

# Public service governance and administration survey

Summary of results and commentary

May 2018

The Pensions  
Regulator

## Background

We regulate the governance and administration of public service pension schemes, which provide pensions for over 16.7 million civil servants, members of the judiciary, local government, teachers, health service workers, members of fire and rescue services, members of police forces and members of the armed forces.

Our Code of Practice no. 14, available at [www.tpr.gov.uk/code14](http://www.tpr.gov.uk/code14), sets out the standards of conduct and practice we expect from public service pension schemes.

We open cases based on the risks we see in schemes and in response to breach of law and whistleblowing reports. Where standards are not being met and issues are not being resolved we consider enforcement action, including the use of improvement notices and civil penalties.

To help us focus our efforts, we surveyed public service pension schemes in autumn 2017 to assess how they were being run. This built on previous surveys in autumn 2016 and summer 2015. In this latest survey we have further examined certain risks and areas of underperformance that schemes identified in previous years.

As in previous years, the survey was an online self-completion questionnaire which was sent for the attention of each scheme contact. We received responses from 191 of the 207 public service pension schemes, covering 98% of memberships. This allows us to draw robust conclusions from the results. This policy summary also draws from the engagement we have undertaken with schemes over the past year through casework, board meetings, training sessions, conferences and speaking events.

This report sets out how we have interpreted the findings, our expectations of those involved in running the schemes and what we will be doing over the next year to address these issues. It accompanies the full research report which shows the responses to all survey questions.

## Summary

The survey supports our existing assessment that the top risks in this landscape are around scheme governance, record-keeping and internal controls, but identifies significant improvements in these areas. Many more schemes are now meeting the basic governance standards, allowing us to focus on building further improvements.

Overall, we were pleased by the significant improvements in performance across most of the areas addressed in the survey, in particular the much improved governance reported by the Police and Fire schemes. While they continue to lag behind their peers, we anticipate that these schemes will continue to show improvements across all governance areas in 2018.

In the third year of having a statutory deadline, 60% of schemes reported that all members had received their annual benefit statement on time. This is a commendable improvement on the previous year when less than half (43%) of schemes met the deadline.

We are pleased to see increased engagement from scheme managers and pension boards in running the schemes. However, the survey shows that over two-fifths (43%) of schemes hold fewer than four meetings a year. In our view, this provides inadequate opportunity for pension boards to effectively carry out their role and raises concerns about the quality of governance.

We also see signs that process improvements have stalled in some Local Government schemes. This group was also the one that was least likely to respond to the survey and we are concerned about the risks of disengagement. Because of the specific challenges faced by Local Government schemes, we expect to focus casework activities on this group in the coming year.

## Scheme governance

The results of this year's survey have shown encouraging improvements in scheme governance. The Police and Fire schemes deserve a particular mention for the improvements they have made over the last year, from a low base. It is also noticeable that the group of centrally administered schemes has also shown improvements in governance, which is pleasing given that they are generally large and complex arrangements.

All six of the key processes monitored by us have improved since 2015, and three have shown improvements since 2016. Of these six processes, the most notable increase has been in schemes that have a documented policy to manage board members' conflicts of interest. This was in place in 92% of schemes, an increase of 11 percentage points since 2016.

A similar improvement was seen in schemes with documented procedures for assessing and managing risks. These are now present in 83% of schemes, an increase of 11 percentage points since 2016.

These items are basic features of scheme governance and we expect this year's improvements to continue. By the end of the year, all schemes should have a conflicts of interest policy and procedures for assessing and managing risks in place.

One of our main messages to public service schemes over the past year has been about the importance of good quality scheme data. It is therefore disappointing to see an apparent fall in the number of schemes with processes to monitor records for accuracy and completeness. This year, 15% of schemes stated that they did not have these in place, a decline of four percentage points since 2016. This suggests that schemes may have reviewed the processes they believed they had in place and have found them either absent or inadequate.

Only 58% of schemes have all six key processes in place. This leaves over 4.8 million members (29%) in a scheme that does not have a complete set of basic governance features in place.

