

**Appendix 4** OPEN ACTIONS

Audit	Date	Ref	Finding	Risk Rating	Agreed Action	Target Date	Requested Revised Target Date	Responsible Officer	Implemented?	Comments
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	1.1	We found that the payments of lump sums and transfers out to other pension providers are managed through a central spreadsheet. The spreadsheet, which is not password protected, has no audit trail and is accessible to all members of the Pension Administration Team, is forwarded periodically to the Business Operations Payment Team in order to set up new vendor records and new payments in SAP. The Pensions Administration Team Leader, who is a SAP approver, advised that the payments in SAP are only checked back to the spreadsheet, not to the source information held in Altair before being released for payment.	High	1. We shall instigate a project to standardise and align these controls by introducing a direct interface between Altair and SAP which will remove the need maintain a payments spreadsheet.	01/03/2020	01/05/2021	Paul Punter	Partial	Heywood's Altair software has a payroll module which has two non-core modules we are looking to introduced to resolve the issue. 1. The ability to make one-off payments using the "Immediate Payments" module. This can either work in a stand-alone, or fully integrated way. To ensure proper control it needs to be fully integrated, requiring all other software components to be in place and up-to-date. <b>Completed June 20.</b> 2. We are looking to implement "Admin to Pay" integration module for payroll but there are a number of actions that need to be completed first: (a) The introduction of Immediate Payments cause the subsequent monthly data transfer from Altair to SAP to crash. The existing Altair extract reports were double counting some transactions from the immediate payments. Its transpired that ESPF set up is different to the other five Orbis funds. Result was we needed Heywoods to prepare two new Altair data extract reports which were prepared, tested and live in September. Meanwhile this created a backlog of data to be entered into SAP. When the June data was imported it was rejected as the system was expecting the current data. This is being resolved with IT - how to open closed periods. <b>Completed October 20</b> (b) The Altair admin and payroll sytems need to contain the same "pensions in payment" data. It transpired that this was not the case for approx 130 pensioners and the records needed investigating. Decision was made to fully investigate the cases greater than £100 p.a. and these cases were completed in August and payroll updated where appropriate in September. For differences less than £100 p.a. the decision was to accept the payroll data as correct and overwrite the data into the admin system. The original admin data would be stored in the notes section and be investigated further as part of the next phase of Data Improvement Project. <b>Was planned for Feb live - being tested now. Testing will be completed but will not go live until April/May as will impact data migration parallel runs testing.</b> (c) Due to a key man risk issue (long term sick) the April 2020 pension increase exercise was outsourced to Heywoods to perform. The main pensions increase were completed but created approx 3,000+ warnings that need to be investigated. <b>These are being reviewed in Feb 21.</b> (d) Heywoods first need to undertake the supplementary pension increases. <b>Completed Nov 20</b>
		1.2		High	2. Until the interface has been implemented, we will ensure that all outgoing payments are correct and reconcile to members' records in Altair.	01/02/2020	01/07/2020	Clare Chambers	Yes	Short term - Team Leaders check the spreadsheet v SAP v Altair for every entry. Long term - Integrated Immediate Payments. <b>WENT LIVE JUNE 20</b>
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	3.1	It was brought to our attention during the course of this audit that, the Pensions Administration Team (PAT) has been undertaking a range of salary-related calculations on behalf of East Sussex County Council, an employer in the scheme. The estimate of the resources used in making these calculations is two full time equivalent staff. These include: • final and career average revalued earnings (CARE) salaries; • leavers moving into deferred status; • leavers moving into retirement status; • refunds (for members with between three and 24 months' LGPS membership) • redundancy payments (including for non-LGPS employees). The PAT does not perform these calculations for other employers and such activities are not and should not be within the remit of the PAT who operate on behalf of the Pension Fund. We understand that this practice arose as a result of staff in the PAT being co-located with payroll staff and having access to the ESCC payroll system.	