

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Decision Report

Decision Maker:	Pension Fund Panel
Date:	4 November 2011
Decision Maker:	Employment in Hampshire County Council Committee
Date:	9 November 2011
Title:	Government consultation on increases to employee contribution rates and changes to scheme accrual rates
Reference:	3410
Report From:	County Treasurer

Contact name: Carolyn Williamson

Tel: 01962 847400

Email: carolyn.williamson@hants.gov.uk

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) issued a consultation paper on 7 October 2011 on proposals to achieve savings of £900m by 2014/15 in the cost of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS). The consultation paper is attached as Appendix 1.
- 1.2. The proposals include increases in employee contribution rates from April 2012 and changes to worsen the rate at which benefits accrue to employees from 2013/14 or 2014/15.
- 1.3. The deadline for responses to the consultation is 6 January 2012.
- 1.4. The DCLG has also set two interim deadlines of:
 - 28 October 2011, for respondents to indicate whether they plan to submit alternative proposals, and
 - 25 November 2011, for submission of any specific costed options.
- 1.5. Following discussions with the Director of Human Resources, the County Treasurer has indicated to the DCLG by the deadline of 28 October 2011 that the County Council may wish to consider options that:
 - meet the full savings required of £900m by worsening the accrual rate from the current 1/60th to 1/70th in 2013/14, with no increases in employee contribution rates

- phase these savings over 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15, in the proportions required by the Government
 - enable the longer term position to be considered as part of the Government's review of public service pensions to be implemented in 2015.
- 1.6. The consultation proposals will be reported to the Employment in Hampshire County Council Committee on 9 November 2011 and to Cabinet on 28 November 2011.
 - 1.7. The views of the Pension Fund's other employers will be sought in the meantime and they have been encouraged to respond to the consultation themselves. There will be an opportunity for the Pension Fund Panel to consider the matter again at its meeting on 16 December 2011, including any points raised by the employers or other commentators, before the final deadline for responses of 6 January 2012.
 - 1.8. This report outlines the issues that could be taken into account in the County Council's final response.

2. Background

- 2.1. Following Lord Hutton's Independent Public Service Pensions Commission review, the Chancellor announced that employees in the unfunded public service pension schemes (civil servants, teachers, etc) would be required to pay increased contributions averaging 3.2%. This would raise £2.8bn a year by 2014/15 and would be phased in from April 2012.
- 2.2. The Government has accepted that the 'funded' nature of the LGPS would allow separate discussions to see if alternative ways could be found to achieve the equivalent savings of £900m for the LGPS in England and Wales.
- 2.3. The Government has published two proposals in the consultation paper for achieving the savings of £900m for the LGPS. Both options require a combination of increases in employee contributions and a worsening of the accrual rate.
- 2.4. In the meantime, the Local Government Group has discussed with the local authority trade unions how the savings of £900m could be achieved. No agreement has been reached. Instead, the Local Government Group has submitted its own proposals to the Government which would provide a degree of choice for employees between increased contribution rates and worsened accrual rates, as well as an increase in the normal retirement age for the scheme from 65 to 66. The Local Government Group's proposals are included in Appendix 1 and will be considered by the Government as part of its consultation process.
- 2.5. Following the Hutton Review, the Government is continuing to prepare longer term proposals for the reform of public service pensions. It intends to introduce changes from 2015 following further consultation. This could include options such as changing from a final salary scheme to a career average scheme.

3. The Government's proposals for achieving savings of £900m

- 3.1. The Government has outlined two options involving changes to employee contribution rates and accrual rates, as summarised in the following table. The full details of the proposals are included in the Government's consultation paper attached as Appendix 1.

Table 1 – The Government's proposals

	Option 1			Option 2		
Employee contributions	To save £450m per annum Phased in over 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15 Eleven salary bands, eg: Up to £15,100: no change £22,001 to £32,400: Now: 6.5% 2012/13 7.2% 2013/14 8.0% 2014/15 8.3%			To save £300m per annum Phased in over 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15 Eleven salary bands, eg: Up to £15,100: no change £22,001 to £32,400: Now: 6.5% 2012/13 6.8% 2013/14 7.2% 2014/15 7.5%		
	Contributions for the highest salary band would increase from 7.5% to 12.5%			Contributions for the highest salary band would increase from 7.5% to 12.5%		
	See Table 2 below for full details of the bands			See Table 2 below for the full details of the bands		
Accrual rates	To save £450m per annum Now 1/60 th 2012/13 no change 2013/14 1/64 th 2014/15 1/65 th			To save £600m per annum Now 1/60 th 2012/13 no change 2013/14 no change 2014/15 1/67 th		
Savings	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Contributions	180	360	450	95	220	300
Accrual rates	-	360	450	-	-	600
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	180	720	900	120	240	900
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

- 3.2. The following table shows the significant impact of the Government's proposals on the mid to higher salary bands, even after meeting part of the required savings by worsening accrual rates.

Table 2 – the Government’s proposals for employee contribution bands

Tariff band	Current	Option 1			Option 2		
	%	2012/13 %	2013/14 %	2014/15 %	2012/13 %	2013/14 %	2014/15 %
£0 – 12,900	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%
£12,901 – 15,100	5.8%	5.8%	5.8%	5.8%	5.8%	5.8%	5.8%
£15,101 – 19,400	5.9%	5.9%	6.0%	6.0%	5.9%	6.0%	6.0%
£19,401 – 21,000	6.5%	6.7%	7.2%	7.7%	6.5%	6.8%	6.8%
£21,001 – 32,400	6.5%	7.2%	8.0%	8.3%	6.8%	7.2%	7.5%
£32,401 – 43,300	6.8%	7.5%	8.3%	8.7%	7.1%	7.8%	8.2%
£43,301 – 60,000	7.2%	8.2%	8.7%	9.0%	7.8%	8.4%	8.8%
£60,001 – 81,100	7.2%	8.7%	9.2%	10.0%	8.7%	8.8%	9.5%
£81,101 – 100,000	7.5%	9.0%	9.8%	11.0%	9.0%	9.8%	10.5%
£100,001 – 150,000	7.5%	9.5%	11.0%	12.0%	9.3%	10.8%	11.5%
£150,001+	7.5%	10.0%	12.0%	12.5%	9.5%	11.8%	12.5%

3.3. An accrual rate of 1/60th means that the contributor will receive 1/60th of their final year’s pay for each year of their service. For example, for a employee with 10 years of service and a final salary of £30,000, the annual pension would be $10/60 \times £30,000 = £5,000$. The proposed reductions in accrual rates would apply to future service. Benefits earned from existing service would be unaffected.

3.4. The Government’s proposals are intended to address a number of issues:

- the need for immediate savings, from the increase in employee contributions
- a concern to protect lower paid staff from increased contributions (but not from worsened accrual rates). This is intended to reduce the number of employees that opt to leave the scheme because it is too expensive
- a view that all employees might prefer a reduction in the level of their future benefits (through the worsened accrual rates) to a full increase in their contribution rates, again with a view to limiting opt-outs from the scheme.

