

National LGPS Technical Group

1 October 2021

Regional Pension Officer Group McCloud update

Index

1. At what stage is each administering authority with regards to collecting the hours/breaks data?	2
2. Administering authorities that already have the hours/breaks data, are you checking the existing data? Or, are you assuming that it is correct?	11
3. Have any of your employers refused or are unable to provide the missing hours/breaks?	18
4. Have administering authorities communicated with scheme members about McCloud?.....	26
5. Have administering authorities put in extra resource to cover this project?	33
6. Are administering authorities in discussions with their system provider, in terms of loading the missing data? and/or, recalculating benefits etc? (with the caveat that until remedy is received, we are not 100% sure what the final position will be)	41
7. Anything else any administering authority wishes to add?.....	49

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

Table 1

	1. At what stage is each administering authority with regards to collecting the hours/breaks data?
WPOG	<p>Cardiff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have had data from our two main employers and out of 42 employers, 15 have yet to return theirs but they are employers with just a handful of people like the town or community councils <p>Gwynedd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have sent data requests to all our small employers and have held meetings with most of our largest employers to inform them of the data requirement • we will be dedicating more time to the McCloud project in the coming months <p>Powys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collected approximately 2 percent of data, not verified or input any <p>Swansea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 951 records processed and checked (re-calculated final salary concurrents, completion of aggregation, interfunds in and out, other various records) • 7447 records need data verified • 19 employers in scope, 11 employers have provided data so far • data received for 4920 records • 2184 records have been updated with data received

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	1. At what stage is each administering authority with regards to collecting the hours/breaks data?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • other data cleansing • audit of pensioner addresses against payroll data, checking gone away against council tax, requesting date of birth verification and death grant nominations <p>Torfaen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have received about 95 percent of the data from our employers <p>Clwyd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have contacted all of our employers and asked them to provide hours and breaks for McCloud if they have not already done so • most of the employers who have sent hours and breaks to us for post 14 membership are taking this opportunity to check what has already been sent • we have contacted all employers, current and former, with in scope members as well as those employers who have only been admitted to the Scheme post 14 <p>Dyfed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • spreadsheets issued to 3 unitary authorities and data to be returned by April 2022 • one unitary authority has commented they may require additional resources • small employers to be completed by March 2022 <p>Rhondda Cynon Taff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we asked some of our smaller employers for data at the end of last year to test the process

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	1. At what stage is each administering authority with regards to collecting the hours/breaks data?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have only collected data for less than 1 percent of members • we need to review our project plan and may start again and request data for the remedy period after March 2022
EMPOG	<p>Leicestershire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we did not continue to collect data after 2014 so have had to request it from all of our employers, hours to 31/3/2020 by 31/3/2021 and hours 31/3/2021 by end of June <p>Derbyshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we continued to collect data since 2014, more hours though than service breaks <p>Nottinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we continued to collect data since 2014 <p>Lincolnshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all employers have continued to send in hours data, but information on breaks not so much <p>Northamptonshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we never officially stopped collecting the data since 2014, all loaded on
NEPOF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are still collating this data; the template has been sent to the employers and we are currently waiting on the data

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>1. At what stage is each administering authority with regards to collecting the hours/breaks data?</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are in the process of collecting it, we have had some replies but not all yet • we have information in from around 75 of our 160 active employers, we are still deciding our strategy for those employers no longer in the Fund, guidance would be helpful • we already hold the data as we didn't stop collecting it • we have just started to contact and collect the data via a 3rd party
SWAPOG	<p>Cornwall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • never stopped collecting the information <p>Devon/Somerset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continued to collect information <p>Avon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all members potentially impacted by the judgement have been identified • all employers have been made aware of the need to provide hours and service break data on an ongoing basis • employers who did not continue to provide changes to hours and/or service breaks after 31 March 2014 have been identified with approximately 82 percent contacted, the remaining employers we are working with to help them to provide the data required • overall, we have checked and updated 26 percent of employers identified as having potential gaps in their hours and service breaks data

