

| Audit | Date | Ref | Finding | Risk Rating | Agreed Action | Target Date | Requested Revised Target Date | Board / Committee Approval ? | 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 | 30/06/2020 | | Nick Weaver | No | The leading LGPS administration systems have the ability to make one-off payments. For our current system it is the "Immediate Payments" module, which 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. The stand-alone version was implemented for the Surrey Fund on 1st May and the necessary work is starting to enable it to be fully integrated. The plan was to implement the stand-alone version at East Sussex from 1st June, integrating it as soon as the core system is up-to-date. However if there is to be a system change, later this financial year, this should be reassessed as changing financial controls twice in a period, as well as system will add risk and complexity. |
| | | 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 | 01/02/2020 | | Clare Chambers | Yes | Short term - Team Leaders check the spreadsheet v SAP v Altair for every entry. Long term - Integrated Immediate Payments. |
| 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 | No | This finding has been reallocated to the administration side. While the current software is able to perform these calculations, it is not being done in our instance, as our core system is incomplete. (A module called "Admin to Pay", which links the Administration module to the "Pensioner Payroll" and "Immediate Payments" modules has not been implemented. Before this can happen the core system will need to be bought up-to-date and any historic customisations removed.) |
| | | 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 | No | This will be addressed at the same time as 2.1 above. (Reallocated to Nick Weaver) |
| 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: | 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 | 30/06/2020 | | Kevin Foster | No | |
| | | 3.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | 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 | | Kevin Foster & Michelle King | No | It was agreed by the Head of Pensions and the chair of the Pension Committee that an examination of the contract is required to substantiate any potential claim of liability. A disclosure note advising that good governance project is being undertaken to clarify the related party transactions is all that is required at this stage |
| 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 received 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | 30/07/2020 | | Mike Lea & Clare Chambers | No | Work is progressing with Hymans to incorporate the Data Improvement Plan results into the ABS' and to issue them by the agreed 31 July deadline. |
| 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | 15/06/2020 | | Kevin Foster | No | Work is progressing with Hymans to incorporate the Data Improvement Plan results into the ABS' and to issue them by the agreed 31 July deadline. (It has been agreed that the data changes can now be made up until 15 June, on the proviso that Hymans will lead on following up the resulting employer EOY Return queries, due to the compressed timetable.) |
| | | 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 | 01/04/2020 | | Mike Lea | Partial | The Service Improvement Plan includes the creation of a Data Quality team, which is currently being resourced. |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------|--|--------|--|------------|------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|
| 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. |
| 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 | 01/04/2020 | Mike Lea | No | On 31 March 2020 there were 512 status 2 and 5,031 status 9 cases. When the system software enables calculations and payments to be fully integrated it would be good practice to analyse the outstanding refund cases and develop an appropriate plan. |
| | | 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 | |
| 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 should 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 | |
| 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 | 15/06/2020 | Kevin Foster | No | |
| | | 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 | 01/04/2020 | Mike Lea | No | The Service Improvement Plan includes the creation of a Data Quality team, which is currently being resourced. |
| 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. | 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 | 30/06/2020 | Kevin Foster | No | |
| | | 10.2 | 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 | 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 | No | This will be resolved as a result of the 10.1 agreed action. |
| 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 | No | The capture of Annual Allowance information when completing an interfund is not mandatory or statutory. It is done by the administration team to make the end of year Annual Allowance process quicker. |
| 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 compliments, 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 | No | Only complaints for the East Sussex Fund are reported as part of the KPI reporting. Any KPI failures have an accompanying commentary as part of the report. |
| 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 | 31/03/2020 | Michelle King & Clare Chambers | Partial | 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. |
| 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 | No | This will be addressed at the same time as 2.1 above. (Reallocated to Nick Weaver) |
| 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 | No | Systems and Support Team to document a process for maintaining access to PensionsWeb for scheme employers. |
| 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 | 30/06/2020 | Clare Chambers | No | Systems and Support Team to document a process for maintaining access to Altair for Orbis PAT. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|----|--|--------|--|------------|------------|--|----------------|---------|--|
| 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 | This is independently governed, with TPR definitions |
| Pension Fund Administration, People, Processes and Systems, 2019/20 | Jan-20 | | 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 | Partial | 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | The Policy has been prepared and is included in the scope of the Good Governance Review. This is due to be agreed by the Pension Committee on the 22 June 2020 and presented to the Pension Board on 8 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 | The Policy has been prepared and is included in the scope of the Good Governance Review. This is due to be agreed by the Pension Committee on the 22 June 2020 and presented to the Pension Board on 8 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 | Partial | 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 | Partial | 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. |