3.5. The Government also propose a change in the scheme’s Regulations to allow fund actuaries to reduce employer contribution rates between the normal three yearly actuarial valuations. This would enable employers to benefit immediately from any savings arising from these proposals, provided individual actuaries are prepared to passport those savings through to employers. Some actuaries may take the view, however, that any reduction in the cost of the scheme should be used, as a first priority, to reduce the currently forecast deficits.

4. The Local Government Group's proposals

- 4.1. The Local Government Group has proposed that the first £300m of the £900m savings required by the Government should be met from an increase in the scheme's normal retirement age from 65 to 66 for benefits earned from April 2014.
- 4.2. The Group suggest that the remaining £600m could be met by offering employees earning more than £15,000 a choice between:
 - an increase in their contribution rates, or
 - a worsening in the accrual rates from April 2014.
- 4.3. In addition, the Group propose that employees earning less than £15,000 could be given the option of reducing their existing contribution rates in return for a worsened accrual rate.
- 4.4. The Group's costings include a number of options for these choices, including phasing the implementation, as set out in Appendix 1.

5. Government's consultation questions

- 5.1. The consultation paper invites responses to the following questions:
 - **Question 1** – Do the proposals meet the policy and objectives to deliver the necessary level of savings?
 - **Question 2** – Are there any consequences or aspects of the proposals that have not been fully addressed?
 - **Question 3** – Is there a tariff of alternative measures which consultees think would help to further minimise any opt outs from the scheme?
 - **Question 4** – Are there equality issues that could result in any individual groups being disproportionately affected by the proposals? If so, what are considered to be the nature and scale of that disproportionate effect? What remedies would you suggest?
 - **Question 5** – Within the consultation period, consultees' views are invited on the prospects of introducing into the LGPS a link with the state pension age as recommended to the Government in Lord Hutton's report.

6. Possible responses

- 6.1. The Government has sent its consultation paper to all local authorities. The County Treasurer has drawn the attention of all the Pension Fund's employers in Hampshire to the consultation paper, including those that are not local authorities, so that they will have the opportunity to respond themselves as employers. The County Treasurer will also discuss the proposals with finance colleagues at the meeting of the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Chief Finance Officers on 11 November 2011, again with a view to encouraging employer responses.

- 6.2. The County Council may wish to form a view on the proposals from the two perspectives, firstly as an employer in the scheme and, secondly, as the administering authority of the Pension Fund.
- 6.3. The aim will be to prepare a single response on behalf of the County Council but it may be necessary to highlight any differences in views as a employer and as an administering authority should they arise.

7. Views as an employer

- 7.1. This section sets out the views on the consultation paper of the Director of Human Resources.
- 7.2. The Government proposals preserve until 2015 a final salary pension scheme. This will remain an attractive feature when most other sectors have withdrawn such schemes. It is not expected therefore that the proposed changes would significantly impact recruitment or retention for most roles. In a more buoyant employment market a number of staff in professional roles would be flexible as to employment in the public or private sector and for these the benefit of the pension scheme has probably so far been an important consideration.
- 7.3. For existing staff, the Government's proposals for increased contributions come on top of continued pay constraint that has already had significant impact on staff and their disposable pay. In addition, the Retail Price Index is currently at over 5%.
- 7.4. Whilst the Trade Unions are not supporting the Government's proposals, there has been an attempt by the Government to satisfy some of their requirements by keeping to a minimum any increased cost for lower paid workers. The resulting impact is a disproportionate increase for staff earning more than £21,000. This will undoubtedly be seen as unfair by many and could result in a reduction in membership from those intended to pay more.
- 7.5. It is expected that the combined effect of the above factors is likely to result in a reduction in pension scheme membership, particularly from those being asked to pay more for a lower level of benefit.
- 7.6. The pension scheme accrual rate changed from 1/80th to 1/60th in 2008 and a two stage change to 1/64th and then to 1/65th will be seen by staff as over complex and no doubt will be followed by a further change in 2015 (the intended timescale for a new scheme). It is considered that, in general, staff would appreciate a more straight forward and more equitable change that minimises increased cost whilst pay constraint continues to impact.

8. Views as the administering authority of the Hampshire Pension Fund

- 8.1. The County Treasurer comments that the proposals to change the accrual rate and, in the case of the suggestions from the Local Government Group, to introduce an element of choice for employees will not be straightforward to administer. These changes are likely to be followed in 2015 (ie, almost immediately) by a completely new scheme to be introduced by the

Government. This follows on from the so-called 'new-look' scheme introduced by the Government as recently as April 2008. This succession of changes will add to the existing complexity of the scheme for administrators and there is a strong argument for keeping any changes made now as simple as possible.

- 8.2. The proposals could also prove to be complicated for employees to understand. The decision about whether to forego future accruals in exchange for lower increases in contribution rates may be simple for some employees who simply cannot afford the increased contributions. For others, the decision could be very difficult to judge and it would be a matter on which the County Council and other employers would not be able to advise.
- 8.3. If there are to be short-term changes to accrual rates, there would be strong advantages in limiting these changes to just one, and to keeping the fractions simple, eg from the current 1/60th to 1/70th. Changing to 1/70th could recover the full amount of the Government's target savings of £900m, without any increase in employee contributions.
- 8.4. Increases in contribution rates will inevitably result in some employees opting to leave the pension scheme. It is difficult to forecast how many but it could have a significant impact on the viability of the Pension Fund and its ability to recover the existing deficit.
- 8.5. There is a risk that these changes to the scheme to meet short-term funding pressures could have a fundamentally damaging impact on it just a year or two before the Government introduces its longer-term reforms in 2015. Whatever changes are made now should leave the scheme as intact as possible so that the new scheme in 2015 can be based on robust foundations.

9. Impact of reductions in the number of contributors on the Pension Fund's funding position

- 9.1. Recent research undertaken by the actuaries Hyman Robertson for the Society of County Treasurers modelled the impact on a typical large LGPS fund of:
 - a 5% reduction in contributors as a result of employees opting out of the scheme
 - a further 10% reduction as a result of service cuts following the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review
 - a further 20% reduction as a result of outsourcings.
- 9.2. Not all these changes are relevant to the Government's current consultation but Hyman Robertson's work illustrates the possible impact of the challenges facing the LGPS.
- 9.3. It showed that the typical fund's small annual cashflow surplus from contributions exceeding benefits would reverse as a result of the reduction in contributors. The fund would also become much more 'mature' with the

ratio of pensioners to contributors increasing. This reduces the scope to recover the existing funding deficit from future employers' contributions and, as a result, employers' contributions would have to rise.