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	1. At what stage is each administering authority with regards to collecting the hours/breaks data?
	<p>Wiltshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have requested this from all employers but we have only received and updated this information for around half the active members so far – see the answers below for the reasons. <p>Environment Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • completed but still working with employers on some service break data <p>Dorset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have the vast majority of this data, but have not as yet finished updating our member records <p>Gloucester</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no response received
SPOG	<p>Fund A – Currently working with a few test employers, prior to requesting data from remaining employers in September 2021.</p> <p>Fund B – We have asked employers to advise if they have concerns about their data as we have continued to collect changes of hours and service breaks since April 2014 and record them. Most are happy. Next steps are to reach out to concerned employers so they or us can check the data.</p> <p>Fund C – We have been communicating regularly with employers since April 2021, through briefing notes, meetings and webinars and are due to start collecting data in October.</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>1. At what stage is each administering authority with regards to collecting the hours/breaks data?</p>
	<p>Fund D – We continued to collect hour/break data, data cleansing exercises have been undertaken to ensure all hour/break data has been recorded and applied to members’ records.</p> <p>Fund E – Correspondence has been sent to each employer asking if they are happy with the data that we have</p> <p>Fund F – We have managed to obtain hours and breaks data from 43% of our employer membership</p> <p>Fund G – Checking data held. Never stopped collecting hours and breaks so interrogating data held to see if any employer has no changes or absences since 2014</p>
SAPOG	<p>Berkshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • employers notified of the need to retain data; not started collection <p>Buckinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • employers notified that a historic collection for the period 01/04/2014-31/03/2021 is required with data for 01/04/2021-31/03/2022 being submitted monthly • a few employers selected and asked for data which is being tested via the software interface • all other employers will be requested when confident the interface is working <p>East Sussex</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • data has been requested from all employers with a deadline of October 2021 to respond <p>Hampshire & West Sussex</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	1. At what stage is each administering authority with regards to collecting the hours/breaks data?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have collected approximately 75 percent of data from employers • checking to make sure it's what is needed <p>Surrey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requests have been sent to all employers for hours/breaks and pay information where applicable, with a deadline return date of 31.10.21
LPOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are using Aquila Heywood to assist us and they have contacted all employers to gather data, some has been returned and some employers are being chased • data held on the system has been sent to employers to confirm as correct or provide updated data where required • we have engaged with our largest employer and they are confident that they will be able to access the necessary hour and service break data, further discussions on how the data will be provided is imminent • we have asked employers to advise if they have concerns about their data as we have continued to collect changes of hours and service breaks since April 2014 and record them, most are happy, next steps are to reach out to concerned employers so they or us can check the data • Heywoods are writing out to all the employers in my fund with a report of the data held in respect of that employer for the hours and breaks checks
SECSOG	<p>Bedford BC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • template is available • still no technical officer to support this project

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	1. At what stage is each administering authority with regards to collecting the hours/breaks data?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • considering proposals from third parties <p>Essex CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have obtained data for the vast number of employers • out of 756 employers where data checks are required, 505 have returned data sets whilst we are outstanding 49 • the remainder are either to be provided by the council payroll service directly, or they are defunct or pre 2014 ceased employers <p>Hertfordshire CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have asked employers to advise if they have concerns about their data as we have continued to collect changes of hours and service breaks since April 2014 and record them, most are happy • next steps are to reach out to concerned employers so they or us can check the data <p>Kent CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have sent the data to one pilot employer with about 300+ employees • as at 02.09.21 we are waiting to hear back <p>Norfolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collected ongoing since 2014 <p>Suffolk CC</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	1. At what stage is each administering authority with regards to collecting the hours/breaks data?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • awaiting data from employers, possibly a third received
NILGOSC	<p>NIGOSC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has issued spreadsheets to employers to collect hours and service breaks • these are in the process of being returned and records updated • we have still to issue spreadsheets to former employers in respect of those members who changed employer during the remedy period
SPLG	Not received by the secretariat of the National LGPS Technical Group

