

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Decision Report

Decision Maker:	Pension Fund Panel
Date of Decision:	5 November 2010
Decision Title:	Pension Fund Panel representatives
Decision Reference:	2215
Report From:	County Treasurer

Contact name: Ian Howell

Tel: 01962 847540

Email: ian.howell@hants.gov.uk

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. This report sets out arrangements for the co-opted representatives on the Pension Fund Panel.

2. Representative of Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils

- 2.1. The co-opted representative of the two city councils on the Pension Fund Panel alternates between the two cities every two years. Councillor Donna Jones of Portsmouth City Council was co-opted in 2008 and her term came to an end on 30 September 2010.
- 2.2. Following the Panel's invitation agreed at the Panel meeting on 18 June 2010, Southampton City Council has nominated Councillor Jeremy Moulton to take up the position as the representative of the city councils for the two years until 30 September 2012. Councillor Moulton held the position between 2006 and 2008.

3. Other representatives on the Pension Fund Panel

- 3.1. The other co-opted representatives are:

Hampshire district councils

- representative

Cllr Peter Giddings

to 31 July 2013

- deputy

Cllr Ian Carr

to 31 July 2013

Pensioners	Mr EW Hughes	annual rolling basis, expiring 31 March
Contributors		
- representative	Mr Phillip Reynolds	to 31 July 2013
- deputy	Mr Brian Wood	to 31 July 2013

3.2. In addition, the Panel's independent adviser, Mr Harvey Cole, is appointed on an annual rolling basis, expiring on 31 December each year. It is proposed that a report will be brought to the Panel's meeting on 15 December 2010 concerning the appointment of an independent adviser for 2011.

4. Representation of the Hampshire district councils and other employers

- 4.1. At the Fund's Annual General Meeting on 29 September 2010, councillors from Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council again argued for an increase in the representation of the Hampshire district councils on the Pension Fund Panel.
- 4.2. The Panel's current membership is nine county councillors plus the four co-opted representatives, with full voting rights, for the city councils, district councils, pensioners and contributors. The County Council's majority representation on the Panel is appropriate given the County Council's role as the administering authority of the Pension Fund.
- 4.3. The Panel last considered this matter at the meeting on 20 November 2009, following similar comments by Basingstoke and Deane councillors at the Annual General Meeting in 2009. The Panel decided that no changes should be made to the membership of the Panel. The reasons for that decision were:
- other employers would also expect to be represented if the Hampshire district councils were granted additional membership of the Panel, including the city councils, the Hampshire Police Authority, the universities and colleges and other education sector bodies, and the admission bodies
 - the Panel would become too unwieldy if additional members are co-opted
 - four of the nine county councillors on the Panel are also district councillors: Councillor Allgood (Winchester), Councillor Carter (Gosport), Councillor Dowden (Test Valley) and Councillor Tennent (Eastleigh).
- 4.4. The representative of the Hampshire district councils is expected to keep the other district councils informed about matters discussed at Panel meetings. A briefing note is prepared by the officers to assist in that process.

4.5. The following table shows the number of active contributors to the Pension Fund at 31 March 2010.

Hampshire County Council	22,884	46.8%
Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils	10,561	21.6%
Hampshire district councils	4,548	9.3%
Hampshire Police Authority	2,626	5.4%
Hampshire Fire & Rescue Authority	359	0.7%
Hampshire Probation Trust	535	1.1%
New Forest National Park	73	0.1%
University of Portsmouth	1,177	2.4%
Southampton Solent University	527	1.1%
Colleges and schools that are scheduled bodies	4,104	8.4%
Town and parish councils and other scheduled bodies	234	0.5%
Admission bodies	1,249	2.6%
	-----	-----
Total	48,877	100.0%
	-----	-----

4.6. This suggests that, at the level of one representative out of a total Panel membership of 13, the Hampshire district councils' representation is broadly in proportion to their number of active contributors to the Fund.

5. Recommendations

- 5.1. That the nomination of Councillor Jeremy Moulton as the representative on the Pension Fund Panel of the two city councils for the two years to 30 September 2012 be accepted.
- 5.2. That the Panel consider whether the Hampshire district councils should be granted a second representative on the Pension Fund Panel.
- 5.3. That the Panel consider whether other changes should be made to the membership of the Pension Fund Panel to give representation to any other employers.

CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:**Links to the Corporate Strategy**

Hampshire safer and more secure for all:	yes/no
Corporate Business plan link number (if appropriate):	
Maximising well-being:	yes/no
Corporate Business plan link number (if appropriate):	
Enhancing our quality of place:	yes/no
Corporate Business plan link number (if appropriate):	
OR	
This proposal does not link to the Corporate Strategy but, nevertheless, requires a decision because the appropriate membership of the Pension Fund Panel needs to be decided.	

Other Significant Links

Links to previous Member decisions:		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Date</u>
Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>	

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

<u>Document</u>	<u>Location</u>
None	

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equalities Impact Assessment:

- 1.1. Equality objectives are not considered to be adversely affected by the proposals in this report.

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

- 2.1. The proposals in this report are not considered to have any direct impact on the prevention of crime.

3. Climate Change:

- a) How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

No specific impact.

- b) How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

No specific impact.