultimate responsibility for decision-making.

2.3 Rathbone Training Ltd was awarded a contract for the Government's Work Based Learning 4 in Wales from the City and County of Swansea on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015, resulting in staff TUPE transferring to Rathbone Training Ltd with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015.

2.4 As in the case for the staff from Gower College, assumptions had been made by Rathbone Training Ltd. that the staff transferring would be transferred to the Admission Agreement already established between Rathbone Training Ltd. and the London Pension Fund Authority (LPFA); however, as stated above, the LGPS regulations specify that each contract must have a separate admission agreement and therefore the City and County of Swansea has been approached as the Pension Fund the staff contributed to while they were employed directly by the City and County of Swansea.

2.5 If it is agreed for Rathbone Training Ltd. to become an admitted body in the Fund, the Fund's Actuary will be approached to carry out a risk

assessment to assess the liability that would be transferred. They would only be admitted subject to this risk assessment.

- 2.6 Rathbone's would also be required to enter into a bond in order to protect the Fund against any level of risk arising on premature termination of the provision of service or assets by reason of insolvency, winding up, or liquidation of the admission body. Alternatively if this is not provided or is not sufficient City and County of Swansea would need to provide an indemnity to the Pensions Fund.

### **3.0 General Issues**

- 3.1 There are no other variations proposed.

### **4.0 Equality and Engagement Implications**

None.

### **5.0 Financial Implications**

- 5.1 There are no financial implications associated with this report.

### **6.0 Legal Implications**

None.

**Background Papers:** None.

**Appendices:** None.

# Agenda Item 7

## Report of the Section 1.5.1. Officer Pension Fund Committee – 17 December 2015

### APPLICATION FOR 'ADMITTED BODY' STATUS OF WESTWARD ENERGY SERVICES LTD (BY NPT HOMES) TO THE CITY & COUNTY OF SWANSEA PENSION FUND

<b>Purpose:</b>	The report requests approval to admit Westward Energy Services Ltd. as an Admitted Body in the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund.
<b>Reason for Decision:</b>	To ensure compliance with the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 (as amended).
<b>Consultation:</b>	Legal, and Finance
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	It is recommended that:  1) The Pension Fund Committee approves the application of NPT Homes to admit Westward Energy Services Ltd. as an admitted body to the City & County of Swansea Pension Fund.  2) The admission is subject to:  a) All parties signing an Admissions Agreement.  b) An actuarial risk assessment.  c) An insurance bond in an approved form with an authorised insurer or relevant institution, being put in place to protect the Pension Fund.
<b>Report Author:</b>	Lynne Miller – Pensions Manager
<b>Finance Officer:</b>	Jeff Dong – Treasury & Technical Officer
<b>Legal Officer:</b>	Stephanie Williams
<b>Access to Services Officer:</b>	N/A

#### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Local Government Pension Regulations 2013 permit an Administering Authority to make an admission agreement with

“a body that is providing or will provide a service or assets in connection with the exercise of a function of a Scheme employer as a result of the transfer of the service or assets by means of a contract or other arrangement”

- 1.2 The original contract was outsourced from Neath Port Talbot CBC to Colin Laver Heating Ltd. in November 2005 for a period of seven years but extended to November 2015 in 2012.
- 1.3 In the interim period, the contract for the function was transferred to NPT Homes as a result of the transfer of housing stock from Neath Port Talbot CBC in 2011.
- 1.4 The contract with Colin Laver Heating ceased with effect 4<sup>th</sup> November 2015 and awarded to Westward Energy Services Ltd with effect from 5<sup>th</sup> November 2015. Two members of staff, who were active members in the LGPS with Colin Laver Heating Ltd., were transferred to Westward Energy Services Ltd. as a result of the transfer and an application for them to remain in the Scheme has been received.

## **2.0 Background**

2.1 Westward Energy Services Ltd. is a private company that was formed in 2001 and is based at Pontardawe, Swansea.

It provides heating and plumbing services to social housing landlords across South Wales. Clients include Cardiff Community Housing Association and Carmarthenshire County Council, as well as NPT Homes.

2.2 The contract with NPT Homes is for a period of seven years

2.3 If it is agreed that Westward Energy Services Ltd. becomes an admitted body in the Fund, the Fund's Actuary will be approached to carry out a risk assessment to assess the liability that would be transferred. They would only be admitted subject to this risk assessment.

2.4 Westward Energy Services Ltd. would also be required to enter into a bond in order to protect the Fund against any level of risk arising on premature termination of the provision of service or assets by reason of insolvency, winding up, or liquidation of the admission body.

## **3.0 General Issues**

3.1 There are no other variations proposed.

## **4.0 Equality and Engagement Implications**

None

## **5.0 Financial Implications**

5.1 There are no financial implications associated with this report.

## **6.0 Legal Implications**

6.1 An Admissions Agreement needs to be completed complying with the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 with an appropriate Bond provided by Westward Energy Services Ltd. to protect the Pension Fund

**Background Papers:** None

**Appendices:** None

## Report of the Section 151 Officer

Pension Fund Committee – 17 December 2015

### INVESTMENT REFORM CRITERIA AND GUIDANCE

Purpose: To receive Government guidance on Investment Reform Criteria and Guidance.

Report Author: Jeffrey Dong

Finance Officer: Jeffrey Dong

Legal Officer: Stephanie Williams

Access to Services Officer: Sherrill Hopkins

#### FOR INFORMATION

#### 1 Background

1.1 In the July Budget 2015, the Chancellor announced the Government's intention to work with Local Government Pension Scheme (the Scheme) administering authorities to ensure that they pool investments to significantly reduce costs while maintaining overall investment performance. Authorities are now invited to submit proposals for pooling which the Government will assess against the criteria in this document. The Chancellor has announced that the pools should take the form of up to six British Wealth Funds, each with assets of at least £25bn, which are able to invest in infrastructure and drive local growth.

#### 2 Investment Reform Criteria and Guidance

2.1 Attached at Appendix 1 is the accompanying guidance on investment reform and guidance for information.

#### 3 Legal Implications

3.1 There are no legal implications.

#### 4 Financial Implications

4.1 There are no financial implications.

#### 5 Equality Impact Assessment Implications

5.1 None.

**Background Papers:** None.

**Appendices:** Appendix 1 - Accompanying guidance on investment reform and guidance.





Department for  
Communities and  
Local Government

# Local Government Pension Scheme: Investment Reform Criteria and Guidance



© Crown copyright, 2015

*Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.*

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

This document/publication is also available on our website at [www.gov.uk/dclg](http://www.gov.uk/dclg)

If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, complete the form at <http://forms.communities.gov.uk/> or write to us at:

Department for Communities and Local Government  
Fry Building  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF  
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/CommunitiesUK>

November 2015

ISBN: 978-1-4098-4734-2

# Contents

<b>Ministerial Foreword</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Addressing the criteria</b>	<b>8</b>
Requirements and Timetable .....	8
Legislative context .....	9
<b>Supporting guidance</b>	<b>10</b>
A. Asset pool(s) that achieve the benefits of scale .....	10
B. Strong governance and decision making.....	15
C. Reduced costs and excellent value for money .....	20
D. An improved capacity and capability to invest in infrastructure .....	24

# Ministerial Foreword

At the summer Budget 2015, the Chancellor announced our intention to invite administering authorities to bring forward proposals for pooling Local Government Pension Scheme investments, to deliver significantly reduced costs while maintaining overall investment performance.