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

Table 2

	<p>2. Administering authorities that already have the hours/breaks data, are you checking the existing data? Or, are you assuming that it is correct?</p>
<p>WPOG</p>	<p>Cardiff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • checking if an employer has said the data is correct so they will not be completing the spreadsheets, we have asked them to sign an indemnity <p>Gwynedd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are sending employers details of hours we currently hold and asking them to confirm that they are still correct or not <p>Powys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we will check all data to ensure its correct <p>Swansea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • member data that is within scope is subject to a full check <p>Torfaen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • employers have been providing the fund with monthly data since 2014 • they have not always included service breaks and hours • we carried out an exercise to identify which months/years we had not received data for, and asked the employers to provide us with this data

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>2. Administering authorities that already have the hours/breaks data, are you checking the existing data? Or, are you assuming that it is correct?</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • once we received the missing data, we asked the employer to confirm that they had sent us all hours and service breaks <p>Clwyd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as most of our employers are reviewing and providing post 14 data we are checking as much of the data provided as we can <p>Dyfed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not Applicable <p>Rhondda Cynon Taff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we plan to check the data received by employers and will query any differences
EMPOG	<p>Derbyshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we will check with our employers that they are confident the information provided is correct <p>Nottinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not checked the accuracy of the data • we possibly will go back and check at some point but may not be until the remedy stage <p>Lincolnshire</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>2. Administering authorities that already have the hours/breaks data, are you checking the existing data? Or, are you assuming that it is correct?</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civica have ran an in scope report and we have shared this data with our employers for accuracy reports and any changes have been requested by 31/7/2021 <p>Northamptonshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have commissioned Heywood to work with us on the project • a list of deliverables are agreed
NEPOF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we will be checking the data • we have collected hours and breaks from employers, however we expect employers to check the data we hold is correct, to do that we have run service and absence histories from our system and made them available to download by employers • not applicable, data not collected • we have carried out significant data cleansing for all employers at year end and valuation and for onboarding MDC
SWAPOG	<p>Cornwall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are assuming they are correct but will check when redress applied <p>Devon/Somerset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • currently completing a data quality exercise

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>2. Administering authorities that already have the hours/breaks data, are you checking the existing data? Or, are you assuming that it is correct?</p>
	<p>Avon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all employers were reviewed to establish which ones had continued to provide hours and service break data after 31 March 2014 and those who had not, either in full or part • all employers who had not continued to provide data were provided with a list of in-scope employees with the instruction to check that the data currently held was correct, i.e. the hours as of 31 March 2014 remained the same or that no changes had been made since the member started • if the data held was correct employers were instructed to confirm this, as well as providing any amendments as required • employers who had continued to provide hours and service break data were not asked to check the data <p>Wiltshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we only continued to ask for this data for members covered by the original underpin which was introduced in 2014; we stopped collecting part-time percentage data for all other members in 2014 • in last couple of years, we have been collecting data for all eligible members and cross-checking any with overlaps <p>Environment Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sample checking <p>Dorset</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>2. Administering authorities that already have the hours/breaks data, are you checking the existing data? Or, are you assuming that it is correct?</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we will use what the employer has supplied most recently, and assume this is correct
SPOG	<p>Fund A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not applicable hours and service breaks not collected since 2014 <p>Fund B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have asked employers to advise if they are happy their data is correct, most are happy <p>Fund C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not applicable we ceased collecting and holding this data in 2014 <p>Fund D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we plan to have a data checking exercise with employers, our plan consists of providing employers with data extract to cross check against their HR/Payroll records • employers would then provide the Fund with a verification on the reliability of the data • the exercise should provide employers the opportunity to identify any missing data and to submit that to the fund <p>Fund E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • correspondence has been sent to each employer asking if they are happy with the data that we have

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>2. Administering authorities that already have the hours/breaks data, are you checking the existing data? Or, are you assuming that it is correct?</p>
	<p>Fund F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not applicable <p>Fund G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not assuming correct, checking data held • never stopped collecting hours and breaks so interrogating data held to see if any employer has no changes or absences since 2014
SAPOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no comment
LPOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are checking • checking • we intend to check that the data held is correct, although this is only in relation to our smaller employers • we have asked employers to advise if they are happy their data is correct, most are happy • not at this point yet, will wait for the output results
SECSOG	<p>Bedford BC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not at this stage <p>Essex CC</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>2. Administering authorities that already have the hours/breaks data, are you checking the existing data? Or, are you assuming that it is correct?</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> our scheme employers have checked the existing data and confirmed to us whether that this is correct or not <p>Hertfordshire CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> we have asked employers to advise if they are happy their data is correct, most are happy <p>Kent CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not applicable <p>Norfolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> all employers confirm data at year end <p>Suffolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not applicable
NILGOSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
SPLG	<p>Not received by the secretariat of the National LGPS Technical Group</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