High	1. A technical solution is being developed to remove the need for these calculations to be made by the Pensions Administration Team.	30/06/2020	01/03/2021	Phil Hall	Partial	SCC payroll developed a leavers report that is run monthly against SAP and then passed to the pensions admin team. The report provides CARE and final pay calcs which in turn removes the need for payroll staff to undertake calculating pay details manually. There are some exceptions on specific types of cases (unpaid leave in the last three years etc.) where a warning indicator is added to the entry on the report so the pensions admin team know to query this with the payroll team and ask for the calculation to be undertaken manually. The Orbis IT SAP development team are currently working on the leavers report for ESCC payroll. The SCC and ESCC payrolls are not identical, so whilst the SAP development team are using the SCC report as the first iteration of the ESCC report it doesn't "fit perfectly" and is currently at the amending and testing stage. <b>ESCC leaver report completed November 20 (in respect of Oct 20 exit cases).</b> The i-Connect file will automatically record new entrants, changes, contributions, CARE and final pay and leaver notifications but it will not provide the final pay calcs for the three year period. Once operational, both i-Connect and the Leavers Report are run monthly going forward. The SCC i-Connect file has just been tested against the Altair test environment, with good initial results, and the i-Connect file for ESCC is ready to be tested, and Amy and Mandy are working together to progress this at the moment. <b>ESCC payroll running December 20 pay in i-Connect live in January 21 - subsequent validation / task creation in Altair in Feb 21.</b> For the employers on the ESCC payroll, HR prepare the redundancy quotations but PAT prepare the final actual numbers (even for non-pension scheme members). PAT have confirmed 80%+ of the quotations are correct and differences are usually down to changes in overtime in the last few months. Discussions to move all calculations to HR are now complications by the Govt introduction of the E95k cost cap and MCHLG redundancy regulations. There has been some slippage on the handover date. Actions and plans are in place to deliver the technical solution (which is now in final testing); assigning tasks within the payroll team to undertake the work and transfer of knowledge and process from pensions team to payroll team. <b>Complete November 20.</b>
		3.2		High	2. A credit adjustment will be made to the annual pension administration charge to compensate the Fund, whilst the technical solution is being developed. The terms of the financial compensation plan will be worked through and presented to the Pension Committee.	01/04/2020	01/04/2020	Ian Gutsell	Yes	Review undetaken and no action no required <b>Complete October 20.</b>
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	10.1	Testing of a sample of deferred pensions found that new deferred tasks are not always allocated to members of the Pensions Administration Team for processing immediately. We found that eight out of 15 cases tested had not been processed promptly, with an average delay of nine weeks before the tasks were allocated in these cases. The KPI for deferred pensions sets a target to process 98% of all deferred cases within 25 days of receipt. The KPI's between November 2018 and July 2019 state that the target has been met. However, the way that the figures are calculated does not take account of the delay in allocating new cases and, therefore, the published KPI for deferred cases is overstated.	Medium	1. This issue will be resolved by the transfer of responsibility for the final pay calculations for ESCC employees to the County Council.	30/06/2020	01/03/2021	Phil Hall	Partial	The issue is linked to 3.1 above and when that is resolved this item will be fixed. <b>Anticipate completion in Feb 21.</b>
		10.2		Medium	2. Until such time that final pay calculations are transferred to ESCC, the KPI for deferred pension transactions will exclude ESCC Pension Fund members.	01/02/2020	30/06/2020	Clare Chambers	Yes	Included in KPIs

**Appendix 4**

**CLOSED ACTIONS**

Audit	Date	Ref	Finding	Risk Rating	Agreed Action	Target Date	Requested Revised Target Date	Responsible Officer	Implemented?	Comments
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	2.1	The Altair system calculates pension benefits for new pensioners. However, during testing, we found that in two out of 15 cases, the benefits had been calculated manually by the Pension Administration Team. We understand that this was because of delays in receiving documentation from the employer, in one case, and the employee in the other case. It is further understood that the Altair system cannot calculate benefits retrospectively. In reviewing these two cases, whilst we found evidence of signed checklists, the manual calculations were not completed using a formal template to aid consistency and there was no clear evidence that the calculations had been checked, for example by the signature of the checker at the foot of each page where system generated figures had been overwritten by manual calculations. Furthermore, there is no clear governance process to support the over-writing of data held in Altair with manual figures because the supporting checklist does not adequately demonstrate that each step in the process has been completed and then checked. Testing of an additional 15 new pensions found a further four pension benefits that had been calculated manually. This suggests that around 20% of pension benefits involve a manual calculation although no errors were found during testing. A pension calculation is a longstanding calculation so an error at inception would pervade 20-30 years after the calculation was committed. This would affect all other calculations derived from that initial calculation.	