
**Teachers’ Pension Scheme Pension Board (TPSPB)**

**19 April 2023 (in London)**

**MINUTES**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present:**  **Board Members** |  | **Also Attending:** |  |
| Neville Mackay (Chair) | NM | Stuart Heatley (Managing Director of Capita Pensions | SH |
| Susan Anyan (Independent Pension Specialist) | SA | Alistair Dennis (Head of Teachers’ Pensions at Capita) | AD |
| Maria Chondrogianni (Member representative | MC | Danielle Barker (Head of TP Operations) | DB |
| Susan Fielden (Employer representative) | SF | Anna Leonard (Head of Supplier Management, DfE) | AL |
| Heather McKenzie (Member representative) | HM | Peter Springhall DfE (Deputy Director) | PSp |
| John Pratten (Employer representative) | JP | John Brown (DfE Head of Policy Projects) | JB |
| Peter Strike (Member representative) | PS | Emir Feisal (DfE representative for ARC) | EF |
| Simon Lowe (Employer representative) | SL | Jeff Rogerson (DfE Head of Assurance and Planning) | JR |
| John McGill (Member representative) | JM |  |  |
| Yvonne Moult (Employer Representative) |  | **Secretariat** |  |
|  |  | Melanie Phillip | MP |
| **Apologies:** |  | Helen Cowan | HC |
| Kate Atkinson (Member Representative) | KA | Kelly Elliott | KE |
| Lisa Sproats (Employer Representative) | LS | Ruby Kennedy | RK |
| Amy Gibbs (TP Head of Governance and Risk) | AG |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | **Action** |
| Agenda item 1 | **Introduction, attendance, apologies:**   * NM welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular new Board members John McGill and Yvonne Moult. * NM introduced Emir Feisal, member of the department’s Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) responsible for TPS matters, who was observing the meeting and Stuart Heatley, Managing Director of Capita Pensions, who was providing an update at agenda item 9. * Apologies were received from Kate Atkinson, Lisa Sproats and Amy Gibbs (TP).   **Minutes of the previous meeting (Paper 2):**   * The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting of 18 January 2023.   **Register of Interests:**   * NM noted the updates to the register and was satisfied there were no conflicts of interest to prevent the meeting going ahead. |  |
| Agenda item 2 | **Actions update (Paper 3):**  NM discussed the ‘open’ actions -   * **AP3/191022 *Cross cutting strategic issue – Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI paper 4****)* and the overarching equalities analysis that the Department would like to conduct. JB reported this would commence once Transitional Protection was in the delivery stage. * **AP6/191022** ***Cross cutting strategic issue – Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*** – consideration should be given to the advice from TPR once issued. JB confirmed that he will ensure that scheme rules meet the recommendations and requirements. * **AP13/191022** – ***The future role of the Commercial sub-committee.*** Would be discussed later in the agenda. * **AP1/180123** – ***regarding DfE’s representation on the Board*** would discussed during the agenda item on the Board’s Terms of Reference. |  |
| Agenda Item 3 | **Independent Pension Specialist Update**   * SA reported that the Government have retained the current public service pensions discount rate methodology. * There were major pension changes within the Spring budget. The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced the complete abolition of the pensions tax Lifetime Allowance (LA). However, the Government opposition have said that they would reverse this change which would have an operational impact on the scheme administration. * The Pensions (Extension of Automatic Enrolment) (No. 2) Bill replaces a similar earlier bill that has been withdrawn. This Bill changes the scope of employees to be included in the process. This is a matter for employers, but the scheme should ensure that auto-enrolment is being managed appropriately. * The Department for Work and Pensions has announced a delay to the connection deadlines for the Pensions Dashboards. The original deadlines will no longer apply and there is currently no update as to the new timetable. JB confirmed planning remained ongoing. * SA advised Article 6 refers to the consultation regarding the second phase of McCloud remedy for NHS Pension Scheme, and Article 7 discusses the launch of the Work and Pensions Committee DB (Defined Benefit) inquiry. These policy improvements do not appear to be aimed at public service schemes, but the Board should consider if the right regulatory framework is in place to enable open DB schemes to thrive and if this impacts the Teachers’ Pensions Scheme (TPS). * The Regulator has also suggested ways to improve the quality of trustee Boards, but this seems aimed at smaller schemes with alternative governance structures to the TPS. * Article 8 covers the rise of Retirement Living Standards costs, and Article 9 refers to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) guidance published by the Pensions Regulator. * In other news, the Government has confirmed that it will not bring forward the date that the state pension age (SPA) will rise to 67. The Pensions Regulator (TPR) has revealed that the consolidated single code of practice will be called the General Code and is now expected to be published this spring. * NM asked JB to confirm the current position surrounding the Teachers’ Pension Scheme: Transitional Protection (McCloud) remedy consultation. JB confirmed the consultation is live and will close on 4 June 2023. * NM questioned if JB anticipated any issues from this consultation. JB advised that the