- 9.4. This analysis is based on many assumptions but the message is clear. Opt-outs by employees could have a significant impact on the future level of employers' contributions which, in turn, could challenge the future viability of the scheme.
- 9.5. It might raise questions about the wisdom of using any short-term savings from increased employee contributions to reduce employers' contributions, instead of retaining the savings in the fund to reduce the existing deficit. Reducing the deficit will, in the longer term, result in lower employer contribution rates.
- 9.6. From Hampshire Pension Fund's perspective, if the number of contributors is reduced significantly and the Fund becomes more mature, it would be necessary to reconsider the investment strategy, reducing the exposure to growth asset (eg, equities) and increase the holdings of less volatile, income producing assets (eg, bonds). In current economic and market conditions, which may of course change, that could be difficult to achieve without forcing up employers' contributions still further.
- 9.7. The Hampshire Pension Fund's actuary, Aon Hewitt, will provide a briefing on the Government's consultation paper in due course. Tim Lunn, the Fund actuary, will be attending the Pension Fund's Annual Employers Meeting on 31 October 2011 to speak on the progress of the Government's review of public service pensions. The County Treasurer will report orally on any insights that result from the meeting.

10. Overview of the possible response

- 10.1. The County Council's response to the Government's consultation could cover the following principles:
 - support for the Government's aim of reducing the cost of the LGPS for employers
 - support for efforts to limit the number of employees that decide to opt out of membership of the scheme
 - support for proposals to meet part, or all, of the savings required by worsening the accrual rate, instead of meeting the savings from increased employee contribution rates
 - it could be worthwhile questioning why all the required savings should not be met by worsening the accrual rate, pending the Government's longer-term reform of the scheme in 2015, for example, by changing the accrual rate from 1/60ths to 1/70ths. That might reduce the level of opt-outs in the short term. This option is considered in more detail in paragraph 10.2

- if employee contribution rates have to be increased, support for the phasing-in of the increases, whilst noting the resultant delay in achieving the target savings of £900m
- support for a single change in accrual rates over the period, to avoid further complications for pensions administration
- no support for proposals for offering employees a choice between increase contributions or worsened accrual rates, in the interest of minimising the complexity of administration
- support for the argument that changes to the LGPS must be consistent with whatever changes are made to the unfunded schemes for civil servants, teachers and others. The advantages from the funded nature of the LGPS should not, paradoxically, result in the LGPS and its employees being disadvantaged by these changes
- it may also be worthwhile pointing out that the proposed changes are short term and will be superseded by whatever the Government proposes in its longer-term reform of the LGPS – which would suggest that the simplest possible, and least damaging, short-term solution should be adopted
- in addition, it would be worthwhile pointing out that it may not be feasible or prudent for all the savings to be passed on to employers when many LGPS funds are in deficit.

10.2. Specifically, the response could propose that all the £900m savings required by the Government could be met by worsening the accrual rate from 1/60th to 1/70th, with no increases in employee contribution rates. The advantages would be that:

- employees' pay would be unaffected
- the level of opt-outs by employees from the scheme should be reduced
- the risk of industrial action might be reduced
- the proposals are easier to understand and simpler to administer.

10.3. The change to an accrual rate of 1/70th could be implemented in 2013/14 so that the saving of £900m would be obtained in that year. However, as the Government wishes to phase in the savings from 2012/13, fund actuaries could be asked to spread the impact on employers over the period from 2012/13 (for example, so that the savings are phased as in the Government's first option in the consultation paper: £180m in 2012/13, £720m in 2013/14 and £900m in 2014/15).

10.4. The County Treasurer has indicated to the Government, by its deadline of 28 October 2011, that the County Council may wish to submit an alternative proposal as outlined in paragraph 10.3.

10.5. If members agree with this approach, and subject to any further comments that members may wish to make, a full response to the Government's consultation questions set out in paragraph 5.1 will be prepared reflecting the views outlined in this section.

11. Recommendations

Pension Fund Panel

- 11.1. That the alternative approach of meeting all the required savings of £900m by worsening the accrual rate, as set out in paragraphs 10.2 and 10.3, be endorsed from the point of view of the administering authority of the Hampshire Pension Fund.
- 11.2. That a full response to the Government's consultation be prepared reflecting the views set out in section 10.

Employment in Hampshire County Council Committee

- 11.3. That the alternative approach of meeting all the required savings of £900m by worsening the accrual rate, as set out in paragraphs 10.2 and 10.3, be endorsed from the point of view of an employer in the Hampshire Pension Fund.
- 11.4. That a full response to the Government's consultation be prepared reflecting the views set out in section 10.

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 a response to the Government's consultation by the County Council is required.	

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.)

DocumentLocation

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.



www.communities.gov.uk
community, opportunity, prosperity

To Local Government Pension
Scheme interests in England
and Wales (see list below)

TBJ Crossley
Deputy Director
Workforce, Pay and Pensions
Zone 5/F5 Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU

Telephone: 0303 44 42168

Website: www.communities.gov.uk

7 October 2011

Dear Colleagues,

Local Government Pension Scheme (Benefits, Contributions and Membership)
Regulations 2007 (SI 2007/1166) (as amended)

Local Government Pension Scheme (Administration) Regulations 2008 (SI
2008/239) (as amended)

Consultation on proposed increases to employee contribution rates and changes to
scheme accrual rates, effective from 1 April 2012 in England and Wales

Introduction

- 1.1 With ministers' agreement, this consultation paper sets out the Government's draft proposals to achieve short term savings of £900m within the Local Government Pension Scheme ('LGPS') by 2014-15, equivalent to the 3.2 percentage point contribution increases in the unfunded public service pension schemes.
- 1.2 This consultation exercise marks the start of the formal statutory consultation process for proposed amendments to the LGPS Regulations (mentioned above), as required by section 7(5) of the Superannuation Act 1972.
- 1.3 Your comments are now invited on the proposed amendments, described in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.5 and Annex A, and should be sent preferably by email to Richard.mcdonagh@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Alternatively, postal responses may be sent to:

The LGPS Pension Team
5/G6,
Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House,
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU

- 1.4 **The closing date for responses is 6 January 2012.**

- 1.5 The intention is that the proposed amendments to the scheme's regulatory framework will take effect from 1 April 2012, subject to the outcome of this consultation exercise.
- 1.6 Consultees are reminded that the proposed amendments, and any others brought forward, will continue to be discussed at forthcoming meetings of the Policy Review Group, and at other meetings being arranged by the Department with LGPS business partners within the statutory consultation period.
- 1.7 The details of the possible amendments to the existing LGPS regulatory framework are explained in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.8.

Policy context

- 2.1 In June 2010 the Government commissioned former Work and Pensions Secretary, Lord Hutton, to chair the Independent Public Service Pensions Commission's review into the long term future of public service pensions. In his final report Lord Hutton set out his recommendations on how these can be made sustainable and affordable in the long-term, whilst at the same time being fair to both public sector workers and the taxpayer. Lord Hutton concluded that reform was needed.