Medium	1. Aquila Heywood will be commissioned to implement system functionality to resolve the retrospective calculation issue together with relevant system controls and sign off controls.	01/04/2020	30/06/2020	Nick Weaver	Yes	Further investigation with the Internal Audit identified a misunderstanding about the functionality capabilities of the Heywood Altair system. It does calculate the member pension benefits at the normal retirement date. Under the LGPS Regulations if the member, for whatever reason, does not forward the completed acceptance forms in a timely manner the benefits are backdated rather than making the member retire at a later date. The issue is where the member benefits are backdated for a number of months or years the Altair system is unable to determine the current benefits. The administrator uses a template spreadsheet to take the Altair calculated benefits at the original normal retirement date to determine the subsequent annual pension increases between then and the actual first payment date plus the arrears for the first pension payment. To ensure the template spreadsheet is clear that it has been checked four new boxes have been added to show the name of the doer and checker and the date they performed and check the work. These names and dates should then be able to be crossed checked against the retirement calculation checklist to provide a clear audit trail that the work was checked. East Sussex follow the same process as Surrey.
		2.2		Medium	2. Until a system-based solution is achieved, we will implement a template for recording manual calculations in order to aid consistency, reduce the risk of error and to provide a clear audit trail to demonstrate how the figures and the final benefit award were derived.	01/02/2020	30/06/2020	Nick Weaver	Yes	ESCC have adopted the Surrey version of the template spreadsheet.
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	4	The Administration Service reported to the September 2019 Pension Board that 258 active members and 11,004 deferred members had not received their Annual Benefit Statements (ABS) for 2018/19. However, our testing identified further members who had not been sent their ABS, or had not been provided with written notification that their ABS are available on-line, as required under section 14 of the Public Service Pensions Act 2013.  Specifically: 1. 1,780 members held in 'status 2' (undecided leavers) did not receive their ABS; 2. 5,631 active members, where no email address was held, did not receive written notification that their statements were available on-line; and 3. New members were not advised in writing that their ABS was available on-line.  Additionally: 4. There are 4,500 members held in 'status 9' (frozen refunds), who may also be entitled to an ABS, did not receive one; and 5. There are 9,535 deferred members, for whom we do not hold a current email address, and who did not receive an ABS. At the time of testing, these additional breaches had not been reported to the Pension Regulator.	High	Measures to ensure that all required ABS are issued by the statutory deadline for 2020 will include, but are not limited to: • A series of workshops to plan the end to end process; • The creation of a robust plan which sets out roles and responsibilities, milestones and objectives; • Consultation with key stakeholders and immediate communication of expectations from employers; • The identification of early tasks that need carrying out before 31 March; • The cleansing of data held in Altair prior to 31 March; • Establishing a membership baseline through the creation of a snapshot of the membership database – as at 31 March; • The identification of all members requiring an ABS; • A clear understanding that no assumptions are made in the absence of documentation from employers; • Appropriate communications with members in accordance with LGPS regulations. The final plan will be agreed with the Fund.	30/06/2020	01/10/2020	Mike Lea & Clare Chambers	Yes	Work was progressing with Hymans to incorporate the Data Improvement Plan (DIP) results into the ABS' and to issue them by the agreed 31 July deadline. However, for various reasons (including coronavirus) not all the data was collected from the employers by the extended deadline of 15 June 2020. That collected and forwarded to the Orbis system support team was incorporated into the ABS data. The Pensions Board and Officers asked Hymans to cease work on the DIP and prepare a handover report as at 24 July 2020. Hymans produced a DIP closure as at 31 July 2020. The project will be finalised as BAU by PAT. COVID-19 had an impact on the employers ability to complete their annual returns so the deadline for completing the ABS was pushed back to 31 August 2020. An update report was provided to the Board & Committee in September 2020. The committee minutes stated " <b>The PAT should be congratulated for the improvements it has made to the Annual Benefit Statement (ABS) process. Excluding a few issues due to employers not responding, 99.6% of statements were issued on time.</b> "
