

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

DATE:	23 June 2025
VENUE:	Hybrid meeting – MS Teams & 18 Smith Square
TIME:	11.00am – 12.30pm

AGENDA

Item		Paper	Timings
1	Welcome, introductions, apologies and declaration of interests		11:00
2	Hybrid meeting protocol		11:05
3	Actions and Agreements from 17 February 2025 meeting	Paper A	11:10
4	Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) update	Verbal	11.15
5	Fit for the Future Response - Governance Proposals	Paper B	11:30
6	Peer Support Offer	Paper C	12:00
7	Workplan update	Paper D	12.20
8	AOB and date of next meeting		12:30

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

Meeting of 23 June 2025

Item 3 – Paper A

Actions and agreements from 17 February 2025

Present

Joanne Donnelly	Meeting Chair in Mark Wynn's absence
Jeffrey Dong	Welsh Treasurers
Karen Gibson	Practitioner – County Councils
Nicola Todd	Practitioner – Northern Ireland
Rachel Brothwood	Practitioner – Metropolitan Authorities
Nemashe Sivayogan	Practitioner – London Borough
Christina Thompson	Practitioner – London Pensions Fund Authority (LPFA)
Richard McIndoe	Practitioner – Scotland
Peter Worth	Advisor - Worth TAS Accounting
Nick Harvey	Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA)
Jack Bower	Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW)
Catherine Pearce	Governance Consultant (Aon)
Ian Colvin	Governance Consultant (Hymans Robertson)
John Neal	UNITE
Will King	Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG)
Ben Lavelle	MHCLG
Jeremy Hughes	Local Government Association (LGA) – Deputy Board Secretary
Becky Clough	LGA – Board Support and Policy Officer
Sophia Chivandire	LGA – Pensions Support and Policy Officer
Ona Ehimuan	LGA – Pensions Secretary
Sarah Tingey	LGA – Research and Data Analyst

Items 1 & 2 – Welcome, introductions, apologies, declaration of interests, and meeting protocol

1. The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and advised them of the meeting protocol. Sophia Chivandire who joined the Secretariat team in December 2024 was welcomed to her first meeting.
2. Apologies were received from Mark Wynn (Chair) and the Committee agreed that Jo Donnelly, Board Secretary would chair the meeting in his absence. Apologies had been received from Fiona Miller (Border to Coast), John Neal (Unite), Kevin Gerard (Dyfed Pension Fund), John

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

Jones (Local Pensions Board) and John Boyd (Audit Scotland). Paul Mayers (National Audit Office) and Peter Turner (London Borough of Bromley) were absent without apology. There were no declarations of interest raised.

Item 3 – Matters arising from the meeting of 21 October 2024

3. The minutes of the meeting on 21 October 2024 were agreed as a fair and true record of the meeting.

Item 4 – MHCLG update

4. Will King (WK) gave an update on key MHCLG workstreams. The Fit for the Future consultation closed on 16 January 2025 and 217 responses had been received. MHCLG were working through the responses, briefing Ministers and would issue their response in due course. The proposals on governance in the consultation are based on the SAB's Good Governance recommendations and the CRC's Good Governance and Administration working group have been making progress on reviewing existing guidance and sharing views on the proposals. It is expected that the changes in governance arrangements could largely be made through guidance and secondary legislation with a response to the consultation expected in the first half of the year. Resulting legislation from the consultation is expected in the second half of the year.
5. MHCLG had held two technical workshops on local audit arrangements and an update on the outcome from the local audit consultation which closed on 29 January 2025 was expected in the second half of the year. There is also an upcoming consultation on covering areas of member benefits which will be published soon.
6. Jeremy Hughes (JH) asked Ben Lavelle (BL) whether a bill had been identified for the separation of pension fund accounts from main authority accounts. A bill had not been identified yet but that there are options, and it was hoped that the proposal for separation would be implemented.