We have been clear for some time that the existing arrangements for investment by the Local Government Pension Scheme are in need of reform, and the announcement made plain our expectation that authorities would be ambitious when developing their proposals. The publication of these criteria and their supporting guidance marks a significant milestone on the road to reform, placing authorities in a strong position to take the initiative and drive efficiencies in the Scheme, and ultimately deliver savings for local taxpayers.

The Scheme is currently organised through 89 separate local government administering authorities and a closed Environment Agency scheme, which each manage and invest their assets largely independently. Recognising the potential for greater efficiency in this system, the coalition government first began to consider the opportunity for collaboration in 2013 with a call for evidence. Since then, we have been exploring the opportunities to improve; gathering evidence, testing proposals, and listening to the views of administering authorities and the fund management industry.

The Chancellor's announcement draws on this earlier work and in particular the consultation, *Opportunities for collaboration, cost savings and efficiencies*, published in May 2014 by the coalition government. More than 200 consultation responses and papers were received and analysed, leading to the development of a framework for reform that has administering authorities at its centre. The criteria published today make clear the Government's expectation for ambitious proposals for pooling, and invite authorities to lead the design and implementation of their own pools. The criteria have been shaped and informed by earlier consultations, as well as several conversations with administering authorities and the fund management industry which took place over the summer.

Working together, authorities have a real opportunity to realise the benefits of scale that should be available to one of Europe's largest funded pension schemes. The creation of up to six British Wealth Funds, each with at least £25bn of Scheme assets, will not only drive down investment costs but also enable the authorities to develop the capacity and capability to become a world leader in infrastructure investment and help drive growth. I know that many authorities have already started to consider who they will work with and how best to achieve the benefits of scale. These early discussions place those authorities on a strong footing to deliver against our criteria, and I look forward to seeing their proposals develop over the coming months.

**Marcus Jones**

# Criteria

1.1 In the July Budget 2015, the Chancellor announced the Government's intention to work with Local Government Pension Scheme (the Scheme) administering authorities to ensure that they pool investments to significantly reduce costs while maintaining overall investment performance. Authorities are now invited to submit proposals for pooling which the Government will assess against the criteria in this document. The Chancellor has announced that the pools should take the form of up to six British Wealth Funds, each with assets of at least £25bn, which are able to invest in infrastructure and drive local growth.

1.2 The following criteria set out how administering authorities can deliver against the Government's expectations of pooling assets.

1.3 It will be for authorities to suggest how their pooling arrangements will be constituted and will operate. In developing proposals, they should have regard to each of the four criteria, which are designed to be read in conjunction with the supporting guidance that follows. Their submissions should describe:

**A. Asset pool(s) that achieve the benefits of scale:** The 90 administering authorities in England and Wales should collaborate to establish, and invest through asset pools, each with at least £25bn of Scheme assets. The proposals should describe these pools, explain how each administering authority's assets will be allocated among the pools, describe the scale benefits that these arrangements are expected to deliver and explain how those benefits will be realised, measured and reported. Authorities should explain:

- The size of their pool(s) once fully operational.
- In keeping with the supporting guidance, any assets they propose to hold outside the pool(s), and the rationale for doing so.
- The type of pool(s) they are participating in, including the legal structure if relevant.
- How the pool(s) will operate, the work to be carried out internally and services to be hired from outside.
- The timetable for establishing the pool(s) and moving their assets into the pool(s). Authorities should explain how they will transparently report progress against that timetable.

**B. Strong governance and decision making:** The proposed governance structure for the pools should:

- i. At the local level, provide authorities with assurance that their investments are being managed appropriately by the pool, in line with their stated investment strategy and in the long-term interests of their members;
- ii. At the pool level, ensure that risk is adequately assessed and managed, investment implementation decisions are made with a long-term view, and a culture of continuous improvement is adopted.

Authorities should also revisit their internal processes to ensure efficient and effective decision making and risk management, while maintaining appropriate democratic accountability. Authorities should explain:

- The governance structure for their pool(s), including the accountability between the pool(s) and elected councillors, and how external scrutiny will be used.
- The mechanisms by which the authority can hold the pool(s) to account and secure assurance that their investment strategy is being implemented effectively and their investments are being well managed.
- Decision making procedures at all stages of investment, and the rationale underpinning this.
- The shared objectives for the pool(s), and any policies that are to be agreed between participants.
- The resources allocated to the running of the pool(s), including the governance budget, the number of staff needed and the skills and expertise required.
- How any environmental, social and corporate governance policies will be handled by the pool(s).
- How the authorities will act as responsible, long term investors through the pool(s), including how the pool(s) will determine and enact stewardship responsibilities.
- How the net performance of each asset class will be reported publically by the pool, to encourage the sharing of data and best practice.
- The extent to which benchmarking is used by the authority to assess their own governance and performance and that of the pool(s), for example by undertaking the Scheme Advisory Board's key performance indicator assessment.

**C. Reduced costs and excellent value for money:** In addition to the fees paid for investment, there are further hidden costs that are difficult to ascertain and so are rarely reported in most pension fund accounts. To identify savings, authorities are expected to take the lead in this area and report the costs they incur more transparently. Proposals should explain how the pool(s) will deliver substantial savings in investment fees, both in the near term and over the next 15 years, while at least maintaining overall investment performance.

Active fund management should only be used where it can be shown to deliver value for money, and authorities should report how fees and net performance in each listed asset class compare to a passive index. In addition authorities should consider setting targets for active managers which are focused on achieving risk-adjusted returns over an appropriate long term time period, rather than solely focusing on short term performance comparisons.

As part of their proposals, authorities should provide:

- A fully transparent assessment of investment costs and fees as at 31 March 2013.
- A fully transparent assessment of current investment costs and fees, prepared on the same basis as 2013 for comparison.
- A detailed estimate of savings over the next 15 years.

- A detailed estimate of implementation costs and when they will arise, including transition costs as assets are migrated into the pool(s), and an explanation of how these costs will be met.
- A proposal for reporting transparently against their forecast transition costs and savings, as well as how they will report fees and net performance.

**D. An improved capacity to invest in infrastructure:** Only a very small proportion of Local Government Pension Scheme assets are currently invested in infrastructure; pooling of assets may facilitate greater investment in this area. Proposals should explain how infrastructure will feature in authorities' investment strategies and how the pooling arrangements can improve the capacity and capability to invest in this asset class. Authorities should explain:

- The proportion of their fund currently allocated to infrastructure, both directly and through funds, or "fund of funds".
- How they might develop or acquire the capacity and capability to assess infrastructure projects, and reduce costs by managing any subsequent investments directly through the pool(s), rather than existing fund, or "fund of funds" arrangements.
- The proportion of their fund they intend to invest in infrastructure, and their ambition in this area going forward, as well as how they have arrived at that amount.