Table 3

	3. Have any of your employers refused or are unable to provide the missing hours/breaks?
WPOG	<p>Cardiff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no <p>Gwynedd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no, all have been positive so far <p>Powys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not yet <p>Swansea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no although a few employers are being chased for the data <p>Torfaen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no <p>Clwyd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no direct refusals • although we may have a problem with a company that has gone in to receivership, we are still working on this one

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	3. Have any of your employers refused or are unable to provide the missing hours/breaks?
	<p>Dyfed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none so far <p>Rhondda Cynon Taff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not yet
EMPOG	<p>Leicestershire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not that we know of, but we expect chasing will be needed <p>Derbyshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none we are aware of <p>Nottinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not sure <p>Lincolnshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no refusals <p>Northamptonshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no, employers will be sent a list of their data in mid-September for them to verify

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	3. Have any of your employers refused or are unable to provide the missing hours/breaks?
NEPOF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no • no refusals to date, of those employers still to provide none have expressed problems, but that is no guarantee • no • some think they do not need to because they have now left but we are putting them right, no-one has yet stated they cannot provide it but not all have actually responded to our request
SWAPOG	<p>Cornwall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not that we are aware <p>Devon/Somerset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none to date <p>Avon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no employers have refused to provide data • we have instances where employers do not hold data over six years old, citing GDPR rules as the reason • for these employers we are updating any changes in the period they can provide data for, the hours and service break data prior to this will be left as it is currently recorded • some employers have provided data for all employees, not just those employees potentially impacted by the judgement • where this data has been provided the member records have been updated

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	3. Have any of your employers refused or are unable to provide the missing hours/breaks?
	<p>Wiltshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none are refusing as such, but some employers are having great difficulty obtaining the data required • the main reasons are because they have changed payroll provider or system, lack of reporting capabilities or they did not store hours changes on their system and hence are needing to look at individual member HR files • we are just asking for data for those members who are eligible (and we are having to tell the employers who is eligible because they would be unaware of aggregations etc) <p>Environment Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no <p>Dorset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the majority of employers have engaged with us • however a small number, representing a small percentage of our members have not responded • we have not yet had a chance to chase this and establish the reasons. We do know that some employers are unable to provide service breaks, many are struggling to provide this information, but none have refused
SPOG	<p>Fund A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>3. Have any of your employers refused or are unable to provide the missing hours/breaks?</p>
	<p>Fund B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not all employers have confirmed whether they are happy with their data yet <p>Fund C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have had a number of questions and concerns raised but to date no one has advised that they are unable to provide the data <p>Fund D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have not encountered any employers who have in principle refused to provide missing hours/breaks • we are aware that some employers may struggle in obtaining data due to changes in payrolls providers and/or TUPE transfers and terminated employers, we plan to assess these scenarios on an individual basis <p>Fund E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not as yet <p>Fund F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • with regards to this we have not had any major issues thus far with our employers; but we expect in the near future to have a rough idea of who can and who cannot provide the necessary information required for McCloud