Department is resource ready for responses, of which there had been a small number to date. JB expected more to be received although it was difficult to predict volumes. * NM noted concerns had previously been expressed regarding the timelines surrounding the Pensions Dashboard. He asked JB if the delay was welcome. JB responded that the original timeline was achievable, but more time is welcome. * AD agreed that the extension is welcome but advised that Teachers’ Pensions (TP) are attempting to stay as close to the original onboarding date as possible. NM welcomed this prudent approach. * SA noted that the Government has confirmed plans to move the annual revaluation date in the Local Government Pension Scheme from 1 April to 6 April in order to mitigate the impact of high inflation on the annual allowance. She asked JB if there were any potential direct or indirect consequences of this. * JB advised that public sector schemes have considered the impact of inflation dates against the annual allowance calculation. However, the TPS, Civil Service, and other public service schemes had decided against moving their annual revaluation date due to the cost and disruption the change would create against the small number of members that are affected by the annual allowance. * JM asked how teachers can access financial advice regarding transitional protection to make an appropriate remedy choice. * JB advised that the Department are in conversations with TP and the Scheme Advisory Board (SAB) to consider what support and information could be offered to members but reiterated that, as an administrator, TP are not licenced to offer financial advice. TP will offer as much information as possible regarding the transitional protection to assist with member decisions. * PS noted that employers cannot offer financial advice either. He commented that Financial Advisers (FAs) could also be expensive and it was difficult to find those with high competency in TPS matters. * SF reflected on how much information regarding scheme specifics could be given to the financial industry to aid with competency. * SA recognised that financial advice is not cheap and the Independent Financial Advisor (IFA) market is already stretched, so would struggle to accommodate large volumes of queries from teachers. * JB advised that Money Helper is currently recommended to members and, although this service does not specialise in TPS matter, it is free and advisers could offer generalist advice and direct members to appropriate support. Further options were being considered. * PSp stressed the importance of the administrator providing members with enough information to make an informed decision, though the scheme was limited to the knowledge they have of a member’s involvement within the TPS and are not aware of the full provisions any individual may possess in order to offer regulatory advice. * SA was conscious, particularly within the private sector, of individuals presenting themselves as financial advisors and charging for advice that was not appropriate to needs of members. She reiterated that communications regarding available advice were important in order for members to make informed decisions and to avoid scams and unnecessary fees and advice. * NM suggested this issue be explored further by the Managing Risk & Internal Controls (MRIC) sub-committee or the Information to Members and Communication sub-committee (IMC), who would scrutinise the situation and report back to the Board. The secretariat to discuss which sub-committee would be best. * SF questioned if the abolishment and potential reinstatement of the LA would cause volatility within the scheme membership. * SA advised that this is being considered within the pensions industry. Some members may claim their benefits early, to ensure they do so before a reinstatement occurs, and therefore take advantage of the period of abolition should it be a temporary measure. The number of members likely to reach the LA is relatively small, though individuals could exceed the LA in aggregate by receiving additional pensions outside of the TPS. There could be an increase in the volume of enquiries received regarding the matter, while members try to understand the implications of the change. * NM voiced concerns regarding how the change would be administered, and whether TP envisaged there would be any issues, or if it was straight forward to amend the algorithm. * DB advised that operational processes were already being amended to reflect changes, but there had been no operational impact to date, and the process could accommodate further changes if needed. * TP had considered whether to proactively notify members of this change, but this was deemed unnecessary as members were already engaging with TP on the matter. * NM reflected that the number of affected members was low, but it was important to consider any administrative consequences. * PS noted that dates had not yet been finalised, so it was difficult to offer consideration to any potential changes. NM suggested that the matter be revisited when information was available. * SA reported her observations regarding the Additional Voluntary Contribution (AVC) scheme from her attendance at the Management Advisory Group (MAG) meeting. She clarified that this update was given within her capacity as the Independent Pensions Specialist (IPS) as she attended MAG meetings as a guest and not as a voting member. The update was for information purposes and recognised that the AVC does not fall within the remit of the TPSPB. * SA advised that the annual AVC review considers the financial strength of Prudential (Pru), the range of funds