# Addressing the criteria

## Requirements and Timetable

2.1 Authorities are asked to submit their initial proposals to the Government to [LGPSReform@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:LGPSReform@communities.gsi.gov.uk) by 19 February 2016. Submissions should include a commitment to pooling and a description of their progress towards formalising their arrangements with other authorities. Authorities can choose whether to make individual or joint submissions, or both, at this first stage.

2.2 Refined and completed submissions are expected by 15 July 2016, which fully address the criteria in this document, and provide any further information that would be helpful in evaluating the proposals. At this second stage, the submissions should comprise:

- for each pool, a joint proposal from participating authorities setting out the pooling arrangement in detail. For example, this may cover the governance structures, decision-making processes and implementation timetable; and
- for each authority, an individual return detailing the authority's commitment to, and expectations of, the pool(s). This should include their profile of costs and savings, the transition profile for their assets, and the rationale for any assets they intend to hold outside of the pools in the long term.

## Assessing the proposals against criteria

2.3 The Government will continue to engage with authorities as they develop their proposals for pooling assets over the coming months. The initial submissions will be evaluated against the criteria, with feedback provided to highlight areas that may fall outside of the criteria, or where additional evidence may be required.

2.4 Once submitted, the Government will assess the final proposals against the criteria. A brief report will be provided in response, setting out the extent to which the criteria have been met and highlighting any aspects of the guidance that the Government believes have not been adequately addressed. In the first instance, the Government will work with authorities who do not develop sufficiently ambitious proposals to help them deliver a more cost effective approach to investment that draws on the benefits of scale. Where this is not possible, the Government will consider how else it can drive value for money for taxpayers, including through the use of the "backstop" legislation, should this be in place following the outcome of the consultation described below.

## Transitional arrangements

2.5 Plans should be made to transfer assets to the pools as soon as practicable. Analysis commissioned by the Government from PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) indicates that, even those pooling mechanisms requiring supporting infrastructure, such as collective investment vehicles, could be established within 18 months. It is expected that liquid assets are transferred into the pools over a relatively short timeframe, beginning from April 2018. It is recognised that illiquid assets are likely to transition over a longer period of time. For the avoidance of doubt, investments with high penalty costs for early



exit should not be wound up early on account of the pooling arrangements, but should be transferred across as soon as practicable, taking into account value for money considerations. Any assets that are held outside of the pool should be kept under review to ensure that arrangement continues to provide value for money.

2.6 While authorities will need to be mindful of their developing pooled approach, they should continue to manage both their investment strategies and manager appointments as they do now until the new arrangements are in place. In keeping with the investment regulations, they are still responsible for keeping both under regular review.

### **Support to develop proposals**

2.7 To help authorities develop proposals quickly and efficiently, the Government has made available PwC's detailed technical analysis of the different collective investment vehicles and their tax arrangements at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-pension-scheme-investment-reform-criteria-and-guidance>. This paper is provided for information only. It does not represent the view of Government, and authorities should seek professional advice as needed when developing their proposals. Authorities are also strongly encouraged to learn from those who have already begun to develop collective investment vehicles, such as the London Boroughs or Lancashire and the London Pension Fund Authority.

## **Legislative context**

2.8 At the July Budget 2015, the Chancellor also announced the Government's intention to consult on "backstop" legislation that would require those administering authorities who do not come forward with sufficiently ambitious proposals to pool their assets with others. That consultation has now been published and is available on the Government's website at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/revoking-and-replacing-the-local-government-pension-scheme>.

2.9 The consultation proposes to introduce a power for the Secretary of State to intervene in the investment function of an administering authority where it has not had sufficient regard to guidance published by the Secretary of State. The intervention should be proportionate and subject to both consultation and review.

2.10 The draft regulations include a provision for the Secretary of State to issue guidance. Subject to the outcome of the consultation, authorities would then need to have regard to that guidance when producing their investment strategy. The Government proposes to issue this document as Secretary of State's guidance if the draft regulations come into effect. The guidance will be kept under review and may be updated, for example if the proposals for pooling that come forward are not sufficiently ambitious.

2.11 The consultation also proposes to replace and update the Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2009 to make significant investment through pooled vehicles possible.

# Supporting guidance

3.1 This guidance is to assist authorities in the design of ambitious proposals for pooling investments and to provide ongoing support as they seek to ensure value for money in the long term. It will be kept under review to ensure that it continues to represent best practice.

## A. Asset pool(s) that achieve the benefits of scale

**Headline criterion:** The 90 administering authorities in England and Wales should collaborate to establish, and invest through asset pools, each with at least £25bn of Scheme assets. The proposals should describe these pools, explain how each administering authority's assets will be allocated among the pools, describe the scale benefits that these arrangements are expected to deliver and explain how those benefits will be realised, measured and reported.

3.2 The consultation, *Opportunities for collaboration, cost savings and efficiencies*, set out strong evidence that demonstrated how using collective investment vehicles and pooling investments can deliver substantial savings for the Local Government Pension Scheme without affecting investment performance. Additional advantages to pooling, which should further reduce costs and improve decision making in the long term, include:

- Increasing the range of asset classes to be invested in directly,
- Strengthening the governance arrangements and in-house expertise available to authorities,
- Improving transparency and long-term stewardship, and
- Facilitating better dissemination of best practice and performance data between authorities.

### The case for collective investment

3.3 Published in May 2014, the analysis in the Hymans Robertson report evidenced that using collective investment vehicles could deliver savings. In the case of illiquid assets alone, they found that £240m a year could be saved if investments were channelled through a Scheme wide collective investment vehicle rather than the existing "fund of funds" approach.<sup>1</sup>

3.4 A review of the academic analysis available also supports the case for larger investment pools. For example, Dyck and Pomorski's paper, *Is Bigger Better? Size and performance in pension fund management*, established that larger pension funds were able to operate at lower cost than their smaller counterparts, through a combination of

---

<sup>1</sup> Hymans Robertson report: *Local Government Pension Scheme structure analysis*, p.3  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/307926/Hymans\\_Robertson\\_report.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/307926/Hymans_Robertson_report.pdf)

improved negotiating power, greater use of in-house management, and more cost effective access to alternative assets like infrastructure.<sup>2</sup>

A third to a half of the benefits of size come through cost savings realized by larger plans, primarily via internal management. Up to two thirds of the economies come from substantial gains in both gross and net returns on alternatives.

3.5 A number of respondents to the May 2014 consultation also set out the case for larger funds being able to access lower cost investments. London Councils, for example, estimated that savings of £120m a year could be delivered if £24bn was invested through the London collective investment vehicle (CIV), as a result of reduced investment management fees, improved performance, and enhanced efficiency.