Item 5 – Good Governance and Administration Update

7. Becky Clough (BC) introduced Paper B to the Committee. The working group is expecting to input into revising the 2008 governance statutory guidance in the coming months. Later in the year, the group would assist in the production of statutory guidance on administration strategy statements.
8. There is still some uncertainty on what areas will be contained in guidance: such as representation of scheme members and the description of the role of the LGPS senior officer, with the former not in the government's consultation document. It was confirmed by MHCLG that the details of the role of the senior officer would be contained in

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

guidance.

9. Peter Worth (PW) stated that the LGPS Senior Officer role should be a statutory role if MHCLG wanted it to be adhered to by all funds. Nemashe Sivayogan (NS) added that MHCLG should ensure that guidance specifies what the expectations are for the senior officer. JH added that given the local government reorganisation that is currently happening, it would be beneficial for the timelines for these workstreams to be considered concurrently. WK confirmed that although this couldn't be guaranteed there is an effort to align as much as possible. NS asked if the secretariat had received any feedback on the budget setting letter that was issued by the Board. No feedback had yet been received, but the committee believed that the letter was a helpful and timely reminder for administering authorities.
10. With regards to the new administration statutory guidance, there was discussion of how the data collected by the Secretariat on Key Performance Indicators should be presented and contextualized. The secretariat were still working on reporting tools and would aim to bring a working version to the next Committee meeting. The Pensions Managers Conference in Torquay was thought to be an ideal event to gain feedback on the new guidance. The Secretariat said they would also seek engagement with the regional and national pension officer groups.
11. BC suggested that the Good Governance and Administration working group be split which the lead officer Jeff Dong (JD) agreed with given the amount of work needed to produce the required documents.
12. The Committee noted the update provided.

ACTION – that the Good Governance and Administration working group be split into separate groups

Item 6 – Peer Support Offer

13. BC introduced Paper C to the Committee. The work to develop the peer support offer had begun and Sophia Chivandire (SC) had been recruited to the secretariat team to lead the project. It was confirmed that the peer support offer and the proposed independent governance review in the Fit for the Future consultation are two separate strands but will be linked. It is envisioned that the peer support offer would be similar to the Local Government Association's (LGA) current offering for member councils as a well recognised developed service. SC and BC are liaising with LGA colleagues to understand the main aspects of how the LGA's peer support service works and how they can be applied to the LGPS. Several fund officers have already put themselves forward as volunteers for the working group and the first meeting will be convened in due course.

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

14. PW suggested that a standard methodology would be useful so that there is consistency despite the varying operational processes at different funds. NS added that the secretariat should carefully consider the right time to ask for volunteers given that it is a triennial valuation year. This was noted by the secretariat.
15. RB asked how the peer support offer would align with The Pension Regulator's (TPR) work and where the report resulting from the peer support would be shared. It was added that it should be designed in a way to add value. BC responded saying that these factors are being actively considered, including the link between the proposed independent governance review and the peer support offer. It is expected that TPR will be represented on the working group where this can be worked through in more detail.
16. Christina Thompson (CT) had been involved in a council peer review with the LGA and suggested that pensions could be built into scope of the teams involved in the existing peer challenge but noted that the resources needed by the fund to prepare for a corporate peer challenge were significant.
17. After the discussion, the Committee approved the Terms of Reference for the Peer Support Offer working group which were contained at Annex A of the paper.

ACTION – that the Secretariat carries out the actions contained in Paper C.

Item 7 – Audit update

18. JH introduced Paper D to the Committee. It was hoped that the proposals for audit separation would be taken forward by the government. If so, it is expected that there will be an influx of work assigned to the audit working group and the Committee was asked for their view on whether a representative from one of the audit firms to join the working group would be acceptable. The Committee ultimately agreed that a representative would be useful to join the audit working group but did raise some concerns that having only one representative could lead to requests for wider representation. It was concluded to try to manage that risk and that the representative of Grant Thornton who had asked to be included was added to the group. This was on condition that they are representing the audit sector generally and attending in a professional capacity, as opposed to representing their organisation.
19. Richard McIndoe (RMc) confirmed that Scottish funds have had their accounts separated for many years and confirmed that the accounts are signed off three to four months earlier than English funds with the same auditor. JD agreed that this was also the case in Wales, and that it was helpful to have the pension fund audit prioritised in this way.

