By e mail to LGPensions@communities.gov.uk

Teresa Clay
Local Government Finance Reform and Pensions
Local Government Finance
2/SE
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Dear Ms Clay

Consultation on Draft Statutory Guidance on Asset Pooling in the Local Government Pension Scheme

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft guidance. This response has been considered and agreed by a meeting of the Teesside Pension Fund Committee on 13th March 2019, and is a response on behalf of Middlesbrough Borough Council acting in its capacity as administering authority for the Teesside Pension Fund.

In general the Council welcomes the guidance, which provides some clarity on how investment pooling within the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) should operate. The approach set out is generally consistent with the approach to pooling that has been adopted by the partner funds within the Border to Coast Pensions Partnership.

There are some specific points the Council would like to make in connection with the views set out in the draft guidance in relation to passive v active management, whether administering authorities have any fiduciary duty to beneficiaries who are not part of their fund, and the extent to which reporting requirements should be detailed in the guidance. These are set out in the table on the following page.

Please contact me if you have any questions or wish to discuss this response.

Yours sincerely

Nick Orton

Head of Pensions Governance and Investments

01642 729040

Paragraph in draft guidance	Comment
Regular review of active and passive management	The requirement to consider moving from active to passive management,
3.6 Pool members, working with the pool company,	but not vice versa, indicates an unexplained bias towards passive
should regularly review the balance between active	management. Although indices tracked in passive investing are useful to
and passive management in the light of performance	benchmark performance of active managers, and there are times within
net of total costs. They should consider moving from	investment cycles when active management tends to be more or less
active to passive management where active	beneficial compared to passive, the Council does not agree with the inherent
management has not generated better net	assumption here that passive management should be the default investment
performance over a reasonable period. Pool	style. The Teesside Pension Fund has a long history of delivering strong
members should also seek to ensure performance by	active management performance above passive indices and is looking
asset class net of total costs is at least comparable	forward to continuing to do this through its Pool company.
with market performance for similar risk profiles.	
4.4 Those who serve on Pension Committees and	The Council agrees that administering authorities should take a long-term
equivalent governance bodies in pool members	view in relation to the costs/benefits of pooling, however there is a general
should therefore take a long term view of pooling	issue in regard to how Administering Authorities can possibly "take account
implementation and costs. They should take account	of the benefits across the Pool and across the scheme as a whole, in the
of the benefits across the pool and across the	interests of scheme members, employers and local taxpayers". The legal
scheme as a whole, in the interests of scheme	fiduciary duty each Administering Authority has is towards its own
members, employers and local taxpayers, and should	beneficiaries, not to those of the "scheme as a whole".
not seek simply to minimise costs in the short term.	
Section 8 'Reporting'	Detailed information on reporting requirements should not be included within
	the draft guidance. It is enough to state that CIPFA guidance should be
	followed – adding further detail of that guidance just means the overall
	investment pooling guidance could need amending every time the CIPFA
	guidance changes in future.