3.6 Formal mechanisms of pooling, such as collective investment vehicles, offer additional benefits to alternative arrangements such as procurement frameworks. For example, Hymans Robertson explained that larger asset pools would increase the opportunities for buy and sell transactions to be carried out within the Scheme, reducing the need to go to the market and so minimising transaction costs. Their analysis found that this could reduce transaction costs, which erode the value of assets invested, by £190m a year.<sup>3</sup>

3.7 Pooling investments will also create an opportunity to improve transparency and information sharing amongst authorities. By having a single entity responsible for negotiating with fund managers and reporting performance, authorities can see what they are paying and generating in returns and how it compares with other authorities. Similarly, Lancashire County Pension Fund and the London Pension Fund Authority, who are developing a pool for assets and liabilities, anticipate economies of scale driving improved performance. They have recently estimated that by pooling they can achieve enhanced investment outcomes of £20-£30m a year from their current levels.<sup>4</sup>

### **Achieving appropriate scale**

3.8 The Government expects all administering authorities to pool their investments to achieve economies of scale and the wider benefits of sharing best practice.

3.9 A move to larger asset pools would also be in keeping with international experience. For example, in Ontario, smaller public sector pension funds are being required to come together to form pools of around \$50bn Canadian (approximately £30bn at the time the proposal was made). Similarly, Australian pension funds have been consolidating in recent years, where a formal review in 2010 recommended that each MySuper pension fund be required to consider annually whether they have sufficient scale and membership to continue as a separate pension fund.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Dyck and Pomorski, *Is bigger better? Size and Performance in Pension Plan Management*, pp.14-15

<sup>3</sup> Hymans Robertson report, pp.14-15

<sup>4</sup> Sir Merrick Cockell, writing in the *Pensions Expert* on 30 September 2015

<sup>5</sup> Government Response to the Review into the Governance, Efficiency, Structure and Operation of Australia's Superannuation System, Recommendation 1.6,

3.10 The May 2014 consultation sought views on the number of collective investment vehicles to be established. Respondents stressed the importance of balancing the need for scale with local input and practical governance arrangements. It was also argued that while larger asset pools would deliver greater savings, the potential difficulties of successfully investing large volumes of assets in a single asset class, particularly active strategies for listed assets, should also be taken into account. However, while individual managers may restrict the value of assets they are prepared to accept or are able to invest, the selection of a few managers for each asset class would help to mitigate this risk.

3.11 Having reflected on the views expressed in response to the consultation and the experience of pension funds internationally, the Government believes that in almost all cases, fewer, larger assets pools will create the conditions for lower costs and reduce the likelihood of activity being duplicated across the Scheme, for example by minimising pooled vehicle set-up and running costs. It therefore expects authorities to collaborate and invest through no more than six large asset pools, each with at least £25bn of Local Government Pension Scheme assets under management once fully operational.

3.12 However, the Government recognises that there may be a limited number of bespoke circumstances where an alternative arrangement may be more appropriate for a particular asset class or specific investment. As set out below, this may include pooling to invest in illiquid assets like infrastructure, direct holdings in property and locally targeted investments.

### **Investment in infrastructure and other illiquid or alternative assets**

3.13 The Hymans Robertson report highlighted illiquid or alternative assets as an area for significant savings for the Scheme. They found that in 2012-2013, illiquid asset classes like private equity, hedge funds and infrastructure represented just 10% of investments made, but 40% of investment fees. They also demonstrated that changing the way these investments are made, moving away from “fund of funds” to a collective investment vehicle, could save £240m a year.<sup>6</sup>

3.14 The Government expects the pooling of assets to remove some of the obstacles to investing in these asset classes in a cost effective way. A separate criterion has been included on infrastructure, although similar benefits exist for other alternative or illiquid assets, such as private equity, venture capital, debt funds and new forms of alternative business finance. In light of this, authorities should consider how best to access these asset classes in a more cost-effective way. Regionally based pools, such as the London boroughs’ collective investment vehicle, would allow authorities to make best use of existing relationships, while a single national pool for infrastructure or illiquid assets would deliver even greater scale and opportunity for efficiency.

3.15 A considerable shift in asset allocation would be needed to develop a pool of £25bn for investment in infrastructure and other illiquid or alternative assets, such as private equity or venture capital. The Government recognises that such a significant movement in

---

[http://strongersuper.treasury.gov.au/content/Content.aspx?doc=publications/government\\_response/recommendation\\_response\\_chapter\\_1.htm](http://strongersuper.treasury.gov.au/content/Content.aspx?doc=publications/government_response/recommendation_response_chapter_1.htm)

<sup>6</sup> Hymans Robertson report, p.24

asset allocation is unlikely in the near term. As such, should authorities elect to develop a single asset pool for illiquid investments or infrastructure, the Government recognises that a value of assets under management less than £25bn might be appropriate.

### **Investments outside of the pools**

3.16 The Government's presumption is that all investments should be made through the pool, but we recognise that there may be a limited number of existing investments that might be less suitable to pooled arrangements, such as local initiatives or products tailored to specific liabilities. Authorities may therefore wish to explore whether to retain a small proportion of their existing investments outside of the pool, where this can demonstrate clear value for money. Any exemptions should be minimal and must be set out in the pooling proposal, alongside a supporting rationale.

### **Property**

3.17 As of the 31 March 2014, authorities reported that they were investing around 2.5% of their assets in directly held property, with a further 4.1% invested through property investment vehicles.<sup>7</sup> However, the amount invested varies considerably between authorities, with some targeting investment of around 10% of their assets in direct holdings, for example.

3.18 A number of consultation responses stressed the importance of retaining direct ownership of property outside of any pooled arrangement, a view echoed in our discussions with interested parties over the summer. Directly held property is used by some authorities to match a particular part of an authority's liabilities, or to generate regular income. If these assets were then pooled, while the authority would receive the benefits of the pooled properties, there is a risk that this would not match the liability or cash-flow requirements that had underpinned the decision to invest in a particular property.

3.19 In light of the arguments brought forward by authorities and the fund management industry, the Government is prepared to accept that some existing property assets might be more effectively managed directly and not through a pool at present. However, pools should be used if new allocations are made to property, taking advantage of the opportunity to share the costs associated with the identification and management of suitable investments.

3.20 Where authorities invest more than the reported Scheme average of 2.5% in property directly, they should make this clear in their pooling submission.

### **Addressing the criterion**

3.21 When developing their proposals for pooling, authorities should set out:

- The size of their pool(s) once fully operational.
- In keeping with the supporting guidance, any assets they propose to hold outside the pool(s), and the rationale for doing so.

---

<sup>7</sup> Scheme Advisory Board, Annual Report <http://www.lgpsboard.org/index.php/investment-performance-2014>

- The type of pool(s) they are participating in, including the legal structure if relevant.
- How the pool(s) will operate, the work to be carried out internally and services to be hired from outside.
- The timetable for establishing the pool(s) and moving their assets into the pool(s). Authorities should explain how they will transparently report progress against that timetable.

## B. Strong governance and decision making

**Headline criterion:** The proposed governance structure for the pools should:

- i. At the local level, provide authorities with assurance that their investments are being managed appropriately by the pool, in line with their stated investment strategy and in the long-term interests of their members;
- ii. At the pool level, ensure that risk is adequately assessed and managed, investment implementation decisions are made with a long-term view, and a culture of continuous improvement is adopted.