The Government accepted his recommendations as a basis for consultation with public sector workers, trade unions and other interested parties about the need for long term reform. The Government intends to introduce changes from 2015 and has confirmed that all pension benefits earned up that point will be protected. The reforms will ensure that all public service pensions, including the LGPS, will continue to be amongst the best pensions available. Lord Hutton's interim report is available via the HM Treasury website at:

www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/indreviewjohnhuttonpensions.htm

Delivery of short term savings

- 3.1 Before making his recommendations for wider reform, Lord Hutton published his interim report. This recommended that if the Government wished to make short term savings to meet current cost pressures, then raising contribution rates would be the most effective way to achieve that objective. Lord Hutton's interim report is available via the HM Treasury website at:
www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/indreviewjohnhuttonpensions.htm
- 3.2 Lord Hutton set out the following rationale for increasing member contributions to public service pension schemes:
 - a. people are living much longer than previous generations – the average 60 year old is living ten years longer now than they did in the 1970s. More of people's lives are now being spent in retirement – between 40 per cent to 45 per cent of adult life compared with around 30 per cent for pensioners in the 1950s

- b. as people are living longer in retirement, the cost of providing pensions is increasing; annual expenditure on public service pensions over the last decade has increased by a third to £32bn. And in the case of the LGPS, expenditure on benefits has increased from £1.8bn to £6bn since 1997
 - c. taxpayers can't be expected to bear all the cost of increased longevity. There needs to be a fairer balance between what employees pay and what other taxpayers contribute towards a public service pension.
- 3.3 At the Spending Review, the Chancellor acted upon the rationale Lord Hutton set out by announcing that employee contributions would be increased by an average of 3.2 percentage points in the unfunded public service pension schemes. This will make savings of £2.8bn a year by 2014-15, to be phased in from April 2012.
- 3.4 The Chief Secretary to the Treasury's statement to the House on 19 July 2011 confirmed that the unfunded schemes would begin formal consultations on the proposed increases in employee contribution rates for 2012-13. In recognition of the funded nature of the LGPS, the Government accepted that separate discussions should take place to see whether alternative ways to deliver some or all of the savings could be found. The equivalent savings in the LGPS are £900m in England and Wales. The Chief Secretary to the Treasury's statement can be found at www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/press8311.htm
- 3.5 On 20 July, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government wrote to Sir Merrick Cockell, Chair of the Local Government Group, inviting him to discuss with the local authority trades unions a package of measures to secure the required short-term savings of £900m by 2014-15. The Group was asked to report the outcome of its discussions to the Secretary of State by 9 September.
- 3.6 Neither the Local Government Group nor the local authority trades unions were in a position to submit proposals as requested by 9 September. Subsequently, on 21 September, the Local Government Group wrote to the Secretary of State with their proposals to achieve the savings requested. These are summarised at paragraph 4.7 and a full copy attached at Annex **B** and related costings are at Annex **C**.
- 3.7 The Local Government Group's proposals can be considered fully within the statutory consultation framework. If discussions between the Local Government Group and local authority trades unions continue, and any other proposals eventually come forward, either separately or jointly, these can also feed into the statutory consultation process alongside any other comments or proposals submitted by other consultees. The Scheme's Policy Review Group provides an expert forum for analysis and discussion to take place. The Government would welcome this discussion continuing and will fully explore any new proposals that are put forward.

Parameters for member contribution increases

- 3.8 The Government believes that any proposed increases in contribution rates should protect low earners and be progressive, so that high earners pay proportionally higher increases to reflect their more generous pensions. The Government set out its preferred parameters for scheme design to achieve the required savings in the Chief Secretary's Written Ministerial Statement of 19 July.
- 3.9 These parameters, outlined below, are reflected in the tariffs being proposed in this consultation document. All references are to full time equivalent salaries:
- there should be no increase in employee contributions for those earning less than £15,000
 - there should be no more than a 1.5 percentage point increase in total by 2014-15 for those earning up to £21,000. This amounts to a 0.6 percentage point increase in 2012-13 on a pro-rata basis; and
 - high earners in the LGPS should pay progressively more than those in lower salary bands more, but no more than 6 percentage points (before tax relief) more

Proposals for the Local Government Pension Scheme

- 4.1 For the LGPS in England and Wales, ministers believe there is an opportunity to consider a broad range of measures to secure appropriate levels of savings for scheme employers. This should enable the Government's priorities in implementing the £900m savings package to be met; protecting the high proportion of low paid, part-time members of the Scheme; and ensuring contribution increases are progressive.
- 4.3 **Option 1** - The following approach fully meets the Government's priorities. This is the option on the basis of which we have set the cost ceiling¹ for wider reform of the Local Government Pension Scheme.

Option 1 - This proposal to achieve the required £900m savings by 2014-15 (3 per cent of forecast pensionable paybill) comprises of two separate elements:

i) An increase in the employees' contribution tariff from April 2012, to raise an additional £450m (1.5 per cent of pensionable paybill), and

ii) A change in the scheme's accrual rate from April 2013, to raise an additional £450m (1.5 per cent of pensionable paybill)

A more detailed analysis is shown at Annex A

¹ The cost ceilings was set with reference to the scheme specific contribution rates required to provide the benefits for a 'Reference Scheme' design, based on Lord Hutton's recommendations for scheme reform. This will inform discussions at scheme level with local government trade unions. Should the outcome of this consultation process be that member contribution increases are not 1.5 pp, the cost ceiling will be amended appropriately.

- 4.4 The Government Actuary's Department confirms that the measures described at **Annex A** above can achieve the required savings of £900m by 2014-15.
- 4.5 **Option 2** - A variation on that approach involving lower tariff increases, but offset by greater changes in accrual rate, or vice versa, could be chosen. One approach is set out below.

Option 2 - This proposal to achieve the required £900m savings by 2014-15 (3 per cent of forecast pensionable paybill) comprises of two separate elements. It differs from Option 1 due to a lower contribution rate increase which is offset by a greater reduction in the accrual rate:

- i) An increase in employees' contribution tariff from April 2012, to raise an additional £300m (1 per cent of pensionable paybill), and**
- ii) A change in scheme's accrual rate from April 2014, to raise an additional £600m (2 per cent of pensionable paybill)**

A more detailed analysis is shown at Annex A

- 4.6. **Normal Pension Age:** In his final report, Lord Hutton recommended that the pension age in public sector schemes could be linked to the State Pension Age.

According to the Government Actuary's Department, setting the national pension age of the LGPS at the national State Pension Age would deliver annual savings in the region of £330m if implemented for future service accruals.

Measures to achieve the remaining required savings could include a combination of changes to accrual rate and employees' contributions.

- 4.7 **Local Government Group:** In response to the Secretary of State's invitation of 20 July, the Local Government Group submitted a proposal to secure £900msavings by 2014-15. This consists of an increase to the normal pension age to 66, and a member choice of an increased contribution rate of change in the scheme's accrual rate.
- 4.8 The Local Government Group's submission (including detailed costings) to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government can be found in full in **Annex B** and **C** respectively.

Part time members

- 4.9 The current scheme regulations require that the appropriate contribution band for part time members is determined by their full time equivalent salary. The amount payable is then based on the individual's actual pay. This will continue to apply. For example, a scheme member currently working part time, doing 50 per cent of full time hours and earning £14,000 will have a full time equivalent salary of £28,000. The rate of 6.5 per cent is therefore applied to the actual earnings of £14,000. It is important to note that although the actual earnings fall within the protection threshold described at para 3.8 above, these protections, like the tariff bands, are based on full time equivalent salaries, in this example, £28,000.