that are available to members, and the performance of those funds. * There was a focus on default funds, such as the Legacy default in the ‘with profits’ fund, and the more modern Unit Links default. * The Government Actuary Division (GAD) complete a full report summarising their views and findings on the arrangements and this supports MAG discussions. The findings were positive overall, and there were no material matters requiring action, but smaller matters were being considered, such as monitoring charges. * SA noted that freestanding AVC schemes, particularly from a private sector point of view, may seem quite attractive as an alternative provider, and individuals may feel they can negotiate better charges. However, freestanding AVCs are somewhat of a legacy - while the AVC assets are quite large, the income in contributions and the renewal of membership is quite low. Therefore, as a commercial proposition, it is potentially not as attractive as it first appears. * Additionally, ‘with profits’ funds within an AVC have the potential to lose guarantees when moved. The matter is quite complex. * Environmental, social and governance (ESG) factors were discussed at the meeting. There were ESG focused funds, and it was understood that this can affect financial performance and is not just a purely ethical matter. * SA felt that the right consideration was being given to the right topics at MAG. * NM recognised that the AVC scheme was outside scope of committee but queried the rationale behind that decision. * JB advised that the AVC scheme is governed separately to the TPS and is run by Pru with little involvement from the Department. The Department’s main interest in the scheme is the investments they utilise. Pru is more of a supplier than a contracted organisation. Previously, there were more significant links between TPS and AVC scheme but these have been severed over time. Members must be teachers to participate, but the benefits are no longer strongly linked. * JR added that the AVC contract is between the member and Pru. * SA clarified that Pru ran a freestanding AVC scheme, not an AVC scheme. An AVC scheme would ordinarily be part of a scheme’s constitution, whereas a freestanding AVC scheme is a commercial product offered externally which is not dictated by DfE. JB confirmed that it may have been dictated by DfE previously, but not anymore. * HM queried when and why this change occurred, and whether it was relevant as she did not think members were aware of the degree of separation between the schemes which could result in enquiries. It was important that information was clear and available to members. * NM noted that the Department invited SA as guest to MAG to create a more formal link between TPSPB responsibilities and the AVC scheme, even though the Board have no formal responsibility regarding AVCs. * PSp advised that AVC governance may have pre-dated the establishment of Pensions Boards, but AVCs are not a public service scheme so do not fall within the Board’s remit. * JM noted that the rules regarding AVCs and the TPS can be confusing and conflicting. Members can potentially be penalised in one scheme by an action within the other. SA acknowledged the potential reputational impact of this. | AP1/190423 |
| Agenda Item 4 | **Policy Update**  **Transitional Protection**   * JB informed the Board that the project is on track for delivery from October 2023. The consultation, together with the draft regulations and equalities impact assessment, is live and will close on 4 June. * The Scheme Advisory Board (SAB) has been involved in the policy and operational aspects and TP are making good progress on building the IT system needed. There was focus on getting the communications to members right and devising a technological solution to individualise those communications. * DB confirmed that rectification activities remained in place, recruitment activities commenced ahead of going live and training is underway.   **Scheme Advisory Board (SAB)**   * JB reported that conversations continued on long covid and whether the ill health provisions are sufficient. The Medical Advisor was unable to attend to discuss ill health assessments and impacts from long covid due to illness so this will be discussed at the next SAB. * JB referred to indexation, which currently only applies if there is a change in pay, meaning members receive a pension freeze along with a salary freeze. A solution was put to SAB for the indexation to be applied bi-annually rather than linked to changes in pay, and to have retrospective effect. * JB confirmed that opt-outs was a standing agenda item for SAB. These increased significantly during covid but are nearly back to pre-covid levels. SAB will continue to monitor. * NM noted the Board’s interest in this area and referred to the IMC sub-committee’s role regarding communications with individual members and schools in respect of discouraging opt-outs. * JM referred to a recent spike in opt-outs of teachers under 30 years of age. JB confirmed that young teachers under 30 were the main source of opt-outs in the scheme but could not confirm if it was a spike or reflective of pre-covid levels.   **Valuation**   * JB referenced the Government announcement they are maintaining the current methodology to determine the SCAPE rate. He acknowledged the upward pressure this will put on the valuation but noted a number of downward pressures too. * Additionally, the Department had been successful in gaining agreement from HMT to provide funding for centrally maintained schools and the Department remains engaged with HMT regarding the impact on the HE sector. * JP referred to schools in phased withdrawal which tended to see younger teachers adopting the new pension scheme where their contributions are lower. Those schools remaining in TPS tend to be larger schools who can afford the higher contributions. If contributions increase to 30%, schools in phased withdrawal should be able to maintain that contribution level due to staff attrition. However, a more significant issue would be the withdrawal of charitable benefits and the VAT on fees which would adversely affect the number of independent schools who remain in the scheme. Consequently, there could be a potential loss of 140,000 students leaving the independent sector for the maintained sector. * NM reminded the Board that, as they were not a policy committee, it was difficult for them to opine on such matters but their focus should be on how to persuade members to stay in the scheme. * PS referenced that whilst independent schools have a decision whether to remain or not, the university sector is tied to the TPS and do not have the same choices. If contributions do reach 30%, it becomes very difficult to market courses to students given such a large proportion of their fees are funding their tutors’ pensions. * NM advised that the Board had ensured the Department was aware of the issues and the impacts on the size of the scheme membership. * SA queried how the Department was going to scenario plan for dealing with the impact and potential risks. It was suggested that this could be managed through the MRIC sub-committee as a risk with proposed mitigations. * SL referenced maintained academies who, although would be receiving additional funding, were also concerned as funding tends to be rolled into large formulae over time and so is lost. * SF expressed an interest in how TP will communicate with employers about the valuation process as she had not been able to find anything on the website. * NM agreed to take an action to discuss with the secretariat how to take this issue forward given its wide ranging impact. * EF confirmed that the Board could add this as a risk to the ARC risk register to raise the profile of the issue. * PSp recognised the strength of feeling from the Board but confirmed this was a major project so had other fora, such as the SAB and other sub-groups, where this was being discussed. He reminded the Board that it was important not to pre-empt the work of analysts and that the Board will be assured on how the project is implemented. * JP noted that if the ARC required input from independent sector he was happy to contribute. * JR confirmed that there was information on the TPS website for employers about valuation but it would limited to process rather than speculation about the result. * Regarding scenario planning, JR clarified that a significant number (333) of independent schools have already left the scheme which have been handled smoothly from an administrative perspective. He reassured the Board that, comparatively, the levels of contributions lost are still relatively small. * NM confirmed that it was reassuring to know that the Department is aware of these issues and they are reflected in the advice provided. | AP2/190423 |
| Agenda item 5 | **Service Delivery & Maintenance of Data sub-committee update:**  **Monthly Contribution Reconciliation (MCR)**   * SL reported the onboarding of employers to MCR has been paused for a period of stabilisation but some minimal activity is ongoing and TP were working to reduce the monies held in the unallocated contribution account. It was anticipated that onboarding would re-commence in May and completion for the project was scheduled for December 2024. * The sub-committee agreed this was a sensible approach and were assured that the process was being managed appropriately, and felt they were receiving an appropriate level of information on the matter.   **Internal Disputes Resolution Procedure (IDRP)**   * SL reported the sub-committee had been given details of the IDRP process, including an explanation of complaints escalations from TP to the Pensions Ombudsman. * The sub-committee were sighted on several cases. Nineteen cases had been escalated to the Ombudsman in 2022, nine of which were upheld or partially upheld. However, in eight those cases, it was found that TP had correctly applied the regulations, but members had been awarded compensation due to distress and inconvenience. * The sub-committee was assured that escalations were low, the process was fit for purpose, and cases were being managed appropriately. A watching brief was suggested for a short period of time to monitor any recurring themes. * NM commented that the end-to-end complaints process had been presented to the Board in the past. * SL added that the number of complaints involved did not impact metrics.   **End of Year Certificates (EYOC) Issues**   * SL reported that there were several outstanding EYOCs but the numbers involved were low and some cases were historic. * There were concerns around the numbers of independent schools being reported to the Regulator for non-payment. There appeared to be number of reason for this including cash flow issues and poor knowledge and understanding. * There were no common themes between those schools being reported. |  |
