

By: Chairman Superannuation Fund Committee  
Corporate Director Finance and Procurement

To: Superannuation Fund Committee – 30 August 2013

Subject: **RESPONSE TO CLG CONSULTATION ON SCHEME GOVERNANCE**

Classification: Unrestricted.

---

Summary: To agree a response to the consultation document.

## **FOR DECISION**

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

1. The consultation document is attached as is a briefing note from Hymans Robertson.

### **RESPONSE**

2. This consultation document is quite confusing as it seems to be a response to a problem which does not exist. Councils already have the ability to introduce a range of different representatives as the Kent Fund has done.
3. Under the LGPS Regulations the pension benefits of scheme members are protected by statute. In that context it makes little sense to have a Pensions Board with half the members drawn from employees. The financial risk of the scheme sits firmly with the employers and if a Board has to be set up it would be more appropriate for employers to have the majority of the membership.
4. The Superannuation Fund Committee already has a diverse membership and exercises a scrutiny role over the investment managers and the scheme officers. It is very hard to see what a Pensions Board would add to the scrutiny which already takes place.
5. A suggested response is attached.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

6. Members are asked to agree the response.

**Nick Vickers**  
**Head of Financial Services**  
**Ext 4603**