Provision allowing scheme employers to benefit from savings

- 4.10 The additional income achieved from the scheme amendments following the Spending Review announcement will help to re-balance the costs of public service pension provision between scheme members on the one hand, and employers and taxpayers on the other. In the context of the funded, locally administered LGPS, this is achieved when employers' contributions are reduced as part of the scheme's statutory triennial actuarial valuation process. However, the current regulations do not allow a downward revision of employer contribution rates between three-yearly actuarial valuations.
- 4.11 To ensure LGPS employers and taxpayers benefit from the savings achieved by the statutory amendments finally introduced, we suggest that it would be necessary to provide a technical amendment, effective from April 2012, that enables scheme-appointed actuaries to vary rates and adjustment certificates both between valuation exercises (i.e. between the 2010 and 2013 valuations), and provide that the accrual rate changes proposed are reflected specifically in the 31 March 2013 valuation exercise to reflect the level of savings produced in scheme employers' contribution rates from April 2014. Views are invited on this particular proposal and how best it might be achieved in regulatory terms.

Summary

- 5.1 The Government Actuary's Department confirms that the introduction of the measures summarised in paragraphs 4.3 and 4.5 above and described in more detail at **Annex A**, can achieve the required savings of £900m by 2014-15.

Consultation responses

- 6.1 Consultees' views on the proposals outlined in section 4 are formally sought by 6 January 2012. However, as set out below, those may be subject to modification in response to submissions received from consultees in the course of the consultation period.

Other proposals

- 6.2 As referred to in paragraph 4.7, the Local Government Group has submitted their proposed package of savings to the Secretary of State. The Department intends to analyse and consider the details of the submission with advisers to the Group within the statutory consultation exercise period.

- 6.3 Any further alternative proposals which may be submitted should if possible:
- be actuarially costed and verifiable and be clearly explained to provide efficient assessment
 - be capable of implementation within the legal powers which govern the regulatory framework of the scheme and
 - not take account of the recent changes in indexation from RPI to CPI or the impact of projected workforce reductions which have already been factored into recent LGPS pension fund valuations
- 6.4 To assist the Department's considerations, consultees who may wish to submit alternative proposals:
- are invited to signal their intention to do so as soon as possible, please, and by **28 October** at the latest and
 - are requested, please, to submit any specific costed options by no later than **25 November**, to allow an opportunity for discussion and appraisal


Next steps

- 7.1 The Department invites consultees' views and any evidence relating to all aspects of this statutory consultation, and in particular to the following questions:
- **Question 1** – Do the proposals meet the policy and objectives to deliver the necessary level of savings in the LGPS?
 - **Question 2** – Are there any consequences or aspects of the proposals that have not been fully addressed?
 - **Question 3** – Is there a tariff or alternative measures which consultees think would help to further minimise any opt outs from the scheme?
 - **Question 4** - Are there equality issues that could result in any individual groups being disproportionately affected by the proposals? If so, what are considered to be the nature and scale of that disproportionate effect? What remedies would you suggest?
 - **Question 5** - Within the consultation period, consultee's views are invited on the prospects of introducing into the LGPS a link with state pension age as recommended to the Government in Lord Hutton's report.

Use of information

- 8.1 This consultation will be available for viewing on the LGFPS website at <http://www.clg.heywood.co.uk/homepage>. A summary of responses will be published within three months of the close of the consultation on this website.
- 8.2 Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).
- 8.3 If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the Freedom of Information Act, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.
- 8.4 The Department will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Yours sincerely,



T B J CROSSLEY

The consultation is addressed to:

The Chief Executive of:

County Councils (England)
District Councils (England)
Metropolitan Borough Councils (England)
Unitary Councils (England)
County and County Borough Councils in Wales
London Borough Councils
South Yorkshire Pension Authority
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council
Bradford Metropolitan City Council
South Tyneside Metropolitan Borough Council
Wolverhampton Metropolitan Borough Council
London Pension Fund Authority
Environment Agency

Town Clerk, City of London Corporation
Clerk, South Yorkshire PTA
Clerk, West Midlands PTA
Fire and Rescue Authorities in England and Wales
Police Authorities in England and Wales
Audit Commission
National Probation Service for England and Wales
New Towns Pension Fund
Local Government Association (LGA)
Employers' Organisation
LGPC
ALACE
PPMA
SOLACE
CIPFA
ALAMA
Association of Colleges
Association of Consulting Actuaries
Association of District Treasurers
Society of County Treasurers
Society of Welsh Treasurers
Society of Metropolitan Treasurers
Society of London Treasurers
Society of Chief Personnel Officers
Association of Educational Psychologists
NALC
Society of Local Council Clerks
Trades Union Congress UCATT
UNISON GMB
NAEIAAC NAPO
UNITE
Equal Opportunities Commission

Annex A: Local Government Pension Scheme in England and Wales

Government's proposals to achieve the required savings of £900m by 2014-15

Design principles

1. The Government believes that any proposed increases in contributions rates should protect low earners and be progressive, so that high earners pay proportionally higher increases to reflect their more generous pensions. The Government also set out its preferred parameters for scheme design to achieve the required savings in the Chief Secretary's Written Ministerial Statement of 19 July.
2. These parameters, outlined below, are reflected in the tariff proposed in this paper (all references are to full time equivalent salaries):
 - there should be no increase in employee contributions for those earning less than £15,000
 - there should be no more than a 1.5 percentage point increase in total by 2014-15 for those earning up to £21,000. This amounts to a 0.6 percentage point increase in 2012-13 on a pro-rata basis
 - high earners will pay more, but no more than 6 percentage points (before tax relief) by 2014-15. This amounts to a 2.4 percentage point cap in 2012-13 on a pro-rata basis
3. For the LGPS in England and Wales, ministers believe there is a case to consider a broader range of opportunities to secure appropriate levels of savings for employers within the scheme. The scheme's funded status lends itself to this approach which not only helps to protect the high proportion of low paid, part-time members of the scheme but it assists directly in the Government's objective to minimise opt-outs and contribute to the ongoing viability of the funded LGPS, itself a major policy component of the package given the national significance of LGPS pension funds by value.

Existing tariff

4. The existing levels of employee contributions as currently set out in regulation 3 of the Local Government Pension Scheme (Benefits, Contributions and Membership) regulations 2007 (the Benefits Regulations) are as follows:

£0 - £12,600	5.5%
£12,601 - £14,700	5.8%
£14,701 - £18,900	5.9%
£18,901 - £31,500	6.5%
£31,501 - £42,000	6.8%
£42,001 - £78,700	7.2%
£78,701 +	7.5%

Government proposals for the Local Government Pension Scheme

5. The Government proposes to achieve the required savings of £900m by 2014-15 from a combination of a proportionate increase in the rate of contribution paid by scheme members and a marginal change in the rate at which scheme benefits are accrued. The proportion of each element relative to the required £900m savings would therefore have different impacts on the extent to which scheme members bear additional costs now (increase in the contribution rate) or later, on retirement (change in the accrual rate).
6. Comments are therefore invited on two possible approaches, the first of which achieves most of the savings from the proposed change in accrual rate, thus impacting less on scheme members' disposable income and the second, weighting more of the required savings towards increases in scheme members' contribution with less impact on future accrual under the current scheme.