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

20. The Audit Roundtable last met on the 9th December 2024 and the minutes from the meeting would be circulated to the Committee. The roundtable group would be meeting again in the Summer, but a date had not yet been confirmed. Asides from audit separation, the Virgin Media 37 case was also discussed by the group. The Committee were informed that the Board would be writing to Pensions Minister Torsten Bell to request that certainly is brought to the sector on the matter.

21. The Committee noted the contents in Paper D.

Item 8 – Knowledge and Skills update

22. BC introduced Paper E to the Committee. There is currently no central document on the knowledge and skills requirements for pension committee and pension board members. The aim of the working group chaired by John Jones is to develop guidance to assist funds with creating their own training strategies, that will include reference to “soft skills” as well. The guidance would cover not just what knowledge and skills were required, but also guidance on developing and delivering a training policy.

23. Paragraph 9 of the paper laid out the high-level areas which could be included in training strategy guidance and the Committee were invited to comment. BC added the timing of this guidance is important to consider alongside the impact of the outcomes of the Fit for the Future consultation which may affect the training needs and requirements.

24. RB asked about the role of independent advisors as proposed in the Fit for the Future consultation and whether they would also need to be in scope. This would still need to be considered. There also needed to be consideration of the average term lengths of committee and board members and the time that it would take to gain the requisite knowledge and skills and the other duties on committee members. Given the link to Fit for the Future proposals, it was agreed to invite someone from MHCLG to join the working group.

25. Nick Harvey (NH) supported what had been said, adding that CIPFA are not opposed to moving away from the current knowledge and skills guidance given that at the time it was written, the landscape of the LGPS was very different to what it is likely to be going forward. PW also raised a need to link this work to the work on the peer support offer.

26. The Committee noted the contents of the report.

Item 9 – Scheme Annual Report update

27. Sarah Tingey (ST) gave the Committee an update on the initial findings from gathering data for the Scheme Annual Report. At the meeting date, data from 83 fund annual reports was available. Following on from the publication of the Annual Report Guidance, the initial rate of compliance with the guidance

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

was also shared with the Committee. The data was still being worked on and a quality assurance check was underway. The Committee welcomed the data on compliance and asked if funds could receive feedback on how they were assessed as doing. The secretariat agreed to consider this and were happy to engage with any fund that wanted to ask about their results specifically.

28. It was hoped that the Scheme Annual Report 2024 could be published towards the end of March and it was agreed that the slides presented by ST will be updated once the analysis was completed and circulated to the Committee after the quality assurance process was completed.

ACTION – that the Secretariat circulate the slides presented on the initial findings of the Scheme Annual Report 2024 after the quality assurance process.

Item 10 – Workplan update

29. BC introduced Paper F to the Committee which gave an overview of the four active workstreams. The Peer Support Offer working group currently had seven fund officers from four funds and the first meeting would be arranged in due course. NS asked about adding a possible end date for the Audit working group, however it was not envisioned that the work of the group could set a date of conclusion until more information on accounts decoupling was known.

Item 10 – AOB and date of next meeting

30. There were three items raised. JD informed the Committee that Mark Wynn would be formally stepping down as the Chair of the Committee and proposed that Jeff Dong (JDo) be nominated as the new chair. The Committee agreed that the nomination be sent to CIPFA and the Board for approval in March.

ACTION – that Jeff Dong is nominated as the Chair of the CRC, pending approval from the Board and CIPFA.

31. The Committee noted that a section 114 notice had been issued at Barnet Council on 23 January 2025.
32. JH raised an item thanking JD for her leadership during her time as LGA Head of Pensions and the LGPS Scheme Advisory Board Secretary as she was stepping down from this role to become CEO of London Pension Fund Authority.
33. The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 23 June 2025 at 11am.