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	3. Have any of your employers refused or are unable to provide the missing hours/breaks?
	<p>Fund G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not contacted yet
SAPOG	<p>Berkshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not applicable <p>Buckinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not for the ones requested in the interface testing stage <p>East Sussex</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not applicable <p>Hampshire & West Sussex</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some employers have advised they are unable to provide data due to old payroll providers or previous mergers where data no longer exists although we are still to look at closed employers, we are aware there are some that have since gone into liquidation <p>Surrey</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	3. Have any of your employers refused or are unable to provide the missing hours/breaks?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no, just queries on why they need to provide it when they think they have done so on end of year, which they have not as hours not requested on end of year return
LPOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> yes, a few are unable to verify all the information not yet not at this time not all employers have confirmed whether they are happy with their data yet not that we are aware of
SECSOG	<p>Bedford BC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not at this stage yet <p>Essex CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> we have not had outright refusals, however some data sets are still outstanding some employers have mentioned that due to change in systems/payroll provider or simply the age of the files to look back to, they have struggled to obtain data <p>Hertfordshire CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not all employers have confirmed whether they are happy with their data yet <p>Kent CC</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	3. Have any of your employers refused or are unable to provide the missing hours/breaks?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are not at this point yet, but we are sure we will have some that are unable / unwilling to retrieve the data needed <p>Norfolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> no <p>Suffolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not yet
NILGOSC	Not to date
SPLG	Not received by the secretariat of the National LGPS Technical Group

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

Table 4

	4. Have administering authorities communicated with scheme members about McCloud?
WPOG	<p>Cardiff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no <p>Gwynedd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have mentioned it in our annual newsletter to members <p>Powys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no <p>Torfaen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we provided members with a brief overview of McCloud in the annual newsletter <p>Clwyd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, in general catch-up bulletins, and wording on our website just been approved • no individual communications yet <p>Dyfed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • only LGA communications

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	4. Have administering authorities communicated with scheme members about McCloud?
	<p>Rhondda Cynon Taff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the only communication with members to date has been a small article included in our annual pensioner newsletter which gave a brief overview of the situations and said that anyone affected by the changes will be contacted
EMPOG	<p>Leicestershire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> information has been put onto our website <p>Derbyshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a communication was sent out to all members last September, in which McCloud was mentioned <p>Nottinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not directly but information on the website <p>Lincolnshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> very loosely, mainly on our website other than two small articles in our member newsletters, one in 2019 and the other in spring 2020 <p>Northamptonshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> yes updates published on website

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	4. Have administering authorities communicated with scheme members about McCloud?
NEPOF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, limited information in newsletters, webinars and on the website • yes, we have put information on our website and included a small article in recent newsletters • yes, with annual statements and updates • yes, with annual statements and on our website • no
SWAPOG	<p>Cornwall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, via annual benefit statement newsletter <p>Devon/Cornwall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, and referred them to LGA FAQs <p>Avon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the McCloud Judgement and potential impact is explained in the annual benefit statement, with referral to the national LGPS website suggested to obtain further information <p>Wiltshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have sent no global communications about it but have mentioned it on the website and in our member's conference • the final position is still unclear, and most members will not be affected and those who will be affected are likely to be affected in an immaterial way

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>4. Have administering authorities communicated with scheme members about McCloud?</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • even for those which are more materially affected, the outcome can only be positive so there seems no need to warn them about it at this stage • we will send out more communications once the position is finalised <p>Environment Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • general updates on public website and newsletters and will include an update in our autumn webinars (member presentations) <p>Dorset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, in an annual newsletter sent to home address
SPOG	<p>Fund A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, via fund website and as part of ABS communication <p>Fund B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not yet <p>Fund C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an overview of McCloud has been included in our benefit statements and annual newsletters <p>Fund D</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	4. Have administering authorities communicated with scheme members about McCloud?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have information on the members' website in regard McCloud with links to the LGA supplied communications. In order to manage member expectations, proactive targeted communications are on hold awaiting the final government response to the consultation <p>Fund E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, information has been included with ABS and further comms will be sent when response to consultation is released <p>Fund F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, we have communicated to members via newsletter and we have a member webpage that provides the latest information regarding the McCloud Judgement for our members to view <p>Fund G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, general message in newsletters and on website
SAPOG	<p>Buckinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • included in member newsletter and a dedicated McCloud page on website with employers being asked to signpost with scheme members <p>Hampshire & West Sussex</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, for data collection, with updates where available in our newsletters