Authorities should also revisit their internal processes to ensure efficient and effective decision making and risk management, while maintaining appropriate democratic accountability.

3.22 A number of consultation responses stressed the importance of establishing strong governance arrangements for pools. Securing the right balance between local input and timely, effective decision making was viewed as essential, but also a significant challenge. The management and governance arrangements of each pool will inevitably be defined by the needs of those participating. However, there are some underlying principles that the Government believes should be incorporated.

### **Maintaining democratic accountability**

3.23 The May 2014 consultation was underpinned by the principle that asset allocation should remain with the administering authorities. Consultation respondents were strongly in favour of retaining local asset allocation, noting that each fund has a unique set of participating employers, liabilities, membership and cash-flow profiles, which need to be addressed by an investment strategy tailored to those particular circumstances.

3.24 Respondents also highlighted the transparency and accountability benefits offered by local asset allocation. If councillors are responsible for setting the investment strategy, then local taxpayers, who in part fund the Scheme through employer contributions, have an opportunity to hold their decisions directly to account through local elections. As one consultation response explained:

The accountability of Members of the employing authorities playing a part in deciding locally how the assets of the Pension Fund are allocated is important. Employer contributions are paid, in the main, by local council tax payers who in turn vote for their local councillors. Those councillors should have the autonomy to make decisions relating to the investment strategy of that Pension Fund.

3.25 The Government agrees that this democratic link is important to the effective running of the Scheme and should not be wholly removed by the pooling of investments. As set out below, determining the investment strategy and setting the strategic asset allocation should remain with individual authorities. When developing a pool, authorities should ensure that there remains a clear link through the governance structure adopted, between the pool and the pensions committee. For example, this might take the form of a shareholding in the pool for the authority, which is exercised by a member of the pension committee.

## **Strategic asset allocation**

3.26 Establishing the right investment strategy and strategic asset allocation is crucial to optimising performance. It is increasingly accepted that strategic asset allocation is one of the main drivers of investment returns, having far greater an impact than implementation decisions such as manager selection.

3.27 The majority of respondents to the May 2014 consultation supported local asset allocation, but discussions with interested parties over the summer have highlighted a lack of consensus as to what constitutes strategic asset allocation. Definitions have ranged from selecting high level asset classes such as the proportions in bonds, equities and property; to developing a detailed strategy setting out the extent and types of investments in each of the different equity or bond markets.

3.28 Informed by these discussions with fund managers and administering authorities, the Government believes that pension committees should continue to set the balance between investment in bonds and equities, recognising their authority's specific liability and cash-flow forecasts. Beyond this, it will be for each pool to determine which aspects of asset allocation are undertaken by the pool and which by the administering authority, having considered how best to structure decision making in order to deliver value for money. Authorities will need to consider the additional benefits of centralising decision making to better exploit synergies with other participating authorities' allocations and further drive economies of scale. When setting out their asset allocation authorities should be as transparent as possible, for example making clear the underlying asset class sought when using pooled funds.

## **Effective and timely decision making**

3.29 Authorities should draw a distinction between locally setting the strategic asset allocation and centrally determining how that strategy is implemented. The Government expects that implementation of the investment strategy will be delegated to officers or the pool, in order to make the most of the benefits of scale and react efficiently to changing market conditions. As one consultation response suggested:

We believe that high-level decisions about Fund objectives, strategy and allocation are best made by individual Funds considering their better knowledge of their liabilities, risk and return objectives and cash flow requirements. More detailed asset allocation decisions should however be centralised to achieve better economies of scale, and to allow more specialist management.

3.30 Authorities will need to revisit and review their decision-making processes as part of their move towards pools. For example, in order to maximise savings, manager selection will need to be undertaken at the pool level. Centralising manager selection would allow the pool to rationalise the number of managers used for a particular asset class. The resulting larger mandates should then allow the pool to negotiate lower investment fees. This approach would also give local councillors more time to dedicate to the fundamental issue of setting the overarching strategy.

3.31 A number of authorities have already delegated hiring and dismissing managers to a sub-committee comprised predominantly of officers. This has allowed these authorities to



react more quickly to changes in the market, taking advantage of opportunities as they arise. Similarly, delegating implementation decisions to the pool will allow the participating authorities to benefit not only from more streamlined decision making, but also from effecting those decisions at scale.

3.32 The creation of pools will necessarily lead to a review of decision making within each authority. The Government expects to see greater consolidation where possible. However, as a minimum, we would expect to see the selection of external fund managers and the implementation of the investment strategy to be carried out at the pooled level.

### **Responsible investment and effective stewardship**

3.33 In June 2011, the Government invited Professor John Kay to conduct a review into UK equity markets and long-term decision making. The Kay Review considered how well equity markets were achieving their core purposes: to enhance the performance of UK companies and to enable savers to benefit from the activity of these businesses through returns to direct and indirect ownership of shares in UK companies. The review identified that short-termism is a problem in UK equity markets.<sup>8</sup>

3.34 Professor Kay recommended that Company directors, asset managers and asset holders adopt measures to promote both stewardship and long-term decision making. In particular, he stressed that ‘asset managers can contribute more to the performance of British business (and in consequence to overall returns to their savers) through greater involvement with the companies in which they invest.’<sup>9</sup> He concludes that adopting such responsible investment practices will prove beneficial for investors and markets alike.

3.35 In practice, responsible investment could involve making investment decisions based on the long term, as well as playing an active role in corporate governance by exercising shareholder voting rights. Administering authorities will want to consider the findings of the Kay Review when developing their proposals, including what governance procedures and mechanisms would be needed to facilitate long term responsible investing and stewardship through a pool. The UK Stewardship Code, published by the Financial Reporting Council, also provides authorities with guidance on good practice in terms of monitoring, and engaging with, the companies in which they invest.

### **Enacting an environmental, social and corporate governance policy**

3.36 The investment regulations currently require authorities to set out within the statement of investment principles the extent to which social, environmental or corporate governance considerations are taken into account in the selection, retention and realisation of investments. The draft regulations published alongside this document do not propose to amend this principle.

3.37 These policies should be developed in the context of the liability profile of the Scheme, and should enhance the authority’s ability to manage down any funding deficit and ensure that pensions can be paid when due. Indeed, environmental, social and

---

<sup>8</sup> *The Kay Review of UK Equity Markets and Long-Term Decision Making*, pp. 9-10  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/253454/bis-12-917-kay-review-of-equity-markets-final-report.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/253454/bis-12-917-kay-review-of-equity-markets-final-report.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> The Kay Review, p.12

corporate governance policies provide a useful tool in managing financial risk, as they ensure that the wider risks associated with the viability of an investment are fully recognised.

3.38 As the Law Commission emphasised in its 2014 report on the fiduciary duty of financial intermediaries, the law generally is clear that schemes should consider any factors financially material to the performance of their investments, including social, environmental and corporate governance factors, and over the long-term, dependent on the time horizon over which their liabilities arise.