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	5.1	We understand that a data cleansing exercise was undertaken during 2019 in preparation for the Triennial Valuation, which identified a number of critical errors, which have subsequently been corrected. We requested sight of information relating to the data cleansing process, including sight of the audit trail of changes made to extracted data. Whilst most of our questions relating to this data were answered satisfactorily, it remains unclear, at the time of reporting, why the number of deferred members reported appears to exceed the number of records on the extracted data. A high-level review of data in the live system was carried out, which identified a number of data quality issues, including: • Eight active member records, where one or more fields contained the word 'Delete' or 'Duplicate?', which casts doubt on the accuracy of these records. • Twelve active and 115 deferred members with temporary National Insurance numbers. • Fourteen deferred records where the date commenced employment, or the date commenced current employment were blank. • Six deferred cases where there was no record of the date that the member left active service. • We found 2,261 deferred cases where the reason for the change in status from Active to Deferred was not recorded.	Medium	1. The Fund has commissioned a data improvement programme to be carried out by Hymans Robertson, who will liaise with employers to correct any missing data or inaccuracies. The data collected will be provided to the Pensions Administration Service which will upload it onto Altair. Any changes between the snapshot provided to Hymans and the data held in the live system at the point of upload will be investigated and resolved.	01/04/2020	31/12/2020	Paul Punter	Yes	See 4 above. Significant data quality improvement work has been achieved by Hymans; the work has been handed back the East Sussex PAT to finalise as BAU. Data quality retention & improvement is an ongoing challenge, a new phase will begin in Q1, 2021. We produce tPR validator common & conditional reports annually (next due November 20) to continually monitor the data quality levels. <b>We are confident the data &amp; quality has improved across the PAT service and therefore happy to close this action - data will never be 100% accurate.</b>
		5.2		Medium	2. The Pension Administration Service will propose procedures and policies to maintain and enhance data quality and seek to obtain the relevant ISO quality accreditation. This will include consideration of capacity and the benefit and cost of establishing a new data quality team.	01/04/2020	01/10/2020	Ian Gutsell	Yes	1. Improvements to procedures and policies impacting the quality of data including the use of statuses is complete. 2. ISO9001 accreditation was a commitment by Orbis that has not materialised. This is a best practice item and nice to have but not a priority so will be revisited in a few years when some of the significant urgent projects are finalised. 3. The Compliance Local Improvement Partner (CLIP) was appointed 3 August 20 and he will oversee quality. The Orbis data quality team has not materialised and the restructure for ES will not include a specific team. Quality should be owned by every individual. <b>We are confident the data &amp; quality has improved across the PAT service and therefore happy to close this action - data will never be 100% accurate.</b>

Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	6	We understand that Status 8 is used in Altair for records that have been created in error. However, we reviewed a sample of six cases and found two records where members had opted out and had received a refund of contributions via payroll. These records had been moved to Status 8 in error and we understand that they have now been moved to Status 0 (opt Out) following the queries raised by Internal Audit.	Low	The Pension Administration Team will develop an improvement plan and identify specific administration resources to address Status 8 cases. It will share the plan with the Pension Board, to which it will also share progress reports.  Consideration will be given to the creation of a new role - Compliance and Local Improvement Partner (CLIP), to co-ordinate and oversee improvements.	01/06/2020	01/06/2020	Mike Lea	Yes	Periodically a report of status 8 cases will be run to ensure it is being used correctly. Historical cases were reviewed by Hymans and the East Sussex head of administration has in August 2020 been given the Heywoods Altair system supervisor status to "delete" records where appropriate.