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	4. Have administering authorities communicated with scheme members about McCloud?
	<p>Surrey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mentioned within annual benefit statement/newsletters with a link to FAQ's on main LGPS member website
LPOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> yes it has been mentioned in newsletters issued with annual benefit statements not yet no, not on a mass exercise
SECSOG	<p>Bedford BC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> via newsletter and on website <p>Essex CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> yes, a brief communication was inserted in the 2021 annual benefit statement <p>Hertfordshire CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not yet <p>Kent CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> yes, on the website and in ABIs etc

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	4. Have administering authorities communicated with scheme members about McCloud?
	<p>Norfolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, in annual benefit statements and FAQs on our website <p>Suffolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have included a general FAQ in annual benefit statement guides to address that there are changes afoot, but have not yet been implemented
NILGOSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • only in general terms in a newsletter and also in the guidance notes of their benefit statements • links to more information on the website were provided
SPLG	Not received by the secretariat of the National LGPS Technical Group

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

Table 5

	5. Have administering authorities put in extra resource to cover this project?
WPOG	<p>Cardiff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have recruited additional staff, not specifically for this however they will be expected to pick some of the work up in their normal duties, might possibly look for third party support once more is known <p>Gwynedd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not yet <p>Powys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recruitment Campaigns already commenced <p>Swansea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, we have established a team comprising of 1 Senior Pension Officer, 2 Pension Officers and 2 Assistant Pension Officers • the team will also work on the GMP rectification exercise when all the data is returned by JLT/Mercer <p>Torfaen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not yet, we are planning to recruit some additional staff on a temporary basis <p>Clwyd</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	5. Have administering authorities put in extra resource to cover this project?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, we have set up a McCloud project team with experienced staff and have done some back-filling on the main operations team • we are also looking to recruit some temporary staff externally for the project • we are using an external provider for project management purposes <p>Dyfed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, but initial resource will increase according to demand <p>Rhondda Cynon Taff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have recruited extra staff with the additional resource that is going to be required for McCloud in mind • two new apprentices and a graduate recruit are starting this month, with a view to get these trained up so that resource from the existing team can be released
EMPOG	<p>Leicestershire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing resource has been reallocated to a McCloud project team following a review of the pension section structure on January 21 <p>Derbyshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • funding has been put aside but recruitment not yet done <p>Nottinghamshire</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	5. Have administering authorities put in extra resource to cover this project?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we appointed a McCloud project manager; we will go back to committee for further resources at a later date <p>Lincolnshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we do have a budget provision for McCloud and the appointment of a member services manager has already been made but he is not working exclusively on McCloud just yet <p>Northamptonshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resource agreed for Heywood to work with us on the project
NEPOF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, we have a new team set up that have already carried out preliminary reviews of all past cases to identify whether members will benefit from the McCloud remedy • in anticipation of the McCloud project and other potential projects, e.g. Pension Dashboards and GMP equalisation, we have appointed a Member Services Manager and a Team Manager to lead a new Projects Team, further members of staff will be recruited to this team as and when required • yes, but difficult to judge full impact until files are uploaded and verified, we have issues with software and to date can only collect data • not as yet • not yet
SWAPOG	<p>Cornwall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, additional budget agreed by pension committee

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	5. Have administering authorities put in extra resource to cover this project?
	<p>Devon/Somerset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes <p>Avon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a project team to cover the project was set up in December 2020 • this team is currently concentrating on the collection, checking and uploading of hours and service data and be kept in place for the remedy calculations once the guidance has been provided <p>Wiltshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not at present • we are currently doing the data updates as part of our programme of onboarding employers onto I-Connect so there is not a distinct resource at the moment • we are likely to dedicate particular resource once legislation is finalised and our software is updated <p>Environment Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • still negotiating with our third party administrator <p>Dorset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not yet, but we will do soon
SPOG	Fund A