3.39 The Law Commission also clarified that, although schemes should make the pursuit of a financial return their predominant concern, they may take purely non-financial considerations into account provided that doing so would not involve significant risk of financial detriment to the scheme and where they have good reason to think that scheme members would support their decision.

3.40 The Government's intention is to issue guidance to authorities to clarify that such considerations should not result in policies which pursue municipal boycotts, divestments and sanctions, other than where formal legal sanctions, embargoes and restrictions have been put in place by the Government. Investment policies should not be used to give effect to municipal foreign or munitions policies that run contrary to Government policy.

3.41 Authorities will need to determine how their individual investment policies will be reflected in the pool. They should also consider how pooling could facilitate implementation of their environmental, social and corporate governance policy, for example by sharing best practice, collaborating on social investments to reduce cost or diversify risk, or using their scale to improve capability in this area.

### **Addressing the criterion**

3.42 When developing their proposals for pooling, authorities will need to set out:

- The governance structure for their pool(s), including the accountability between the pool(s) and elected councillors, and how external scrutiny will be used.
- The mechanisms by which the authority can hold the pool(s) to account and secure assurance that their investment strategy is being implemented effectively and their investments are being well managed.
- Decision making procedures at all stages of investment, and the rationale underpinning this.
- The shared objectives for the pool(s), and any policies that are to be agreed between participants.
- The resources allocated to the running of the pool(s), including the governance budget, the number of staff needed and the skills and expertise required.
- How any ethical, social and corporate governance policies will be handled by the pool(s).
- How the authorities will act as responsible, long term investors through the pool(s), including how the pool(s) will determine and enact stewardship responsibilities.

- How the net performance of each asset class will be reported publically by the pool, to encourage the sharing of data and best practice.
- The extent to which benchmarking is used by the authority to assess their own governance and performance and that of the pool(s), for example by undertaking the Scheme Advisory Board's key performance indicator assessment.

## C. Reduced costs and excellent value for money

**Headline criterion:** In addition to the fees paid for investment, there are further hidden costs that are difficult to ascertain and so rarely reported in most pension fund accounts. To identify savings, authorities are expected to take the lead in this area and report the costs they incur more transparently. Proposals should explain how the pool(s) will deliver substantial savings in investment fees, both in the near term and over the next 15 years, while maintaining overall investment performance.

Active fund management should only be used where it can be shown to deliver value for money, and authorities should report how fees and net performance in each listed asset class compare to a passive index. In addition authorities should consider setting targets for active managers which are focused on achieving risk-adjusted returns over an appropriate long term time period, rather than solely focusing on short term performance comparisons.

3.43 As set out in the July Budget 2015 announcement, the Government wants to see authorities bring forward proposals to reform the way their pension scheme investments are made to deliver long-term savings for local taxpayers. Authorities are invited to consider how they might best deliver value for money, minimising fees while maximising overall investment returns.

### Scope for savings

3.44 Pooling investments offers an opportunity to share knowledge and reduce external investment management fees, as the fund manager is able to treat the authorities as a single client. There is already a considerable body of evidence in the public domain to support authorities in developing their proposals for investment reform and this continues to grow with new initiatives emerging from local authorities:

- **Passive management:** Hymans Robertson showed that annual fee savings of £230m could be found by moving from active to passive management of listed assets like bonds and equities, without affecting the Scheme's overall return.<sup>10</sup>
- Their analysis suggested that since passive management typically results in fewer shares being traded, turnover costs, which are a drag on the performance achieved through active management, might be reduced by £190m a year.<sup>11</sup>
- **Collective investment:** Hymans Robertson also demonstrated that £240m a year could be saved by using a collective investment vehicle instead of "fund of funds" for illiquid assets like infrastructure, hedge funds and private equity.<sup>12</sup>
- Similarly, the London Pension Fund Authority has estimated that they have reduced their external manager fees by 75% by bringing equity investments in-house, and hope to expand this considerably as part of their collective investment vehicle with Lancashire County Pension Fund.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Hymans Robertson report, p. 12

<sup>11</sup> Hymans Robertson report, pp. 14-15

<sup>12</sup> Hymans Robertson report, p. 3

<sup>13</sup> Chris Rule, LPFA Chief Investment Officer, reported in *Pension Expert* on 1 October 2015

- **Sharing services and procurement costs:** The National Procurement Framework has also helped authorities to address some of the other costs associated with investment, such as legal and custodian fees, reporting measurable savings of £16m so far.<sup>14</sup>

3.45 As Hymans Robertson's analysis shows, just tackling the use of "fund of funds" for illiquid assets like infrastructure could save around £240m a year, with clear opportunities to go further. It is in this context that the Government is encouraging authorities to bring forward their proposals for collaboration and cost savings. Although a particular savings target has not been set, the Government does expect authorities to be ambitious in their pursuit of economies of scale and value for money.

### **In-house management**

3.46 Some authorities manage all or the majority of their assets internally and so can already show very low management costs. In these cases, a move to a collective investment vehicle with external fund managers is unlikely to deliver cost savings from investment fees alone. However, there are wider benefits of collaboration which authorities with in-house teams should consider when developing their proposals for pooling. A pool of internally managed assets could lead to further reductions in costs, for example by sharing staff, research and due diligence checks; it may improve access to staff with stronger expertise in particular asset classes; and could introduce greater resilience in staff recruitment, retention and succession planning. Alternatively, newly created pools might wish to work with existing in-house teams to build up expertise and take advantage of their lower running costs.

### **Active and passive management**

3.47 The May 2014 consultation considered the use of active and passive management by the Local Government Pension Scheme. Active management attempts to select fund managers who actively choose a portfolio of assets in order to deliver a return against a specific investment target. In practice, this is often used to try and outperform a benchmark, for that class of assets over a specific period. In contrast, passive management tracks a market and aims to deliver a return in line with that market.

3.48 The consultation demonstrated that when considered in aggregate, the Scheme had been achieving a market return over the last ten years in each of the main equity markets. This suggested that collectively the Scheme could have delivered savings by using less costly passive management for listed assets like bonds and equities, without affecting overall performance. While the majority of consultation responses agreed that there was a role for passive management in a balanced portfolio, most also argued that authorities should retain the use of active management where they felt it would deliver higher net returns.

3.49 In response to that consultation, the Government has now invited authorities to bring forward proposals for pooling investments to deliver economies of scale. The extent to which passive management is used will remain a decision for each authority or pool,

---

<sup>14</sup> National LGPS Frameworks website, <http://www.nationallgpsframeworks.org/national-lgps-frameworks-win-lgc-investment-award>

based on their investment strategy, ongoing performance and ability to negotiate lower fees with fund managers. However, in light of the evidence set out in the Hymans Robertson report and the May 2014 consultation, authorities are encouraged to keep their balance of active and passive management under review to ensure they are delivering value for money. For example, should their net returns compare poorly against the index in a particular asset class over the longer term, authorities should consider whether they are still securing value for money for taxpayers and Scheme members.

3.50 When determining how to measure performance, authorities are encouraged to consider setting targets for active managers that are focused on achieving risk-adjusted returns over an appropriate long term time period, rather than solely focusing on short term performance comparisons.

