

**Teachers' Pension Scheme Pension Board (TPSPB)
Service Delivery and Maintenance of Data Sub-Committee**

23 March 2022 - (by Teams teleconference)

Present:		
Jackie Wood	Employer Representative – Chair	JW
Susan Anyan	Independent Pension Specialist	SA
Simon Lowe	Employer Representative	SL
Peter Strike	Member Representative	PS
Heather McKenzie	Member Representative	HM
Susan Fielden	Employer Representative (observer)	SF
Danielle Barker	TP Head of Operations	DBa
Amy Gibbs	TP Head of Governance and Risk	AG
Anna Alderson	DfE Senior Contract Manager and Programme Management Office	AA
Zaheer Patel	DfE Contract Manager	ZP
Kathryn Symms	DfE Casework & Correspondence & TPSPB	KS
Kelly Elliott	DfE Secretariat	KE
Diana Wray	DfE Secretariat	DW
Lizzy Chard	DfE Policy Manager (Observer)	LC
John Simmons	CEM Benchmarking	JS
Hannah Blomfield	CEM Benchmarking	HB

	Item	Action
Agenda Item 1	<p>Welcome and Apologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JW welcomed those in attendance – including SF to her first SD&MoD sub-committee meeting, JS and HB from CEM Benchmarking, and LC as observer. The minutes from 15 December 2021 were ratified. 	
Agenda Item 2	<p>CEM Benchmarking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JW explained that CEM Benchmarking is an independent company that specialises in providing benchmarking insight into pension schemes worldwide. The report covers the period April 2020 to March 2021. HB stated that CEM had tried to maintain a static peer group to ensure accurate comparison to previous years. She noted that TP's administrative cost per member was one of the lowest within the peer group, and that the Business as Usual (BAU) cost per member was almost half the cost of the peer median. Project cost per member was slightly closer to the median, but still low. Governance costs were relatively low compared to the peer group. However, it was noted that the structure of some schemes with assets and resources relating to running a business programme would naturally have higher governance costs. The overall member service score had decreased slightly by two points compared to 2020, but was still comfortably above the peer median. Other schemes had experienced a more significant decrease in total points, and this was mainly attributed to the impact of COVID-19. TP's handling of COVID-19 challenges was impressive and the scheme should be applauded for their performance. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In summary, compared to the peer group, the TPS review was positive. Tracing deferred members had improved significantly this year, which impacted the scheme's overall score. The TPS had a good quality digital offering compared to the peer group and the scheme actively surveyed members to gain feedback on levels of satisfaction. The difference in performance was not significant in areas where the TPS scored lower than peers. • One particular issue within the scheme had a considerable impact on the total score, resulting in a three-point deduction. Without this, the score would have continued to rise as per the yearly trend. The issue is not expected to reoccur and so the score is expected to increase next year. • HB noted that the scheme was comfortably situated in the low-cost, high-quality service bracket and is expected to continue to improve. • AG noted that the review was mostly positive and safeguards are in place to ensure the error is not repeated. She was pleased to note that the scheme had maintained low cost and high quality while facing challenges. • SL agreed that the report was positive, but also noted that, historically, backlogs of work had taken considerable time to resolve. He wondered if the low-cost element of the scheme contributed to these timescales. • AG stated that TP has a risk management framework, carries out close operational monitoring and manages capacity carefully to address unexpected situations and to minimize impact, and that there is still a desire to maintain low cost. • SL asked whether complaint volumes was a cause for concern. • AG and JS confirmed that there was a lack of consistency in reporting across the schemes. JS acknowledged that not all schemes were providing information according to the same standard, and TP were perhaps a degree more transparent than others. He noted that some schemes were experiencing known serious service issues and yet this was not reflected in their complaints volume. The benchmarking exercise is likely to exclude this metric next year because the lack of consistency is unhelpful. • PS echoed SL's comments regarding cost, but also noted that the CEM data was now a year old and recently SLA performance has improved. However, he noted that TP's response to tax queries was significantly slower than peers, and the timescales for issuing lump sums on death had longer timescales than peers. He wondered if greater resource in certain areas could make the scheme more effective. • JS advised that a significant difference between schemes was the level of control over a budget to invest in administration. For schemes like the TPS, the process of procuring services and spending public money involved greater barriers and higher levels of permissions. • JS noted that a scheme with a £150 administrative cost per member was not delivering as good a service as the TPS. He added that the TPS was a great example globally of how to deliver high quality service at low cost. • AG added that the number of employers within the schemes would also have an impact on data. The TPS has approximately 	
--	--	--