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	5. Have administering authorities put in extra resource to cover this project?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not as yet but plan to shortly <p>Fund B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project team in place <p>Fund C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, due to the scale of the project we have established a project team and have recruited and are still recruiting additional resources <p>Fund D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no, we have not to-date invested extra resources • we are engaged with the system provider in regard using technology eg bulk recalculation update to member records to inform resource requirements in the future <p>Fund E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, we have a data collection team in place at the moment and will be recruiting when we are position to look at rectification <p>Fund F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	5. Have administering authorities put in extra resource to cover this project?
	<p>Fund G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have agreement to do so, long winded getting it all in place though
SAPOG	<p>Berkshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • looking into additional resource <p>Buckinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an additional senior pensions officer and three pensions officers so far with reviews at key milestones <p>Hampshire & West Sussex</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, an initial resource of four staff plus a project manager, this will be subject to review and likely to increase <p>Surrey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not as of yet, still undecided as to whether will be dealt with in house or undertaken by a third party
LPOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • utilising Heywood but otherwise using existing resources • no • project team in place • at present we have commissioned Heywoods

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	5. Have administering authorities put in extra resource to cover this project?
SECSOG	<p>Bedford BC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • budget approved, not yet commenced project <p>Essex CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the initial project team had to complete McCloud work on top of regular work loads • the team responsible for updating the member records has recruited additional employees <p>Hertfordshire CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project team in place <p>Kent CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not yet. we think we will need to though <p>Norfolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no <p>Suffolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes.
NILGOSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we anticipate recruiting three additional staff

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	5. Have administering authorities put in extra resource to cover this project?
SPLG	Not received by the secretariat of the National LGPS Technical Group

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

Table 6

	<p>6. Are administering authorities in discussions with their system provider, in terms of loading the missing data? and/or, recalculating benefits etc? (with the caveat that until remedy is received, we are not 100% sure what the final position will be)</p>
<p>WPOG</p>	<p>Cardiff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they have said they cannot provide an update yet on recalculations until they are sure of the final position <p>Gwynedd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no, we are currently waiting to see what Heywood has to offer in respect of loading missing data • we feel that a lot of the changes will be done manually in particular if aggregation has taken place <p>Powys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no <p>Swansea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no <p>Torfaen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are using Heywood's solution to load Service Breaks into Altair, but are going to update hours manually <p>Clwyd</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>6. Are administering authorities in discussions with their system provider, in terms of loading the missing data? and/or, recalculating benefits etc? (with the caveat that until remedy is received, we are not 100% sure what the final position will be)</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are Altair users and have done a small amount of testing using the Heywood interface • we have not recalculated any benefits yet, just looking at how the system uploads the missing information and what errors, mismatches and common themes are being produced <p>Dyfed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • using Heywood system <p>Rhondda Cynon Taff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not looked at this yet
EMPOG	<p>Leicestershire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are in regular discussions regarding the interface facility used to backload hours changes <p>Derbyshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have been in touch with Heywoods regarding the remedy <p>Nottinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UPM's in scope report identified approx. 29,000 members, this was ran in April <p>Lincolnshire</p>

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>6. Are administering authorities in discussions with their system provider, in terms of loading the missing data? and/or, recalculating benefits etc? (with the caveat that until remedy is received, we are not 100% sure what the final position will be)</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as and when, but we are sitting in our system providers project group <p>Northamptonshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • engaged with Heywood
NEPOF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have our system, which will be updated once the information is received from employers • yes • yes, but have concerns over first stage of data load and validations • yes • system provider is Heywoods so Class group dealing with taking developments of system forwards
SWAPOG	<p>Cornwall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes <p>Devon/Somerset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, we have representatives and the Heywood Aquila meetings <p>Avon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the provider has provided a reporting system to identify in-scope members and an interface to upload hours and service break data into the system

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>6. Are administering authorities in discussions with their system provider, in terms of loading the missing data? and/or, recalculating benefits etc? (with the caveat that until remedy is received, we are not 100% sure what the final position will be)</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they will also be providing a system to recalculate benefits when the guidance is issued • it is envisaged that we will be involved in testing the calculation system once it is available <p>Wiltshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, and they have been providing system updates in anticipation of the final legislation <p>Environment Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes <p>Dorset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes
SPOG	<p>Fund A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes <p>Fund B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • our current system provider has provided reports to identify relevant data for checking and bulk interface for correcting data • unsure what functionality exists with our new provider

