Pension Fund Risk Register 2017/18 Q3

| Description | Actions in Place | | Rating / DOT | Lead Officer / Cabinet Member |
|--|--|--|---------------------|--|
| PEN 01 - Fund assets fail to deliver returns in line with the anticipated returns underpinning valuation of liabilities over the long-term | Anticipate long-term return on a relatively prudent basis to reduce risk of failing to meet return expectations. Analyse progress at three yearly valuations for all employers. Undertake Inter-valuation monitoring. | position is kept under regular review and Pension Committee informed of the impact of prevailing market conditions on the funding level. | Likelihood = Medium | Sian Kunert / Cllr P Corthorne |
| PEN 02 - Inappropriate long-term investment strategy | Set Pension Fund specific strategic asset allocation benchmark after taking advice from investment advisers, balancing risk and reward, based on historical data. Keep risk and expected reward from strategic asset allocation under review. Review asset allocation formally on an annual basis. Investment strategy group actively monitors this risk. | Investment Strategy Group (ISG) has been formed to | Likelihood = Low | Sian Kunert / Cllr P Corthorne |
| PEN 03 - Active investment manager under-performance relative to benchmark | The structure includes active and passive mandates and several managers are employed to diversify the risk of underperformance by any single manager. Short term investment monitoring provides alerts on significant changes to key personnel or changes of process at the manager. Regular monitoring measures performance in absolute terms and relative to the manager's index benchmark, supplemented with an analysis of absolute returns against those underpinning the valuation. Investment managers would be changed following persistent or severe underperformance. | any single manager on the Fund. Active monitoiring of each manager is undertaken with Advisors and Officers meeting managers on a quarterly basis and communicating regularly. Comments on whether mandates should be maintained or reviewed are included and where needed specific performance issues will be discussed | Likelihood = Low | Sian Kunert / Cllr P Corthorne |

| Description | Actions in Place | Progress Comment | Risk Category / Rating / DOT | Lead Officer / Cabinet Member |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | 1. The focus of the actuarial valuation process is on real returns on assets, net of price and pay increases. The actuarial basis examines disparity between the inflation linking which applies to benefits, the escalation of pensionable payroll costs, which only applies to active members, and on which employer and employee contributions are based. 2. Inter-valuation monitoring gives early warning and investment in index-linked bonds also helps to mitigate this risk. 3. Employers pay for their own salary awards and are reminded of the geared effect on pension liabilities of any bias in pensionable pay rises towards longer-serving employees. | part of the Council's MTFF processes and any potential impact on pension fund contributions is kepty under review and factored into the Council's overall position. However, there is an increasing likliehood of rising inflation impacting on the overall liabilities of the Fund however the risk rating takes this into account. | Strategic risk Likelihood = Low Impact = Medium Rating = E3 (Static) | Sian Kunert / Cllr P Corthorne |
| PEN 05 - Pensioners living longer. | 1. Mortality assumptions are set with some allowance for future increases in life expectancy. Sensitivity analysis in triennial valuation helps employers understand the impact of changes in life expectancy. 2. Club Vita monitoring provides fund specific data for the valuation, enabling better forecasting. | The Fund is part of Club Vita, a subsiduary of the Fund Actuary, which monitors mortality data and feeds directly into the valuation. In addition, further mortality monitoring in undertaken by CEB, the fund's administrators. | Strategic risk Likelihood = Low Impact = Small Rating = E4 (Static) | Ken Chisholm / Cllr P Corthorne |
| quality information supplied to both | Quarterly review meetings held Weekly update calls with officers Quarterly KPI reports are provided to track and monitor performance | New cases are being dealt with and improvements in processes within the contract. There are signs of improvement in the quality of data inherited by SCC from Capita. | Strategic risk Likelihood = Low Impact = Large Rating = E2 (Static) | Ken Chisholm / Cllr P Corthorne |

| Description | Actions in Place | | DOT | Lead Officer / Cabinet Member |
|-------------|---|---|----------------------|--|
| | Applications have been made to sustain "Professional Status" of the pension fund to enable continuation of the existing investment strategy. All current application's have successfully been resolved confirming professional status | changes and is continually assessed. The fund is required to show an appropriate level of knowlegde and skills for investment decision markers. | Likelihood =Very Low | Sian Kunert / Cllr P Corthorne |

| Attributes: | | | | Risk rating | Score | Risk rating | Score | Risk rating | Score | Risk rating | Score | | |
|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|---|-------------|--|----------------|-------|----|----|
| Greater than 90% | This week | K E L H | Very High (A) | A4 | 6 | A3 | 12 | A2 | 18 | A1 | 24 | | |
| 70% to 90% | Next week / this month | | | K | High (B) | B4 | 5 | В3 | 10 | B2 | 15 | B1 | 20 |
| 50% to 70% | This year | | Significant (C) | C4 | 2 | C3 | 4 | C2 | 6 | C1 | 8 | | |
| 30% to 50% | Next year | | Medium (D) | D4 | 1 | D3 | 2 | D2 | 3 | D1 | 4 | | |
| 10% to 30% | Next year to five years | | Low (E) | E4 | 0 | E3 | 0 | E2 | 0 | E1 | 0 | | |
| Less than 10% | Next ten years | | Very Low (F) | F4 | 0 | F3 | 0 | F2 | 0 | F1 | 0 | | |
| | | | | Small (4) | | Medium (3) | | Large (2) | | Very Large (1) | | | |
| Attributes: | | | IMPACT | | | | | | | | | | |
| THREATS: | | Financial | up to £500k | | Between £500k a £10m | and | Between £10m and £50m | | Over £50m | | | | |
| | | Reputation | Minor complaint, no media interest | | One off local med interest | dia | Adverse national media interest or sustained local interest | | Ministerial intervention, public inquiry, remembered for years | | | | |