Good governance is essential to pension schemes delivering good member outcomes. This is a key focus for us, through our ongoing programme on 21st century trusteeship and governance, which can be found at [www.thepensionsregulator.gov.uk/21st-century-trusteeship](http://www.thepensionsregulator.gov.uk/21st-century-trusteeship).

We are pleased that there appears to be a greater awareness of their governance duties among scheme managers and pension boards<sup>1</sup>. However, we remain concerned that scheme managers are not always working well with pension boards. While 85% of surveys were completed

<sup>1</sup> Further information regarding the roles and responsibilities of those involved in governing public service pensions schemes can be found at [www.thepensionsregulator.gov.uk/public-service-schemes/roles-and-responsibilities.aspx](http://www.thepensionsregulator.gov.uk/public-service-schemes/roles-and-responsibilities.aspx)

with the involvement of the scheme manager, the pension board chair was only involved in 45% of responses, and pension board members in just 16%. This may lead to a biased or unbalanced view of the performance and risks facing the scheme.

We also have doubts about the commitment shown towards scheme governance. Encouragingly, while 88% of scheme managers or their representatives now attend every pension board meeting, these meetings occur less than quarterly in 43% of schemes. This appears to only be an issue in locally administered schemes, and is independent of the size or structure of a scheme. We do not believe that schemes can be governed effectively through occasional meetings, particularly given the time dependent nature of many of the issues to be addressed.

The infrequent nature of meetings in many schemes may result in a superficial assessment of the challenges they face. Despite four-fifths (80%) of schemes saying they had the resources and knowledge needed to run the scheme effectively, a third (31%) do not actually regularly evaluate the performance or effectiveness of the board.

Over the coming year we will continue to focus on improving governance in public service pension schemes. In addition to our 21st century governance work, we will continue to educate scheme managers and pension boards through face-to-face meetings, and we will work with scheme advisory boards and other stakeholders to reach disengaged scheme managers. The vast majority of respondents have used the resources on the public service section of our website and have found them useful. We would encourage schemes to make further use of them. Materials online include practical guidance on how to comply with legal requirements such as an example risk register, an internal controls checklist and a self assessment tool enabling schemes to identify issues and ways to address them.

Engagement by TPR was identified by 43% of schemes as a driver of improved governance and administration in the last year. We believe by clearly communicating about the standards we expect from all parties, and by providing tools to help schemes meet these standards, we can continue to support improvements in governance and administration. Schemes and other interested parties may request a speaker from TPR at their events by using our speaker request form at <https://secure.thepensionsregulator.gov.uk/speaker-request.aspx>.

## Record-keeping

Failure to maintain complete and accurate member records will affect a scheme's ability to carry out its most basic function; paying the right members the right benefits at the right time. Record-keeping issues in public service schemes are well known and 39% of respondents identified this as a top risk to their scheme. Schemes reported that almost a fifth (18%) of breaches of law were caused by a failure to maintain records or rectify errors.

### Data

We have made our expectation clear that all schemes should do an annual data review. However, 17% of schemes had not carried out a data review in the last twelve months, and a further 8% were not sure. The value of regular data reviews is clear; 69% of schemes carrying them out identified issues, an increase of 9% from last year. However, the survey still raises concerns about how effective some of the data reviews have been. It is questionable that just over a quarter (28%) that had carried out a review did not identify any issues.

We are aware that some schemes have embarked on a multi-year process intended to review and reconcile their data and we welcome this activity. While the scope of these plans is not clear, we are not surprised that few schemes have completed the rectification of their data (7%), given the scale of the projects to be undertaken. It may be difficult and uneconomic to rectify all data issues at one time, and we support schemes that prioritise the work in a structured, sequential way.

In the past year, we have set out our expectations around data security and provided additional guidance on developing a good data improvement plan. We will consider enforcement action where scheme managers fail to demonstrate that they are taking appropriate steps to improve their records, including having a robust improvement plan in place.

For the first time, the 2018 scheme return will ask schemes to report on their common and scheme specific data scores. While our research indicates that a good proportion of schemes are familiar with these terms, we will be producing further material for scheme managers on this subject. We also intend to work with scheme advisory boards this year to encourage the creation of common data standards that can be adopted by employers to ease the problems faced by schemes and their employers.