### **Improving the transparency of costs**

3.51 In addition to the fees paid to asset managers, there are considerable hidden costs of investment that are difficult to identify and so often go unreported by investors. In the case of the Local Government Pension Scheme, Hymans Robertson showed that investment costs in 2012-13 were at least £790m a year, in contrast to the £409m reported by the authorities.<sup>15</sup> Even the £790m understated the total investment costs as it excluded performance fees on alternative assets such as private equity and hedge funds (it included performance fees on traditional assets) and turnover costs (investment performance figures include the impact of turnover costs).

3.52 To really drive savings within the Scheme, it is essential that these hidden costs are better understood and reported as transparently as possible. Although many of these costs are not paid out in cash, they do erode the value of the assets available for investment and so should also be scrutinised and the opportunities for savings explored.

3.53 The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) has already made some changes to their guidance, Accounting for Local Government Pension Scheme management costs 2014, to encourage authorities to explore these costs and report some through a note to the accounts. For example, these include performance fees and management fees on pools deducted at source. Authorities should have regard to this guidance and ensure that they are reporting costs as transparently as possible.

3.54 In addition, the Scheme Advisory Board is commissioning advice to help authorities more accurately assess their transparent and hidden investment costs. Once available, authorities should take full advantage of this analysis when developing their proposals.

### **Addressing the criterion**

3.55 As set out above, there is a clear opportunity for authorities to collaborate to deliver hundreds of millions in savings in the medium term. Although there is no overall savings target for the Scheme, the Government expects authorities to take full advantage of the benefits of pooling to reduce costs while maintaining performance.

---

<sup>15</sup> Hymans Robertson report, pp.10-11

3.56 To support the delivery of savings authorities bringing forward proposals are asked to set out their current investment costs in detail, and demonstrate how these will be reduced over time and the savings forecast. Where possible, costs should be reported back to 2012-2013 so that any cost reductions already achieved as a result of procurement frameworks and early fee negotiations are transparently captured.

3.57 Authorities are encouraged to provide:

- A fully transparent assessment of investment costs and fees as at 31 March 2013.
- A fully transparent assessment of current investment costs and fees, prepared on the same basis as 2013 for comparison.
- A detailed estimate of savings over the next 15 years.
- A detailed estimate of implementation costs and when they will arise, including transition costs as assets are migrated into the pool(s), and an explanation of how these costs will be met.
- A proposal for reporting transparently against their forecast transition costs and savings, as well as how they will report fees and net performance.

## D. An improved capacity and capability to invest in infrastructure

**Headline criterion:** Only a very small proportion of Local Government Pension Scheme assets are currently invested in infrastructure; pooling of assets may facilitate greater investment in this area. Proposals should explain how infrastructure will feature in authorities' investment strategies and how the pooling arrangements can improve the capacity and capability to invest in this asset class.

3.58 Investment in infrastructure is increasingly being seen as a suitable option for pension funds, particularly amongst larger organisations. This may in part be the result of the typically long term nature of these investments, which may offer a useful match to the long term liabilities held by pension funds.

### International experience

3.59 Multiple large international pension funds are investing a significant proportion of their assets in infrastructure. A recent OECD report, which analysed a sample of global pension funds as at 2012, showed that some Canadian and Australian funds (with total assets of approximately £35-40bn in 2014 terms) were investing up to 10-15% in this asset class.<sup>16</sup> The report also noted that those funds with the largest infrastructure allocations were investing directly, and that such investment was the result of the build up of sector-specific knowledge, expertise and resources.<sup>17</sup> This experience might be demonstrated through an organisation's ability to manage large projects, as well as the associated risk.

3.60 Figures published by the Scheme Advisory Board for the 2013 Annual Report show that around £550m, or 0.3%, of the Scheme's total assets of £180bn was invested in infrastructure.<sup>18</sup> This falls some way behind other large pension funds that have elected to invest in this area, such as those noted above and the Ontario Teachers Pension Plan which invested 6.1% according to the same 2014 report.

### Creating the opportunity

3.61 The Scheme's current structure, where assets are locked into 90 separate funds, reduces scale and makes significant direct infrastructure investment more difficult for administering authorities. As a result, authorities may determine that they are unable to invest in infrastructure, or may invest indirectly, through the "fund of funds" structure. Such arrangements are expensive, as the Hymans Robertson report demonstrated and this paper sets out in paragraph 3.13.

3.62 Developing larger investment pools of at least £25bn will make it easier to develop or acquire improved capacity and capability to invest in infrastructure. In so doing, it should be possible to reduce the costs associated with investment in this area. This is likely to be the case particularly if authorities pool their infrastructure investment nationally, where the

---

<sup>16</sup> OECD, *Annual Survey of Large Pension Funds: report on pension funds' long-term investments*, p.32, available at: <http://www.oecd.org/daf/fin/private-pensions/LargestPensionFunds2012Survey.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> OECD report, p.14

<sup>18</sup> Scheme Advisory Board annual report <http://www.lgpsboard.org/index.php/scheme-investments>



resultant scale may allow them to buy-in or build-up in-house expertise in relevant areas, such as project and risk management.

3.63 In considering such investment, administering authorities might want to reflect on the wide range of assets that might be explored, such as railway, road or other transport facilities; utilities services like water and gas infrastructure; health, educational, court or prison facilities, and housing supply. Authorities should also examine the benefits of both:

- Greenfield infrastructure – projects involving the construction of brand new infrastructure, such as a new road or motorway junction to unlock a housing development, or the recent investment of £25m by the Greater Manchester Pension Fund to unlock new sites and build 240 houses; and
- Brownfield infrastructure – investing in pre-existing infrastructure projects, such as taking over the running of (or the construction of a new terminal building at) an airport.

3.64 As set out above, investment in infrastructure represents a viable investment for pension funds, offering long term returns to match their liabilities. Authorities will need to make their investments based on an assessment of risk, return and fit with investment strategy. However, the creation of large pools will make greater investment in infrastructure a more realistic prospect, opening up new opportunities to develop or buy-in the capacity and capability required.

3.65 In developing their proposals for pooling, authorities should take the opportunity to review their asset allocation decisions and consider how they can be more ambitious in their infrastructure investment. The Government believes that authorities can play a leading role in UK infrastructure and driving local growth, and encourages authorities to compare themselves against the example set by the leading global pension fund investors in their approach to allocating assets in this area.

### **Addressing the criterion**

3.66 Authorities should identify their current allocation to infrastructure, and consider how the creation of up to six pools might facilitate greater investment in this area. When developing proposals, authorities should explain:

- The proportion of their fund currently allocated to infrastructure, both directly and through fund, or “fund of funds”.
- How they might develop or acquire the capability and capability to assess infrastructure projects, and reduce costs by managing any subsequent investments directly through the pool(s), rather than existing fund, or “fund of funds” arrangements.
- The proportion of their fund they intend to invest in infrastructure, and their ambition in this area going forward, as well as how they have arrived at that amount.