| Agenda item 6 | **Managing Risk and Internal Controls sub-committee update:**  **Group Internal Audit (GIA)**   * SA noted that the sub-committee will be provided with the full GIA reports at each meeting going forward. They will review each report and bring any observations to the Board. * The sub-committee had received the MCR report and SA highlighted the two findings within the report – one red and one amber. The sub-committee had expressed disappointment to see a red and amber finding but had acknowledged that the issues had been addressed and members felt assured by the discussion. * SA advised that since the meeting, she had been made aware of a further report that was not included on the quarterly list which concerns portfolio management. She felt it would be useful to have all reports made available and asked for this report to be provided alongside the report already due for the next sub-committee meeting.   **Finance**   * SA provided the highlights from the finance update, acknowledging that on End of Year Certificates (EOYC)’s there was sufficient focus from an assurance perspective and efforts would continue. * The Annual Reports and Accounts (ARA) are on track. SA highlighted that the interim audit was completed earlier this year and the final audit is due to start this week. Whilst the deadline is later this year, she noted that normal practice is to complete this exercise before summer recess and this is on track. * The Office for Budgetary Responsibility (OBR) exercise was conducted as normal with no concerns or pushback noted. * NM asked if the full GIA reports included the response from the department as well as the management response from Capita. SA explained they did not always include the department’s response which she thought was due to timing. PSp clarified that the portfolio management report was a GIAA (Government Internal Audit Agency) report rather than GIA (Capita’s Group Internal Audit) report and was one of two additional internal reports that he had requested to provide assurance, to him, as SRO. He was content for responses to the portfolio management report to be shared with the Board. * EF questioned whether the sub-committee fed comments into a response upon receipt of a red report. SA clarified that the sub-committee had only recently started to receive the reports and clarified that one of the findings was red, but the overall report rating which amber. She explained that if the overall rating had been red, the sub-committee would express their views on assurances. * JR explained that the GIAA audit was requested to ask for assurance around the workings of the Portfolio Board. He noted that, whilst it may appear as the Capita response on the audit report, often the action is agreed between Capita and the Department. He also recognised that not all audits directly impact the control environment and the main issue was how the cases are monitored on MCR which has now been addressed. * SA confirmed that the MRIC sub-committee was assured by the content of the report and noted that the sub-committee would have an opportunity to influence and inform the plan for the next year and this had been put on the agenda for the quarter 3 meeting. | AP3/190423 |
| Agenda item 7 | **Information to Members and Communications sub-committee update:**  **MCR Communications to Employers and Employees**   * HM highlighted the work undertaken by TP on the Employer Portal and referred to the presentations which were user friendly and reflected members’ needs. Equally, the Contact Us presentation had highlighted process improvements such as directing queries to the correct team more efficiently.   **Executive Review (paper 6)**   * HM explained that this is a document produced at the end of the financial year of the Board’s achievements and activities. The paper goes to the IMC sub-committee in March and the Board in April. The paper will be uploaded to TP website and provide a helpful summary to ministers and stakeholders. * NM referred the Board to Paper 6 and asked if the Board was content with the summary. * SF raised a concern that the paper didn’t reflect the significance of the issues related to MCR. NM recognised that MCR appears significant because it falls within the remits of all sub-committees meaning it is discussed frequently but that he was content with the way it was reflected in the Executive Summary. * EF confirmed that the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) had requested a presentation on TPS Risks, Processes and Controls including the approach to fiscal event, the MCR project and its interaction with the suspense balance. This will take place in May. EF suggested that the Board could take assurance from the ARC in this respect. * NM queried whether the Board should delay approving the Executive Summary until the outcome after the ARC presentation. JR reminded the Board of the different types of assurance within the governance structure. The ARC is concerned with the safeguarding of scheme funds and annual reports and accounts whereas the Board’s concern is the extent to which the project is progressing, and issues are being addressed. Therefore, the Board need not be delayed in approving the Executive Review. * NM confirmed that the Board were content to approve the Executive Review. He also requested an update on the outcome of the ARC feedback at the next Board meeting and suggested that the Board be routinely informed if the ARC had requested TPS Presentations. * NM thanked HM for her update. | AP4/190423 |
