



Item		Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GP confirmed he had written to Carl Horsburgh regarding his attendance at meetings and that he had decided to stand down from his position as a Board member. The reasons for this were that he felt he was unable to 'represent members' interests' or 'play an active role'.</li> <li>• GP to do a Bulletin item inviting EOIs from staff to join the Board as Employee Reps. The importance of ensuring that any prospective members have a clear understanding of what the role involves was emphasised.</li> <li>• MR felt it would be useful to clarify the role of 'shadow' members and include this in the ToRs; it was agreed that if the Board is not quorate shadow members would be eligible to act as bone fide Employee Reps.</li> <li>• HS noted that most Boards she attends find it easier to recruit from FBU members and a number also have pensioners as members.</li> <li>• SL advised that TPR are planning to do some training around the single Code of Practice; HS added that WYPF are planning to deliver training which their clients will be invited to attend.</li> <li>• SL to speak to NC again regarding his training needs. SL to update GP when she has a date for this so he can ensure there are sufficient numbers on station to provide cover.</li> <li>• Action carried forward: MR noted that a number of Pension Boards seem to be exceeding their remit in terms of pension schemes yet appear to be held up as examples of best practice; MR to discuss with Cllr Roger Phillips.</li> <li>• MR confirmed he had spoken to the CFO regarding the acknowledgment of IDRPs forms to ensure an appropriate system is in place.</li> </ul>	<p>GP</p> <p>NS</p> <p>SL/GP</p> <p>MR</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Pensions Board Training Needs</b></p> <p>No specific training needs were identified.</p> <p>HS noted that there are currently no details regarding timeframes for the introduction of the single Code of Practice but undertook to follow this up.</p> <p>Warwickshire are organising training regarding Matthews and others, and there may be opportunity for us to piggy back onto this (HS advised the consultation should be out in March).</p>	<p>HS</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Scheme Advisory Board Update</b></p> <p>Pension Board members all had a copy of the SAB update. HS &amp; SL noted the following:</p> <p><u>Matthews</u>: forms are available on the LGA website for members to complete in order to determine whether or not they are in scope for the second exercise. MR noted we have 3 blocks of people: current employees, former employees (with last known addresses) and others for whom addresses have been archived. A number of people who should have been in scope didn't appear on our list. Given the</p>	

Item		Action
	<p>amount of work involved, particularly in terms of chasing up addresses (for which it may be an option to use an agency), it was decided to defer sending letters until we have a more informed position regarding eligible members information. In the meantime, SL to repeat the SB item and include a link to the generic FPS form.</p> <p>HS noted it might be possible for WYPF to reference Matthews when sending ABS, DBS and P60s and undertook to raise this internally.</p> <p><u>IQMPs</u>: some FRAs are having difficulties finding IQMPs so the LGA is looking to hold a central list that FRAs could approach. FRSs have been asked to approach their IQMPs to see if they would be happy to be included on this list. SL noted that Heales appoint their own IQMP; unless we feel a need to intervene, we are comfortable with this arrangement as it provides some distance between the Service and the IQMP.</p> <p><u>Ill Health Retirement</u>: some individuals who have been awarded ill health retirement during the remedy period might need to be reassessed under different regulations under rollback. FPS have put together a factsheet to help FRAs determine if anyone needs to be reassessed; HWFRS have 2 affected members and both have been assessed under both schemes.</p> <p><u>Injury to Feelings ET for transitional protection</u>: this applies to all original 2015 claims and it is understood that these have now been settled; there is still some dispute over claims served in 2020. SL noted that the FBU website states that '9,000 FFs are set to receive a pay-out of at least £3,750'. HWFRS has approx. 200 FBU members in service.</p> <p><u>Public Service Pensions Remedy</u>: consultation on the proposed draft regulations on pensions tax rules closed on 6<sup>th</sup> January. HS noted that HMRC are supposed to be producing a calculator and WYPF will reissue annual statements to anyone with a breach as a result of rollback.</p> <p><u>RDS FF ET pension claims</u>: the FBU have submitted a tribunal claim and we are likely to receive 2 claims. This concerns On-Call staff in the 1992 scheme who have become WT and wish to aggregate periods of pensionable service in both roles.</p>	<p>SL</p> <p>HS</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Risk Register Update</b></p> <p>The Risk Register was reviewed and the following points noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following discussion at the previous meeting, we now have a BCP in place in the event of a cyber security attack. HS suggested that this, and any other risks that currently sit with WYPF, should also be in place for our payroll provider: SL to follow up with Tania Ling.</li> <li>• HS also suggested we seek evidence from our payroll provider around KPIs to ensure they are meeting the terms of the contract. SL to speak to Tania to ascertain if she receives this information from Warwickshire. AE to follow up with the HR Department.</li> <li>• PEN005 (changes to regulations following court cases) – change likelihood from 4 to 3.</li> <li>• PEN006 (interruption to service as a result of Covid) – archive.</li> </ul>	<p>SL</p> <p>SL AE</p>