Approach 1

7. Under this proposal, £450m (equivalent to 1.5 per cent) would be achieved from a phased increase in employees' contribution rate as shown in the table below:

Tariff Band (% of membership)	Current	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
£0 - £12,900 (8.67%)	5.5%	5.5% (0.0%)	5.5% (0.0%)	5.5% (0.0%)
£12,901 - £15,100 (10.61%)	5.8%	5.8% (0.0%)	5.8% (0.0%)	5.8% (0.0%)
£15,101 - £19,400 (25.20%)	5.9%	5.9% (0.0%)	6.0% (0.1%)	6.0% (0.1%)
£19,401 - £21,000 (7.47%)	6.5%	6.7% (0.2%)	7.2% (0.7%)	7.7% (1.2%)
£21,001 - £32,400 (31.34%)	6.5%	7.2% (0.7%)	8.0% (1.5%)	8.3% (1.8%)
£32,401 - £43,300 (11.16%)	6.8%	7.5% (0.7%)	8.3% (1.5%)	8.7% (1.9%)
£43,301 - £60,000 (4.18%)	7.2%	8.2% (1.0%)	8.7% (1.5%)	9.0% (1.8%)
£60,001 - £81,100 (0.91%)	7.2%	8.7% (1.5%)	9.2% (2.0%)	10.0% (2.8%)
£81,101 - £100,000 (0.25%)	7.5%	9.0% (1.5%)	9.8% (2.3%)	11.0% (3.5%)
£100,001 - £150,000 (0.16%)	7.5%	9.5% (2.0%)	11.0% (3.5%)	12.0% (4.5%)
£150,001 + (0.05%)	7.5%	10.0% (2.5%)	12.0% (4.5%)	12.5% (5.0%)

Local Government Pension Scheme employee contributions are deducted from gross pay before income tax. Therefore, they normally benefit from tax relief.

The tables below illustrate the effect of tax relief on the level of contributions members would pay if the proposed tariff above is adopted in 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15.

Full-time pay	2011/12	2012/2013		
	Contribution rate net of tax relief ¹	Contribution rate net of tax relief	Increase in contribution rate net of tax relief	Additional cost (£ per month)
£10,000	4.40%	4.40%	0.00%	0
£25,000	5.20%	5.76%	0.56%	12
£40,000	5.44%	6.00%	0.56%	19
£80,000	4.32%	5.22%	0.90%	60

1:Contribution rate net of tax relief is the percentage of your total pay by which your take-home pay is lower because of the proposed new tariff.

Full-time pay	2011/12	2013/2014		
	Contribution rate net of tax relief ¹	Contribution rate net of tax relief	Increase in contribution rate net of tax relief	Additional cost (£ per month)
£10,000	4.40%	4.40%	0.00%	0
£25,000	5.20%	6.40%	1.20%	25
£40,000	5.44%	6.64%	1.20%	40
£80,000	4.32%	5.52%	1.20%	80

1:Contribution rate net of tax relief is the percentage of your total pay by which your take-home pay is lower because of the proposed new tariff.

Full-time pay	2011/12	2014/2015		
	Contribution rate net of tax relief ¹	Contribution rate net of tax relief	Increase in contribution rate net of tax relief	Additional cost (£ per month)
£10,000	4.40%	4.40%	0.00%	0
£25,000	5.20%	6.64%	1.44%	30
£40,000	5.44%	6.96%	1.52%	51
£80,000	4.32%	6.00%	1.68%	112

1:Contribution rate net of tax relief is the percentage of your total pay by which your take-home pay is lower because of the proposed new tariff.

8. The balance of £450m in this case would be achieved a by a stepped change in the scheme's accrual rate from the current rate of 1/60ths to 1/64ths with effect from April 2013 and to 1/65ths with effect from April 2014

Impact of benefits of change in accrual

The following tables show the effect on the pension of a change in accrual rate from 60ths to 64ths in 2013-14 and to 65ths in 2014-15:

Final pensionable pay (31.03.2015)	1 year of service		
	1/64th	1/65th	% Change
£10,000	£156.25	£153.85	-1.54%
£25,000	£390.63	£384.62	-1.54%
£40,000	£625.00	£615.38	-1.54%
£80,000	£1,250.00	£1,230.77	-1.54%

Final pensionable pay (31.03.2015)	Five years of service		
	1/60th	64ths and 65ths in last two years	% Change
£10,000	£833.33	£810.10	-2.79%
£25,000	£2,083.33	£2025.25	-2.79%
£40,000	£3,333.33	£3,240.38	-2.79%
£80,000	£6,666.67	£6,480.77	-2.79%

In the above table, the member accrues 60ths for three years, 64ths for 1 year and 65ths for one year.

A member with final pensionable pay of £40,000 and service of five years at 31 March 2015 will have accrued a pension of £3,333.33 pa on an accrual of 60ths. If the accrual rate is lowered to 64ths in 2013-14 and to 65ths in 2014-15, then the accrued pension at 31 March 2015 will be around 3 per cent lower at £3,240.38.

9. On this basis, the total expected savings over the Spending review period would be:

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Tariff Increase	£180m	£360m	£450m
Accrual Rate	£0	£360m	£450m
Total	£180m	£720m	£900m

10. In line with the Government's preferred design, the overall savings achieved from the above proposed increases in employees' contribution rates have been phased in over the Spending review period on a ratio of 40:40:20.

Approach 2

11. Under this proposal, £300m of the £900m required savings (equivalent to 1 per cent) would be achieved from a phased increase in employees' contribution rate as shown in the table below:

Tariff Band (% of membership)	Current	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
£0 - £12,900 (8.67%)	5.5%	5.5% (0.0%)	5.5% (0.0%)	5.5% (0.0%)
£12,901 - £15,100 (10.61%)	5.8%	5.8% (0.0%)	5.8% (0.0%)	5.8% (0.0%)
£15,101 - £19,400 (25.20%)	5.9%	5.9% (0.0%)	6.0% (0.1%)	6.0% (0.1%)
£19,401 - £21,000 (7.47%)	6.5%	6.5% (0.0%)	6.8% (0.3%)	6.8% (0.3%)
£21,001 - £32,400 (31.34%)	6.5%	6.8% (0.3%)	7.2% (0.7%)	7.5% (1.0%)
£32,401 - £43,300 (11.16%)	6.8%	7.1% (0.3%)	7.8% (1.0%)	8.2% (1.4%)
£43,301 - £60,000 (4.18%)	7.2%	7.8% (0.6%)	8.4% (1.2%)	8.8% (1.6%)
£60,001 - £81,100 (0.91%)	7.2%	8.7% (1.5%)	8.8% (1.6%)	9.5% (2.3%)
£81,101 - £100,000 (0.25%)	7.5%	9.0% (1.5%)	9.8% (2.3%)	10.5% (3.0%)
£100,001 - £150,000 (0.16%)	7.5%	9.3% (1.8%)	10.8% (3.3%)	11.5% (4.0%)
£150,001 + (0.05%)	7.5%	9.5% (2.0%)	11.8% (4.3%)	12.5% (5.0%)

Local Government Pension Scheme employee contributions are deducted from gross pay before income tax. Therefore, they normally benefit from tax relief.