| Agenda item 9 | **TP Update:**   * DB confirmed that performance remained strong despite an increase in demand and volumes across all operations with a significant increase in all communication channels. Analysis is underway to identify what is driving the increase. * TP are working with the Department to investigate covid impacts, the cost of living crisis and increase in members’ awareness of the scheme following a drive from government bodies and industry experts to make members more financially aware of the benefits of engaging with their pension. * Regarding service delivery, DB noted that the scheme pays exercise was successfully completed by the HMRC deadline of 31 January. * Member outcome measures have seen an improvement. There has been a slight impact to OM3 as a result of changes made to the questions but improvements to performance are expected. * TP have conducted a deep-dive into OM5 and 6 which are linked and relate to how TP communicate to members. * NM reflected that it was a very positive report and queried if the increase in caseload was causing a resource issue for TP. * AD confirmed that increased member interest in pensions has led to a rise in questions but expects this will plateau at some point. However, he is looking forward to capacity planning. * NM found it reassuring that it was not causing administrative overload. * NM referred to OM3, 5 and 6 and noted the ongoing issue with volumes of customer feedback. AD confirmed TP are looking at what can be done differently including using different channels to encourage feedback. * SF queried what the timings were for the ICS survey. AD confirmed it would go live for external members next week.   **Outage Update**   * SH referred to the cyber incident experienced by Capita on 31 March which affected Microsoft 365 applications across its servers. * Steps were taken to restore access and, by Monday, TP systems were up and running, albeit without full functionality. * Hartlink and some other applications were restored utilising a work around as they were unable to connect via Microsoft. TP are currently delivering a good service albeit not yet back into the position they were prior to the attack. * Capita Group are working with specialist advisers including Microsoft DART team and forensic experts to investigate what happened. SH expected to be able to share a further update with Board Members tomorrow (20/4/23). * SH referenced the media coverage on the issue, specifically speculation that Capita artefacts were on sale on the dark web. Capita had found no evidence of pension related artefacts being available on the dark web but further monitoring will be conducted. * SH is unable to provide assurance that there was no impact on TP as a result of the cyber incident. Whilst there is no evidence of loss of information or corruption within Hartlink or its applications, he cannot confirm that no documents were viewed, copied or extracted. However, Microsoft Defender was active at the time of the attack and would raise an alert if there was any attempt to extract data. TP received no alert and SH was able to provide assurance that the Hartlink databases are encrypted even at rest, and their systems are now clean and secure. * Work with Microsoft was ongoing to produce a detailed report about the attack. NM asked if the Board would receive a copy of the final report to fulfil its assurance role. * SH explained that it is a Capita Group report so had a much wider remit than just Teachers’ Pensions but that he would provide an extract relevant to TP. * PSp explained that the Cabinet Office was the Government Department leading on the incident to reflect Capita’s position as a strategic supplier to the Government and also as the cyber incident had been toward Capita and was not TPS specific. * NM queried whether there was a contractual obligation for TP to report a cyber incident to DfE within a certain timeframe. AD confirmed that TP must report IT outages to DfE within 2 hours. That timeframe was complied with in respect of this incident. * NM asked if a reciprocal arrangement could be arranged with the DfE and Board for future incidents, even if the extent of the incident is not known. * SA expressed concern that the Board, and herself as Chair of the MRIC sub-committee, had not been informed earlier. * The DfE made a commitment to review the existing protocols, in light of the recent cyber-attack, and review with NM as requested. * MC queried whether the Board could receive assurance before the next meeting that TP data was not affected by the incident. SH confirmed he would provide that to DfE. PSp stated that he would also take assurance from security specialists within DfE before sending that assurance to the Board. * MC asked if Capita Group’s security defences have been adapted to prevent a reoccurrence. SH confirmed that all appropriate steps had been taken to ensure that the systems were robust and the networks are clean and secure. * EF referred DfE colleagues to the Cabinet Office protocol regarding the amount of detail that can be disseminated with third parties. | AP5/190423  AP6/190423  AP7/190423  AP8/190423 |
| Agenda Item 10 | **Cross Cutting Strategic Issue - Terms of Reference (ToR)**  The remainder of this section has been removed to ensure commercial sensitivities are maintained. A full version of the minutes will be prepared and shared with Board Members, and at the next TPSPB meeting. |  |
| Agenda item 11 | **Portfolio Executive Summary**   * The remainder of this section has been removed to ensure commercial sensitivities are maintained. A full version of the minutes will be prepared and shared with Board Members, and at the next TPSPB meeting. |  |
| Agenda item 12 | **Any Other Business:**   * No other business |  |
|  | Neville concluded by thanking everyone for their attendance and contributions to a productive meeting.  The next meeting will take place on Wednesday, 12 July 2023. |  |



Minutes agreed: Date: 28/4/23

|  |
| --- |
| Minutes circulated to Board members for review 11 May 2023. The following changes were made following Board member review. No amendments were requested/made. |
| Minutes ratified at subsequent TPSPB – 12 July 2023 |