# Agenda Item 9

## Report of the Head of Legal & Democratic Services

### Pension Fund Committee – 17 December 2015

#### EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

<b>Purpose:</b>	To consider whether the Public should be excluded from the following items of business.	
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	None.	
<b>Reason for Decision:</b>	To comply with legislation.	
<b>Consultation:</b>	Legal.	
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	It is recommended that:	
<b>1)</b>	The public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item(s) of business on the grounds that it / they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as set out in the Paragraphs listed below of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007 subject to the Public Interest Test (where appropriate) being applied.	
	<b>Item No's.</b>	<b>Relevant Paragraphs in Schedule 12A</b>
	10-14	14
<b>Report Author:</b>	Democratic Services	
<b>Finance Officer:</b>	Not Applicable	
<b>Legal Officer:</b>	Patrick Arran – Head of Legal & Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer)	

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007, allows a Principal Council to pass a resolution excluding the public from a meeting during an item of business.
- 1.2 Such a resolution is dependant on whether it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the public were present during that item there would be disclosure to them of exempt information, as defined in section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972.

#### 2. Exclusion of the Public / Public Interest Test

- 2.1 In order to comply with the above mentioned legislation, Cabinet will be requested to exclude the public from the meeting during consideration of the item(s) of business identified in the recommendation(s) to the report on the grounds that it / they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as set out in the Exclusion Paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government

Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007.

- 2.2 Information which falls within paragraphs 12 to 15, 17 and 18 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended is exempt information if and so long as in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.
- 2.3 The specific Exclusion Paragraphs and the Public Interest Tests to be applied are listed in **Appendix A**.
- 2.4 Where paragraph 16 of the Schedule 12A applies there is no public interest test. Councillors are able to consider whether they wish to waive their legal privilege in the information, however, given that this may place the Council in a position of risk, it is not something that should be done as a matter of routine.

### **3. Financial Implications**

- 3.1 There are no financial implications associated with this report.

### **4. Legal Implications**

- 4.1 The legislative provisions are set out in the report.
- 4.2 Councillors must consider with regard to each item of business set out in paragraph 2 of this report the following matters:
  - 4.2.1 Whether in relation to that item of business the information is capable of being exempt information, because it falls into one of the paragraphs set out in Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended and reproduced in Appendix A to this report.
  - 4.2.2 If the information does fall within one or more of paragraphs 12 to 15, 17 and 18 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended, the public interest test as set out in paragraph 2.2 of this report.
  - 4.2.3 If the information falls within paragraph 16 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 in considering whether to exclude the public members are not required to apply the public interest test but must consider whether they wish to waive their privilege in relation to that item for any reason.

**Background Papers:** None.

**Appendices:** Appendix A – Public Interest Test.

## Public Interest Test

No.	Relevant Paragraphs in Schedule 12A
<b>12</b>	<b>Information relating to a particular individual.</b>
	<p>The Proper Officer (Monitoring Officer) has determined in preparing this report that paragraph 12 should apply. His view on the public interest test was that to make this information public would disclose personal data relating to an individual in contravention of the principles of the Data Protection Act. Because of this and since there did not appear to be an overwhelming public interest in requiring the disclosure of personal data he felt that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. Members are asked to consider this factor when determining the public interest test, which they must decide when considering excluding the public from this part of the meeting.</p>
<b>13</b>	<b>Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.</b>
	<p>The Proper Officer (Monitoring Officer) has determined in preparing this report that paragraph 13 should apply. His view on the public interest test was that the individual involved was entitled to privacy and that there was no overriding public interest which required the disclosure of the individual's identity. On that basis he felt that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. Members are asked to consider this factor when determining the public interest test, which they must decide when considering excluding the public from this part of the meeting.</p>
<b>14</b>	<b>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).</b>
	<p>The Proper Officer (Monitoring Officer) has determined in preparing this report that paragraph 14 should apply. His view on the public interest test was that:</p> <p><b>a)</b> Whilst he was mindful of the need to ensure the transparency and accountability of public authority for decisions taken by them in relation to the spending of public money, the right of a third party to the privacy of their financial / business affairs outweighed the need for that information to be made public; or</p> <p><b>b)</b> Disclosure of the information would give an unfair advantage to tenderers for commercial contracts.</p> <p>This information is not affected by any other statutory provision which requires the information to be publicly registered.</p> <p>On that basis he felt that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. Members are asked to consider this factor when determining the public interest test, which they must decide when considering excluding the public from this part of the meeting.</p>

No.	Relevant Paragraphs in Schedule 12A
15	<p><b>Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority.</b></p>
	<p>The Proper Officer (Monitoring Officer) has determined in preparing this report that paragraph 15 should apply. His view on the public interest test was that whilst he is mindful of the need to ensure that transparency and accountability of public authority for decisions taken by them he was satisfied that in this case disclosure of the information would prejudice the discussion in relation to labour relations to the disadvantage of the authority and inhabitants of its area. On that basis he felt that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. Members are asked to consider this factor when determining the public interest test, which they must decide when considering excluding the public from this part of the meeting.</p>
16	<p><b>Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.</b></p>
	<p>No public interest test.</p>
17	<p><b>Information which reveals that the authority proposes:</b>  <b>(a) To give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or</b>  <b>(b) To make an order or direction under any enactment.</b></p>
	<p>The Proper Officer (Monitoring Officer) has determined in preparing this report that paragraph 17 should apply. His view on the public interest test was that the authority's statutory powers could be rendered ineffective or less effective were there to be advanced knowledge of its intention/the proper exercise of the Council's statutory power could be prejudiced by the public discussion or speculation on the matter to the detriment of the authority and the inhabitants of its area. On that basis he felt that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. Members are asked to consider this factor when determining the public interest test, which they must decide when considering excluding the public from this part of the meeting.</p>
18	<p><b>Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime</b></p>
	<p>The Proper Officer (Monitoring Officer) has determined in preparing this report that paragraph 18 should apply. His view on the public interest test was that the authority's statutory powers could be rendered ineffective or less effective were there to be advanced knowledge of its intention/the proper exercise of the Council's statutory power could be prejudiced by public discussion or speculation on the matter to the detriment of the authority and the inhabitants of its area. On that basis he felt that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. Members are asked to consider this factor when determining the public interest test, which they must decide when considering excluding the public from this part of the meeting.</p>

# Agenda Item 10

By virtue of paragraph(s) 14 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972  
as amended by the Local Government (Access to  
Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 14 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972  
as amended by the Local Government (Access to  
Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007.

Document is Restricted

# Agenda Item 11

By virtue of paragraph(s) 14 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972  
as amended by the Local Government (Access to  
Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007.

Document is Restricted



By virtue of paragraph(s) 14 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972  
as amended by the Local Government (Access to  
Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007.

Document is Restricted

# Agenda Item 12

By virtue of paragraph(s) 14 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972  
as amended by the Local Government (Access to  
Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007.

Document is Restricted

# Agenda Item 13

By virtue of paragraph(s) 14 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972  
as amended by the Local Government (Access to  
Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 14 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972  
as amended by the Local Government (Access to  
Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 14 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972  
as amended by the Local Government (Access to  
Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007.

Document is Restricted