The tables below illustrate the effect of tax relief on the level of contributions members would pay if the proposed tariff above is adopted in 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15.

Full-time pay	2011/12	2012/2013		
	Contribution rate net of tax relief ¹	Contribution rate net of tax relief	Increase in contribution rate net of tax relief	Additional cost (£ per month)
£10,000	4.40%	4.40%	0.00%	0
£25,000	5.20%	5.44%	0.24%	5
£40,000	5.44%	5.68%	0.24%	8
£80,000	4.32%	5.22%	0.90%	60

1: Contribution rate net of tax relief is the percentage of your total pay by which your take-home pay is lower because of the proposed new tariff.

Full-time pay	2011/12	2013/2014		
	Contribution rate net of tax relief ¹	Contribution rate net of tax relief	Increase in contribution rate net of tax relief	Additional cost (£ per month)
£10,000	4.40%	4.40%	0.00%	0
£25,000	5.20%	5.76%	0.56%	12
£40,000	5.44%	6.24%	0.80%	27
£80,000	4.32%	5.28%	0.96%	64

1: Contribution rate net of tax relief is the percentage of your total pay by which your take-home pay is lower because of the proposed new tariff.

Full-time pay	2011/12	2014/2015		
	Contribution rate net of tax relief ¹	Contribution rate net of tax relief	Increase in contribution rate net of tax relief	Additional cost (£ per month)
£10,000	4.40%	4.40%	0.00%	0
£25,000	5.20%	6.00%	0.80%	17
£40,000	5.44%	6.56%	1.12%	37
£80,000	4.32%	5.70%	1.38%	92

1: Contribution rate net of tax relief is the percentage of your total pay by which your take-home pay is lower because of the proposed new tariff.

12. It is proposed that the balance of £600m (equivalent to 2 per cent) would be achieved by a change in the Scheme's accrual rate from the current 1/60th to 1/67th with effect from 1 April 2014

Impact of benefits of change in accrual

The following tables show the effect on the pension of a change in accrual rate during the year 2014-15.

Final pensionable pay (31.03.2015)	One year of service		
	1/60th	1/67th	% Change
£10,000	£166.67	£149.25	-10.45%
£25,000	£416.67	£373.13	-10.45%
£40,000	£666.67	£597.01	-10.45%
£80,000	£1,333.33	£1,194.03	-10.45%

Final pensionable pay (31.03.2015)	Five years of service		
	1/60th	1/67th	% Change
£10,000	£833.33	£815.92	-2.09%
£25,000	£2,083.33	£2,039.80	-2.09%
£40,000	£3,333.33	£3,263.68	-2.09%
£80,000	£6,666.67	£6,527.36	-2.09%

A member with Final Pensionable Pay of £40,000 pa and service of five years at 31 March 2015 will have accrued a pension of £3,333.33 pa on an accrual of 60ths. If the accrual rate is lowered to 67ths in 2014-15, then the accrued pension at 31 March 2015 will be around 2 per cent lower at £3,263.68 pa.

13. On this basis, the total expected savings over the Spending review period would be:

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Tariff Increase	£95m	£220m	£300m
Accrual Rate	£0	£0m	£600m
Total	£120m	£240m	£900m

Annex B: Local Government Group proposals, 21 September 2011

Local Government Pension Scheme – Proposed increase in employee contributions

As you will be aware, in the public sector Spending Review statement in October 2010 the Government announced its intention to increase employee pension contributions in the public service pension schemes (other than the Armed Forces Pension Scheme). The Government intended that the increases should be introduced progressively over the period 2012-13 to 2014-15. It was subsequently confirmed that the level of increase for members of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) would be 3.2 per cent, on average.

The Local Government Group made representations to the Government that the funded nature of the LGPS meant that income equivalent to a 3.2 per cent increase could be generated in ways other than wholly via an increase in employee contributions. As a result of those representations the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government wrote to me on 20 July 2011 asking the Group to enter into discussions with the local government trade unions. This was with a view to establishing a package of measures to secure short term savings by 2014-15, equivalent to a 3.2 per cent increase in employee pension contribution rates, with any necessary legislation to be in place by 1 April 2012. The package could include alternative ways to deliver some or all of the savings, whilst providing protections from contribution increases for the lower paid.

The LG Group has been in discussions with the trade unions since then.

The Secretary of State's letter of 20 July 2011 initially required the Group to provide him with an update on the outcome of the discussions by 9 September but a short extension to this deadline was subsequently allowed. However, despite constructive discussions with the trade unions, it has not so far been possible to reach agreement on a joint proposal to put to the Secretary of State.

I have therefore written to the Secretary of State (on 21 September 2011) setting out the Group's proposals as to how the required 3.2 per cent savings can be achieved in a way which we believe is fair to employees and affordable for the taxpayer (as an alternative to the level of increases in employee contributions that DCLG might otherwise come forward with). The proposals minimise the impact on the lower paid whilst at the same time giving choice to individuals.

The key elements of the Group's proposals are:

- no increase in employee contributions for staff with full-time equivalent earnings of less than £15,000, a moderate increase for those earning between £15,000 and £21,000 of 1.5 per cent and an increase of between 2 per cent and 2.5 per cent for those earning over £21,000
- choice for employees, by giving those with full-time equivalent earnings of £15,000 or more who feel they cannot afford an increase in contributions the option of taking a reduced pension accrual rate instead for

future service from April 2014. Any employees with full-time equivalent earnings of less than £15,000 who may be finding it difficult to meet the current level of contribution would have the option of taking a reduction in their contribution rate but would, as a result, have a reduced pension accrual rate for future service from April 2014

- raising the normal pension age from 65 to 66 for benefits built up from April 2014. Benefits built up prior to then would retain a normal pension age of 65

A full copy of my letter to the Secretary of State is available at <http://www.lge.gov.uk/lge/core/page.do?pageld=1> under 'News and features' together with some worked examples of the effect the choice mentioned in the second bullet point above would have on individuals.

We believe our proposals:

- overcome the issue of part-time employees having to pay an increased contribution rate determined by reference to their full-time equivalent salary (i.e. they would have the choice of being able to take the reduced accrual rate option instead)
- would help the low paid to stay in the scheme and reduce opt out rates
- give employees a choice, which they can exercise in the light of their own personal circumstances
- ensure that those employees earning above the £15,000 threshold who want to keep their current pension accrual rate will have to pay more to retain that accrual rate, and
- reduce the risk of industrial action

We understand that the Secretary of State will issue a statutory consultation document towards the end of September setting out the DCLG proposals for how the 3.2 per cent savings could be met. We would hope that consultation paper will make some reference to the LG Group proposals and it is our intention to continue discussions with the trade unions.