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	7.1	A review of cases held in Altair under 'status 2' (Undecided Leavers) and 'status 9' (Frozen Refunds) identified over 5,000 cases that had been in these status codes for more than a year and, in some cases, based upon the 'date left active service' field in Altair, extending back as far as 1975. A review of these cases, found that 449 members were above the retirement age, including 288 who were above the age of 70. Whilst we have not tested the reasons behind these cases, we have seen evidence of at least one transfer out where notification of a member's intention to transfer the pension had been received but had not been actioned because the Administration Team believed the information to be incomplete. When this matter was brought to the attention of the team, it was indicated that no action would be taken to address the issue because they believed it was not their responsibility to take any further action. From this, it may be inferred that it is possible that other notifications have been received but not processed, which would result in cases remaining indefinitely in a suspense account.	Medium	1. The Pension Administration Team will develop an improvement plan and identify specific administration resources to address Status 2 and Status 9 cases. It will share the plan with the Pension Board, to which it will also share progress reports.	01/04/2020	31/12/2020	Mike Lea	Yes	On 30 January 2020 a full cut of scheme data was provided to Hymans to commence the DIP and significant improvement have been made since then (outlined in the 31 July 2020 Hymans closure report): <b>Status 2 (unresolved leavers)</b> Initially 977 cases identified & at the point of handover back to ES PAT 532 had been resolved & a further 117 were ready to be validated. This left 323 remaining to be followed to seek missing data from Employers (8 Employers accounted for 282 cases or 87% and 16 Employers for the remaining 41 cases or 13%). To put in perspective the 2020 ABS has identified 865 new status 2 cases that will need investigating <b>Status 9 (frozen - undecided refunds)</b> Initially 4,650 cases and all validated as true cases (except 6) - these are with ES PAT to settle as requested by members. New process in place to automatically prepare to settle these three months before the five years anniversary of leaving. The new process includes address tracing where necessary and providing a quotation and requesting bank details for settlement. This is now BAU with diarised monthly reports being run to identify forthcoming cases. <b>We are confident the data &amp; quality has improved across the PAT service and therefore happy to close this action - data will never be 100% accurate.</b>
		7.2		Medium	2. Consideration will be given to the creation of a new role - Compliance and Local Improvement Partner (CLIP), to co-ordinate and oversee improvements.	01/04/2020	01/04/2020	Kevin Foster	Yes	CLIP started on 3 August 2020
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	8.1	We understand that there is no process in place to update addresses for employees who opt out and defer their pensions, even though employers hold this information.	Low	1. The Pension Administration Team will develop an improvement plan and identify specific administration resources to capture changes of address for all deferred members. It will share the plan with the Pension Board, to which it will also share progress reports.	01/06/2020	01/06/2020	Clare Chambers	Yes	This will be part of the standard deferred benefit process.
		8.2		Low	2. Consideration will be given to the creation of a new role - Compliance and Local Improvement Partner (CLIP), to co-ordinate and oversee improvements.	01/06/2020	01/06/2020	Kevin Foster	Yes	CLIP started on 3 August 2020.