	<p>12,500 employers and a large amount of the scheme's administration requires employer input. However, she added that employer service and support was something TP wanted to do better.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PS stated that the fragmentation of the school system had caused an increase in the number of employers. AG agreed and explained that the contract allowed for an increase in core charges when the membership increased. There were triggers in place for TP to request further funding. • JW asked for an explanation regarding the cost per member decrease versus the BAU increase. JS explained that although BAU costs had increased slightly, the TPS membership had also increased, so the cost had been spread over a larger base. • JW thanked HB and JS for their report and CEM colleagues left the meeting. 	
Agenda Item 3	<p>Actions from the previous meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JW noted all items were closed. 	
Agenda Item 4	<p>Transitional Protection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AA advised that the Public Services Pensions & Judicial Offices Bill received Royal Assent on 10 March, therefore the scheme could now make amendments to the TPS Regulations later this year to enable Transitional Protection casework to commence. • The final salary scheme would be closed from 31 March and members would be moved into the career average scheme from 1 April. • Rectification work is planned to begin in October 2022. The Commercials are still being worked through, with agreement and contract signature due by 31 March. 	
Agenda Item 5	<p>Any issues raised from TPARG (3 March):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZP advised that no issues had been raised. 	
Agenda Item 6	<p>Review Dashboard and supporting papers:</p> <p>Dashboard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JW was pleased to note that the cases being processed were exceeding the number received in the same period. • PS noted that the new pie chart showing the make-up of sectors and sector membership was interesting, for example showing more accurately the number of FE and HE members. He queried whether the amount of money associated with each sector was available. • AG agreed to investigate whether the value of contributions received by sector was available. <p>Quarterly Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AA stated that the winter retirement exercise was completed successfully. • She advised that there had been changes to the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) relating to complaints to enhance the member experience. TP is now achieving 100% performance within this KPI, and that service level performance 	SD1/230322

	<p>is generally being achieved across board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was still some progress to be made regarding SLA 3. TP and the Department are working on changes to the reporting mechanisms associated with it which will be reported in the next quarterly report. • Outcome Measures were generally performing well and there was an understanding regarding the reasoning behind those that were not being achieved as successfully. More positive results were expected in the next quarter because fewer complaints were being received, and they were being answered in a more timely and accurate manner, increasing member satisfaction. • JW noted that at the last meeting the Goodwin cases were being processed ahead of what expected and now some of the cases were not progressing as quickly. She asked for reassurance that the project was still on target. • AA advised that TP had recruited a significant number of staff onto the Goodwin and Transitional Protection teams. However, training and mentoring has brought down productivity. This is expected to recover by the end of March. Overall, Goodwin is ahead of schedule and the expectation was for this to continue. • AA advised that the feasibility of the Month Contributions Reconciliation (MCR) April 2022 deadline was being discussed. • AG added that additional management had been put in place to support the process. Employer relationship managers were also involved to try to support the 1400 or so employers that TP had struggled to engage with. • JW noted that some live employers were facing difficulties and she understood it was a challenging project. She also noted that some employers had already received post-April onboarding dates. • ZP drew attention to the Historic Revisions mini-project. He explained that these c90,000 had been difficult to triage, but that process will be completed by the end of April. Processing casework is scheduled to begin properly in May, and regular forecast and burndown reporting will be provided to the Department. Of the 1300 cases processed, 322 produced an overpayment – with the highest overpayment value so far being £3,500. • DBa provided an update on aged complaint cases. She advised that there were now three remaining, and these are complex cases. Third parties are involved in all three, but it is hoped that the cases will be concluded by the end of March. • SF asked if any information was available regarding the number of employers who have acted regarding the indexation issue; and whether there may be an administrative burden on TP. HM also raised concerns as to whether the situation should be monitored. • AA replied that there was no information regarding this and it was an employment issue between the member and the employer. Employers would report a change in salary to TP in the normal way. • AA advised that the Scheme Advisory Board (SAB) is working with stakeholders regarding the policy but that the regulations are working as intended. 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KS advised that any action taken would not be retrospective so casework would not need to be revisited. DBa also assured the sub-committee that there were risk and capacity plans in place in case there is an increase in employer activity. <p>Issue Log</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JW noted no issues had been reported. <p>Complaints Dashboard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JW felt it was positive that the volume of complaints had dropped significantly compared to the last quarter. DBa agreed there had been a marked improvement and that KPI measures were predominately being achieved at 100%. She advised sub-committee members that although a reduction in level of complaints had been reported in this quarter, there has been an increase recently, but this was still significantly lower than 12-months ago. 	
Agenda Item 7	<p>Agree Key Issues from the Meeting / Report to highlight at the next TPSPB meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEM Benchmarking MCR project delay CAN update on Transitional Protection 	
Agenda Item 8	<p>Agree whether any individual papers or presentation should be shared with remaining Board members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEM Benchmarking presentation 	SD2/230322
Agenda Item 9	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was agreed that the June and September 2022 meetings would be held face to face in Darlington, and December 2022 meeting would be by Teams. For 2023, it was agreed that alternate meetings would be face-to-face starting in March 2023. 	
Next meeting	22 June 2022 in Darlington	

Minutes agreed by Chair: *Jackie Wood*

Date: 28 March 2022

Confirmed by circulation to sub-committee members on: 30 March 2022

To be ratified at sub-committee meeting on 22 June 2022