Annex C: Costings submitted with Local Government Proposals, 21 September 2011

1 Data

1.1.1 We have used national salary data to estimate the possible savings. We have assumed a £30bn payroll split as shown below.

	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current Rate	Actual Salary
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	£465,749,324
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	£903,561,303
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	£4,336,702,797
Band 4	£18,901	£31,500	6.5%	£12,996,837,271
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	£6,132,933,585
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	£4,433,984,527
Band 7	£78,701	plus	7.5%	£730,231,193
Total				£30,000,000,000

1.1.2 This is the best available national data we have and is available in summary form only.

1.1.3 We note that contribution bands have changed but the overall shape of the salary distribution is assumed to remain relevant for this exercise. Any further up to date data becoming available should be used to update the calculations.

1.2 Core element 1 - increasing normal retirement age

1.2.1 Increasing the retirement age for all by one year reduces the ongoing cost of the scheme by about 1 per cent to 1.5 per cent of payroll though this will vary by fund. We have assumed that GAD may value this on detailed national data on an average set of fund valuation assumptions and have assumed that 1 per cent of payroll will be saved by adopting this change. This is equivalent to £300m per year on the data shown above.

1.3 Core element 2 - accrual or contribution rate changes

1.3.1 We have therefore considered how we can raise the further £600m being required by HM Treasury.

1.3.2 There are infinite combinations of contribution increases that will provide the £600m provided there are no opt outs, the data remains as estimated above and at this stage we are considering that 60ths accrual remains.

1.3.3 We have shown three examples below. These show the impact and make no allowance for any further options being proposed.

Table 1.3	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution	a) same increase	b) same uplift	c) steeper increase
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	2.1%	1.9%	1.5%
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%	1.5%
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%	2.0%
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%	2.5%
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	2.1%	2.2%	2.5%
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	2.1%	2.3%	2.5%
Band 7	£78,701	plus	7.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Total raised				£600m	£605m	£605m

1.3.4 We have assumed that lower paid protection level is set at £15,000 and members with salaries below this level will not be required to increase their contribution levels going forward.

1.3.5 As can be seen, all these options will provide for the required income target. However, there is a higher risk of opt out for higher contribution increases, especially at lower salary levels. We consider that steeper patterns than option c) will effect much higher levels of opt out at higher salary bands, with the possible cascade effect as members follow behaviour patterns of their senior managers or directors.

1.3.6 Option c) also meets the patterns required for other public sector schemes in that a 1.5 per cent limit is set for those with salaries up to £21,000.

1.4 Core element 3 - reduce accrual option

1.4.1 This section shows the possible savings from providing a reduced accrual option.

1.4.2 These savings assume that all members opt for the reduced accrual option.

Table 1.4	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution rate	Reduce accrual (67ths)	Reduce accrual (68ths)	Reduce accrual (69ths)
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 7	£78,701	plus	7.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Total raised				£600m	£675m	£715m

1.4.3 The accrual reduction that provides for £600m will depend upon both how the GAD value the reduced accrual change of the benefits on national detailed data.

1.4.4 It will also depend upon where the lower paid protection limit gets set and the above assumes that this is set at £15,000.

1.5 Core element 3 – the lower paid

1.5.1 The model suggested allows for lower paid members to pay reduced contributions if they choose the lower accrual route. We have used 68th accrual in the following table and assumed that a reduction in contributions of say 60/68 times the current rate would be a fair level of reduction.

Table 1.5	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution rate	Reduce accrual (67ths)	Reduce contributions	Net effect
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	2.4%	0.6%	1.7%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	2.4%	0.7%	1.7%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%			
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%			
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%			
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%			
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%			
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%			
Band 7	£78,701	plus	7.5%			
Total raised				£32m	£10m	£22m

1.5.2 As can be seen above the saving will depend upon how much a reduction in contributions is offered to the lower paid members and how many of the lower paid opt for reducing accrual compared to the status quo.

1.5.3 However, we feel it remains equitable to offer this reduced cost option, setting the possible accrual level at the same level as the higher paid to provide the lower paid with a similar choice.

1.5.4 Any savings made from the above will depend on members choice so should not be included as certain in the total costs.

1.6 Core element 3 – the higher paid

1.6.1 The model suggested that higher paid members will retain their current 60th accrual by paying more into the scheme. However we recognise that this will not be attractive and perhaps unaffordable for some.

1.6.2 In this section therefore we have shown possible reduced accrual options that would provide these members with an alternative allowing their current contribution rates to remain.

1.6.3 We have shown three cases below corresponding to the tables of proposed contribution increase tariffs within section 1.4.

Table 1.6 a	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution rate	a) same increase	Reduce accrual (67ths)
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 7	£78,701	plus	7.5%	2.1%	2.1%
Total raised				£600m	£600m

Table 1.6 b	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution rate	b) same proportionate increase	Reduce accrual (68ths)
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	1.9%	2.4%
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	2.2%	2.4%
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	2.3%	2.4%
Band 7	£78,701	plus	7.5%	2.4%	2.4%
Total raised				£605m	£675m

Table 1.6 c	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution rate	c) steeper increase	Reduce accrual (69ths)
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	1.5%	2.5%
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%	1.5%	2.5%
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%	2.0%	2.5%
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	2.5%	2.5%
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	2.5%	2.5%
Band 7	£78,701	plus	7.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Total raised				£605m	£715m

1.6.4 Of course there is no way of telling which way members will opt and most will need some help and financial advice to make the correct decision but the above shows that we can design a scheme which meets the required target.

1.6.5 As there is a risk of members selecting the option that does not raise sufficient income the accrual rate for a steeper contribution increase pattern than 1.3 c) will mean the accrual that can be offered as an option will become very unattractive.

1.7 Stepping any changes

1.7.1 We understand that stepping any changes over the three year period may be acceptable. Administratively no changes will be very straightforward but stepping changes to the contribution patterns will be possible whereas stepping the reduction in accrual will not be feasible.

1.7.2 A possible spread of increase in step of 20 per cent/40 per cent/40 per cent will defer much of the change until the new scheme takes shape.

1.8 Summary

1.8.1 Therefore we have the following patterns or options.

- Steeper stepping patterns for contributions than we have considered in section 1.3 which incur very high opt out risk, especially at middle to high salary bands. We have rejected this option due to opt out risk at all levels that may cascade throughout the workforce in general.
- Contribution patterns considered like those in section 1.3, which also have the appeal of being more easily phased in over a three year period.
- Contribution patterns with a suitable accrual reduction depending upon the upper contribution bands to ensure the required savings are met. As accrual reduction cannot be phased in it would need to be accepted that this change would only be practical in say year 2014.

1.8.2 Due to administration simplicity and the ability to step the costs it seem that an option like 1.3 c) may be most favourable.

1.8.3 However if options and choice for members are consider a more key factor then 1.6 b) would appear to offer a good solution as the accrual reduction is minimised.

1.8.4 Alternatively, option 1.6 c) meets the contribution increase limits applying to other public sector funds, whereby the increases at lower salary bands are restricted. It also offers flexibility and choice for members, perhaps being an advantage outweighing the simplicity of 1.3c).