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	9.1	The previous year's audit reported that a data cleansing exercise had been carried out, which had identified 14,000 queries and 67,000 warnings, where data may contain errors or be incorrect. It was agreed that all errors and/or warnings from the membership data cleansing exercise would be investigated and the data would be amended, if it was found to be incorrect.	High	See Action 5, above.	01/04/2020	01/10/2020	Kevin Foster	Yes	See 5 above
		9.2	This action has not been carried out and it was noted that the 2019/20 data cleansing exercise for the triennial valuation identified 137,911 warnings.	High	See Action 5, above.	01/04/2020	01/10/2020	Ian Gutsell	Yes	See 5 above

Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	11	The Pension Administration send out an annual return at the end of each year relating to members' annual allowances. For new members transferring into the fund, this information needs to be collected from the previous employer. We tested a sample of transfers into the Pension Fund. We found that, in one out of five cases, the member's annual allowance information had not been received from the previous employer but that the checklist had been approved as complete, despite the step to obtain the annual allowance information being left blank. Further enquiries confirmed that there were five other transfers in where the annual allowance was missing. In three of these cases, checklists had been marked to show the transactions as complete. The remaining checklists differed and did not cover the receipt (or not) of annual allowance information. The closing of transfer-in cases before all steps have been completed also has a positive and misleading impact upon the KPIs.	Low	We will review the process and the Transfer In checklist to ensure that the most efficient use is made of our resources.  We shall review the KPI report to ensure all relevant information is included and that reports provided to the Board and Committee are clear.	01/06/2020	30/06/2020	Clare Chambers	Yes	The Annual Allowance (AA) statements are produced for about 120 ESPF members who exceed the annual monetary amount. In trying to determine the correct AA information you can account for any unused allowance for the previous three years. For members who have completed an interfund transfer during the year the data may not be easily assessable (for members with no Altair member print from the previous employer). East Sussex administration team tried to obtain a note of the AA used in the current years part of the TV-in process. As the provision of this data is not mandatory or statutory and does not impact the calculation of the transfer of benefits it is not chased at the time of transfer. If later, it is discovered the member is actually exceeds the AA, then the administrator will as part of that task request the AA data from the previous employer.
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	12	Testing revealed that 80% of complaints to the Pensions Administration Team were not responded to within 10 days, in accordance with Orbis service standards, increasing the risk of reputational damage. It was also noted that there is a lack of information recorded within the Complaints Log, with some fields being left blank. Furthermore, some members' feedback, which could reasonably be considered to be complaints, is recorded as comments, thus avoiding the need to include them in the statistics. In addition, we found that some complaints had not been recorded within the KPI figures presented to the Committee or Board, whilst all complaints, including those relating to a fund managed on behalf of another authority were, thus reducing the accuracy with which Members are able to view the administration's performance.	Low	KPI statistics will be checked to ensure that they are complete and only include data relating to the East Sussex Pension Fund. Accompanying narrative on the cause of each failure will be provided together with proposals to rectify any failures.	01/05/2020	30/06/2020	Clare Chambers	Yes	Action undertaken and only complaints for the East Sussex Fund are reported as part of the KPI reporting. A
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	13	During testing, we found evidence of correspondence having been sent to a member threatening to suspend their pension unless they responded to the letter to confirm that they were still alive. In this case, correspondence had previously been returned marked 'Unknown at this address'. However, at the date of testing, which was a month past the specified deadline, the pension was still in payment. We understand that the reason why the pension was still in payment was because the Pension Administration Team had not sought or received approval from the Governance Team to suspend the member's pension benefit.	Medium	A process, including clearly defined roles and responsibilities, between the Pension Fund and the administration will be developed and agreed with the Pension Fund.	31/03/2020	01/10/2020	Michelle King & Clare Chambers	Yes	The Good Governance Working Party proposals for the roles and responsibilities was agreed by ES Pensions Committee on 21 September 2020 but cant be fully implemented until been consulted upon with Employers and we have our own Altair database (Orbis will not permit new different SLA/KPIs for the PAT to be set-up. The decision to move the administration back in-house means there will be a more holistic approach and joined up processes.  The ES Head of Pensions Administration has completed a review of "suspended" pensioners during September and the remaining cases are appropriate. He has also taken on responsibility of authorising the suspension of new cases, including a number of pensioners being suspended from September 20, whose payslips between March & May 2020, and appropriate letters and chasers were issued (including via banks) in the intervening period.
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	14	The Pensions Regulator expects pension administrators to maintain complete and accurate records and has published guidance on the minimum data that it expects trustees and scheme managers to hold. Of the eleven common data fields specified by the Regulator, nine are mandatory in Altair. Although we did ask for clarification from management about the other two mandatory fields, no response was forthcoming and it remains unclear why the 'Address' and 'Post Code' fields are not mandatory.	Low	We will approach the software vendor (Aquila Heywood) to investigate the possibility of making the address fields mandatory, including any potential cost implications.	31/05/2020	30/06/2020	Nick Weaver	Yes	The address and postcode fields are not mandatory on any pension software suppliers. East Sussex does have policies in place to undertake missing address tracing exercises biannually. In addition for individuals approaching retirement where an address is missing address tracing is performed three months beforehand. East Sussex PAT will produce tPR validator common and conditional reports annually for the Pensions Board to track the data quality scores.