Item		Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PEN015 (failure to communicate with staff members) – change likelihood to 2.</li> <li>• Now that SL is providing support to SFRS, it was agreed to log a new risk around the potential risk/impact on us in terms of failure to backfill SL's role whilst she is supporting SFRS.</li> <li>• MR/AE to draft a SLB paper to request an increase in pensions admin support for SL's role from 50% to 100% using the income received from SFRS.</li> </ul> <p>SL to update the Risk Register based on the above.</p>	<p>MR/AE</p> <p>SL</p>
7.	<p><b>Composition of Scheme Membership/KPIs/Data Scores/Completed Processes</b></p> <p><u>Scheme Membership</u></p> <p>All staff are now in the 2015 scheme – 95% of WT and 93% of On-Call. Over 50% of members are RDS so we need to consider this when issuing comms.</p> <p><u>Data Scores</u></p> <p>HS confirmed that the slight drop in the 2015 Scheme Specific score is because scoring is calculated differently for active and deferred members; this means that the Scheme Specific percentage will always fluctuate.</p> <p><u>KPIs</u></p> <p>The 'Deferred Benefits set up on Leaving' KPI looks worse than it actually is due to the small numbers involved with one of only four cases taking longer than average.</p>	
8.	<p><b>IDRPs / Breaches</b></p> <p><u>IDRPs</u></p> <p>1 new IDRPs had been received since the last meeting – another Immediate Detriment.</p> <p>SL to check the detail around Item 20 on the list of IDRPs which is currently showing as having gone to a Stage 2.</p> <p>Item 17 is not being pursued so can be shown as greyed out (as per Item 16).</p> <p><u>Breaches</u></p> <p>1 new breach added since the last meeting relating to the incorrect aggregation of pensionable pay. Two members should have been included in the first options exercise and, as a result, WCC had aggregated 18 months of service which we are in the process of rectifying. It was not felt necessary to report this to TPR.</p>	<p>SL</p> <p>SL</p>
9.	<p><b>Decisions Log</b></p> <p>SL to add the following to the Decisions Log:</p>	<p>SL</p>

Item		Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulletin item to attract new Board members.</li> <li>• Add additional sentence around the use of shadow representatives under the quorum section of Board ToRs.</li> <li>• Hold off on sending letters re. Matthews until we have further information. SL to reissue Bulletin item on this subject.</li> <li>• Amend risk register scores and include payroll provider risks as additional risks.</li> <li>• Support uplift in admin support for Pension Officer; MR/AE to draft a paper for SLB.</li> <li>• Decision taken not to record new breach to TPR re. aggregation of pensionable pay.</li> </ul>	
10.	<p><b>Immediate Detriment</b></p> <p>No further update.</p>	
11.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>GP noted that the Service has completed and submitted The Pensions Regulator Public Service Governance and Administration Survey 2022-23.</p>	
12.	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>Tuesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2023 at 1400 hrs (in person or via MS Teams)</p> <p>Apologies: SL</p>	