Employer compliance with data standards continues to be an issue for schemes and was recognised as a barrier to improving governance and administration by 28% of schemes. Timely data was provided to all employers in just 37% of schemes, and accurate data was received from all employers by less than a third (30%) of schemes. Scheme managers should work with employers to ensure processes are effective and fit for purpose, and take action to rectify issues in the first instance. The use of penalties by schemes remains low, and we would encourage schemes to take all reasonable measures available to them before asking us to intervene with our own powers.

## Administration

Pension boards should pay close attention to the performance of their scheme administrators, since they are critical to the good running of the scheme. It is notable that two of the top three causes of complaints received by schemes<sup>2</sup> have a basis in poor administration and poor record-keeping.

We have made it clear that schemes and pension boards should focus on administration as a key influence on data quality and member outcomes. It is therefore disappointing that administrators operate without service level agreements in place in over a quarter (26%) of schemes and that only a fifth (20%) of schemes use penalties where service or contractual standards are not met. This lack of accountability by administrators is most noticeable in the 46% of schemes that are managed in-house, or where administration is outsourced to another public body (24%).

Schemes should ensure that administration is a feature of every pension board meeting (24% currently do not), so they have sight of emerging issues and trends. Administrators can also provide regular reports to the scheme manager (17% of schemes do not do this). Schemes may wish to consider whether to obtain assurance reports on the performance of their administrators, or to commission assurance reports themselves.

2  
Inaccuracies or disputes around pension value or definition (31%) and slow or ineffective communication (30%)

## Internal controls

Scheme managers, pension board members and other parties have a duty to report breaches of the law to us in certain circumstances. Nine out of ten schemes (90%) now have procedures in place to identify (92%) and report (91%) breaches of law. This is a significant improvement from previous years. Fewer schemes had identified or reported any breaches of law this year, and we attribute this to the improvement in producing annual benefit statements. However, we remain concerned that schemes may be choosing not to report material breaches in certain circumstances as they are concerned about the potential consequences.

## Member communications

Public service schemes must provide annual benefit statements to active members by a specific deadline, generally 31 August. This year, respondents reported that 92% of members received their annual benefit statement on time, a significant improvement on the 75% seen in 2016. However, only 60% of respondents reported that all their members received their statements on time. We recognise that public service pension schemes initially faced challenges meeting their new duties. However, we expect schemes to have made significant progress by now and will have much less tolerance for shortcomings this year.

## Taking action

Scheme managers should be aware that we are more likely to use our enforcement powers this year. Where we open cases, we will work with the schemes involved to resolve gaps in their risk and breach of law processes. When considering action or setting fines, we will take into account a party's co-operation with us, and their efforts to put things right. For example, those who fail to report breaches to us quickly could receive a higher penalty for a breach, and an additional penalty for a failure to report. You can find further information in our monetary penalty policy at [www.tpr.gov.uk/ps-monetary](http://www.tpr.gov.uk/ps-monetary).

We have taken, and will take, enforcement action where scheme managers have not taken sufficient action to address issues or meet their duties. In line with our compliance and enforcement policy (found at [www.tpr.gov.uk/strategy](http://www.tpr.gov.uk/strategy)), we will continue to publish reports of our regulatory activities - including enforcement activity - to encourage higher standards.



## How to contact us

Napier House  
Trafalgar Place  
Brighton  
BN1 4DW

[www.tpr.gov.uk](http://www.tpr.gov.uk)

[www.trusteetoolkit.com](http://www.trusteetoolkit.com)

Free online learning for trustees

[www.pensionseducationportal.com](http://www.pensionseducationportal.com)

Free online learning for those running public service schemes

## Public service governance and administration survey

Summary of results and commentary

© The Pensions Regulator May 2018

You can reproduce the text in this publication as long as you quote The Pensions Regulator's name and title of the publication. Please contact us if you have any questions about this publication. This document aims to be fully compliant with WCAG 2.0 accessibility standards and we can produce it in Braille, large print or in audio format. We can also produce it in other languages.

The Pensions  
Regulator