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	15	The previous audit (2018/19) identified an employer, which had left the Fund, but could still access the employer portal (Pensions Web). It was agreed that the employer's account would be deleted and all employers with access to Pensions Web would be contacted to confirm their employees who need access to the system on an annual basis. We found that that the employer account referred to above had been deleted. However, there was no record to confirm whether all employers had been contacted to confirm who needed access to Pensions Web.	Low	We will write to all employers with access to Pensions Web to confirm the employees who need access to the system on an annual basis.	31/05/2020	30/06/2020	Clare Chambers	Yes	Systems and Support Team will document a process for maintaining access to PensionsWeb for scheme employers. There is an employer database which holds the employer key contact details - name, address, email, plus authorised signatories etc. These will be updated as part on the annual data return for the ABS process. CLIP will have oversight of the quality of this work.

Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	16	The previous audit (2018/19) found that five out of 32 users who had access to Altair had left the Council. It was agreed that the users' accounts would be deleted and that a review of user access to Altair would be undertaken, at least on an annual basis. We found that the five users' accounts identified during the last audit had been deleted. However, the review of user accounts had not been completed.	Low	A review of user access to Altair will be undertaken annually and evidence of the review will be maintained.	31/05/2020	01/12/2020	Tom Lewis	Yes	Systems and Support Team to document a process for maintaining system access and levels in Altair for both internal and external access users. (a) create three lists of users - PAT, other internal users (Fund / Authority) and External (advisers) (b) review users list against current staff and ensure named individuals in Fund, Authority & external advisers are still employed and access is deemed appropriate (c) despite (b) if users have not used the system for 3 months their access should automatically be disabled and at six months be deleted (d) all new access or reaccess requests must be pre-approved by a Manager East Sussex Head of Pensions Administration has offered to perform the review of users and approve/challenge their access rights - the first review in due in Q4, 2020. The primary responsibility for informing IT and systems of joiners and leavers resides with HR. So check referred to above should simply be a safety net.
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	17	The previous audit (2018/19) found that the Pensions Regulator requires each scheme to have developed a set of scheme specific data items that should be present for each member. No scheme specific data set has been defined.	Medium	The Pension Administration Team will develop a set of scheme-specific data, including considering guidance from outside bodies, as necessary. This will be presented to the Board for approval.	31/03/2020	31/03/2020	Mike Lea	Yes	Will be captured by East Sussex PAT
Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20	Jan-20	18	The previous audit (2018/19) found that Surrey County Council (as the pension administration service provider within Orbis) is responsible for developing an annual schedule of tasks that will be agreed by East Sussex County Council. The annual schedule sets out a timetable of key pension activities that should be completed by the service provider, including statutory activities such as submitting tax returns and issuing annual benefit statements. However, the annual schedule for 2018 was not developed, despite requests from the Council. It was agreed that an annual schedule of key pension activities would be presented to the Council for approval by the start of each calendar year. Whilst a schedule has been produced for 2019, it has not been shared with, and approved by, the Pension Fund.	Medium	We shall develop and submit an annual schedule of key pension activities to the Council for approval by the start of each calendar year. We shall ensure that the schedule includes all statutory returns and reports.	31/03/2020	31/03/2020	Clare Chambers	Yes	The 2020 Annual Schedule has been drafted and being submitted to the 8 June Local Pension Board.