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>6. Are administering authorities in discussions with their system provider, in terms of loading the missing data? and/or, recalculating benefits etc? (with the caveat that until remedy is received, we are not 100% sure what the final position will be)</p>
	<p>Fund C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, we are working with Civica on the bulk data upload and will be included in the discussions about the key requirements for rectification work, which will include the required amendments to the calculations <p>Fund D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, we have been in close contact with our system provider and have undertaken testing of the McCloud tools introduced and provided our feedback <p>Fund E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, we are being kept in the loop by JPG with regard to system development required for under pin calc <p>Fund F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • our system provider has a project plan in place to add the functionality to our system to be able to enact the remedy • thus far we have been provided the functionality to load the missing data onto our database <p>Fund G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, all work is chargeable though

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>6. Are administering authorities in discussions with their system provider, in terms of loading the missing data? and/or, recalculating benefits etc? (with the caveat that until remedy is received, we are not 100% sure what the final position will be)</p>
SAPOG	<p>Buckinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, currently working with system provider on load issues with the interface <p>Hampshire & West Sussex</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, we are at testing stage of the uploader <p>Surrey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have tested some of the uploading but not in direct discussion about uploading missing data or recalculating benefits
LPOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes, Heywood to help us with this • yes • early stage discussions have been had • our current system provider has provided reports to identify relevant data for checking and bulk interface for correcting data, we understand this is compatible/consistent with our new provider • we have not received any output data yet
SECSOG	<p>Bedford BC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	<p>6. Are administering authorities in discussions with their system provider, in terms of loading the missing data? and/or, recalculating benefits etc? (with the caveat that until remedy is received, we are not 100% sure what the final position will be)</p>
	<p>Essex CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have been in discussions with Civica in terms of loading missing data and recalculating benefits <p>Hertfordshire CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • our current system provider has provided reports to identify relevant data for checking and bulk interface for correcting data, I understand this is compatible/consistent with our new provider <p>Kent CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heywoods have provided instructions on how to load the data, we have had no guidance (as far as we are aware) regarding recalculating benefits <p>Norfolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes <p>Suffolk CC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are with Heywood who have provided an upload function, and are understood to be working on calculations (but we do not expect much movement on the calculations until the final remedy is confirmed)

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	6. Are administering authorities in discussions with their system provider, in terms of loading the missing data? and/or, recalculating benefits etc? (with the caveat that until remedy is received, we are not 100% sure what the final position will be)
NILGOSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes
SPLG	Not received by the secretariat of the National LGPS Technical Group

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

Table 7

	7. Anything else any administering authority wishes to add?
WPOG	<p>Clwyd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it might be useful if the warnings and errors produced by the upload in to Altair included a narrative, rather than just confirming that there is an error - this would help with identifying problem batches of data • it might also be useful if there was a way we could “rubber stamp” each member record to confirm that the data upload has been checked and completed, prior to any re-calculations • one of our major concerns is the number of aggregated records that may need amending, and the methodology we will need to apply in these cases <p>Dyfed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • guidance for employers that have ceased or refuse to give data
EMPOG	<p>Derbyshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • moving from UPM to Altair in 2019 may lead to issues regarding hours uploads <p>Nottinghamshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are in regular contact with Civica regarding what they can do to support the project <p>Lincolnshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we have an issue with the way that service history is recorded with the London Boroughs in our fund

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	7. Anything else any administering authority wishes to add?
NEPOF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no • we are heavily reliant on software providers, also concerned that guidance remains outstanding for cases with missing data • no • no, other than it is a sledgehammer solution to crack a tiny nut
SWAPOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no
SPOG	<p>Fund A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no <p>Fund B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no <p>Fund C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to support the Fund in undertaking this major rectification exercise, we urgently need SAB guidance on interfund and ceased employers, and concurrent cases and assumption that can be made for employers that are unable to provide the data <p>Fund D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups

	7. Anything else any administering authority wishes to add?
	Fund E <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no Fund F <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not applicable Fund G <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no
SAPOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no
LPOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are not impressed with the work that will be involved, the lack of resources we have, and the cost we will all incur when this was not of our doing
SECSOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no
NILGOSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no
SPLG	Not received by the secretariat of the National LGPS Technical Group

For completion by representatives of the regional pension officer groups