Pension Fund - Compliance with Regulatory Requirements 2019/20	Jan-20	18	All breaches or potential breaches should be recorded in a log which should be used to inform the Pension Board and Pension Committee on a regular basis. Our testing found two versions of the breaches log, neither of which appeared to be complete. The log does not always record: • whether the breach was reported to the Pension Board; • whether the breach was reported to the Pension Committee; • whether the breach is open or closed; or • the breach's RAG status. Moreover, the log has no provision to capture: • whether the breach has been reported to the Pension Regulator; • who decided to report the breach; or • who made the decision to close the breach.	Medium	Aon and Eversheds Sutherland have been commissioned to determine a breaches policy, breaches log and breaches procedure which complies with Regulation. This will be agreed at the Pension Board on 2nd March and Pension Committee on 16th March.	16/03/2020	16/03/2020	Michelle King	Yes	Agreed by the Pension Committee on the 22 June 2020.
Pension Fund - Compliance with Regulatory Requirements 2019/20	Jan-20	2	The Reporting Breaches Policy states that breaches or likely breaches should be reported to the Pension Committee, Pension Board and, where necessary, the Pension Regulator. Despite the incomplete nature of the breaches log (see ref 1, above), the entries that had been made indicated that few breaches had been reported to the Pension Committee or Pension Board.  As previously mentioned, the log does not record whether breaches have been reported to the Pension Regulator.	High	All officers will be reminded to comply with the Breaches Policy and Procedures to be agreed at Pensions Committee on 16 March 2020. This policy will ensure that the reporting of breaches complies in full with the provision of the Regulator's Code of Practice.	01/04/2020	01/04/2020	Michelle King	Yes	Agreed by the Pension Committee on the 22 June 2020.
Pension Fund - Compliance with Regulatory Requirements 2019/20	Jan-20	3	There is currently no Service Level Agreement in place between the East Sussex Pension Fund and Business Operations, which provides its Pension Administration Service. The only document that sets out the service to be provided, is a Statement of Requirements, which is dated 2013, and does not cover more formal responsibilities in the event that service provision falls below the expected standard.	High	Aon, Eversheds Sutherland and Hymans Robertson to produce three Service Level Agreements which sit under the umbrella of the current Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA). Eversheds are updating the IAA to ensure compliance with GDPR provisions and to determine the roles and responsibilities of the Data Owner, Data Controller and Data Administrator. The following Service Level Agreements (SLAs) are sub sections of the IAA agreement. Aon are preparing a SLA between the Fund and the Administrator which will be performance managed through the Performance Management Group which is a newly formed governance vehicle to conduct oversight of the operational requirement. A separate SLA for actuarial services to determine performance between Orbis and the actuary is commissioned to ensure that information is provided to the actuary in a timely, accurate and complete manner. All SLAs will form appendices to the IAA and will be ratified by the Pension Committee on 16th March 2020. The IAA will be further, retrospectively, ratified by the Pension Committee on 16th March 2020.	16/03/2020	01/07/2020	Michelle King	Yes	Dependant on production of SLA through Good Governance Review. The Good Governance Working Party resolved on 19-05-20 that the roles and responsibilities is due to be agreed by Committee in September 2020. There has been a delay by Orbis in agreeing these documents therefore additional time has been agreed by the Working Party. Philip Baker has advised that no changes will be made to the IAA. The SLA will sit outside of the IAA.
Pension Fund - Compliance with Regulatory Requirements 2019/20	Jan-20	4	In accordance with regulations, there is an Internal Dispute Resolution Procedure Guide available which provides a formal process to handle and escalate complaints. However, there is no policy or procedure in place for the resolution of customer complaints at a basic level, prior to this escalation.	Low	The implementation of a Service Level Agreement, as agreed in reference three, will set out the Fund's requirements of the administration in relation to complaints handling; this will be discussed at Pension Committee on 16th March 2020.	16/03/2020	16/03/2020	Michelle King	Yes	Dependant on production of SLA through Good Governance Review. The Good Governance Working Party resolved on 19-05-20 that the SLA is due to be agreed by Committee in September 2020. There has been a delay by Orbis in agreeing these documents therefore additional time has been agreed by the Working Party. In relation to complaint handling by the Pension Fund at a basic level the Pension Fund follows the ESCC Complaints processes. The Orbis Pension Administrator as a supplier to the Pension Fund will need to provide the method statement agreed by CIPFA within the National Framework Procurement detailing the provisions for complaint handling in the tender.