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

HYBRID MEETING - 23 June 2025

ITEM 5 – PAPER B

Fit for the Future Response – Governance Proposals

Background

1. The Government has now published [its response to the Fit for the Future consultation](#). A significant element of those proposals was implementation of the Good Governance recommendations made by the Board in 2021, which is welcomed. To summarise, the Government intends for the following new requirements to apply to administering authorities (AA):
 - To prepare strategies on Governance (including member representation), a Training Strategy and a Conflicts of Interest policy (replacing the governance compliance statement).
 - To appoint a Senior LGPS officer
 - To prepare and publish an Administration Strategy
 - To change the way in which strategies on governance and training, funding, administration and investments are published in the Annual Report
 - To participate in an independent governance review (IGR) and, if applicable, produce an improvement plan to address any issues identified (every three years rather than two as originally consulted on)
 - That pension committee members, the LGPS Senior officer and officers should have the appropriate level of knowledge and understanding for their roles, and that the requirements for pension committee members and local pension board members should be aligned.
 - For the Governance and Training strategy to set out how AA's will ensure that the new requirements on knowledge and understanding are met
 - To appoint an independent advisor to the pension committee (without voting rights). This advisor would be required to have one or more of the following qualifications and experience: qualifications from Pensions Management Institute (PMI) – the award in pension trusteeship, diploma in professional trusteeship, certificate in professional trusteeship, accreditation for professional trustee; member of, and accredited by, the Association of Professional Pension Trustees (APPT); and significant experience of pensions and/or investments.
2. Possibly in response to the Board flagging that this had been omitted from the original proposals, they now also include the requirement for

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

administering authorities to have cover member representation in their Governance Strategy.

Workplan and delivery of proposals

3. The consultation response sets an ambition for all of these proposals to be implemented through amendments to LGPS regulations and statutory guidance in time for adoption in the 2026/27 scheme year. However, some of the proposals, such as the requirement to undertake an IGR, are conditional on progress and final assent being granted to the [Pensions Bill](#).
4. For many of these, the consultation response outlines that it is expected that the Scheme Advisory Board will be asked to take the policy and/or drafting lead. That approach is positive and can be seen as confidence in similar guidance products and working group input that have been led by the Board in the past year. However, it is a considerable body of work in a relatively short timescale. It will require the continued input to working groups and reviewing documentation from both the Secretariat Team and working group members (who continue to volunteer their time), during an exceptionally busy and challenging time for the LGPS.
5. It is understood that there will be Governance Statutory Guidance (covering broadly Knowledge requirements, Senior LGPS Officer, Conflict of Interest and Pool Governance), Training Strategy Guidance and Administration Strategy Guidance.
6. This Committee's workplan had long been established to develop the recommendations made in the original Good Governance recommendations so the Secretariat have planned for this work however there will need to be some to allow for. As a reminder the current CRC working groups are below:
 - Knowledge and Skills working
 - Governance working group
 - Peer Support
 - Audit working group
7. It was agreed at the last Committee meeting that there will need to be a working group established to focus on the Administration Strategy guidance and the Secretariat will need to gather input from other networks such as Pension Officer Groups.
8. The consultation response proposed changes to the Annual Report guidance covered to require AAs to report on their local investments and pooling performance. There are also changes proposed to the Annual Report guidance to cover the opt out data (in the [Access and Fairness consultation](#)). This will mean the Annual Report guidance will need to be updated and possibly the original or new working group established to review the

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

proposals. This was expected, as the Secretariat had aimed to review the implementation of the guidance, but these additions will mean the review will need to be started earlier than planned.

9. We have been working closely with Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) officials to pull together a project plan for the work, including understanding priorities and some of the contingencies around the passage of the Bill and drafting of the necessary regulatory amendments. A first round of working group meetings has also been held ahead of this Committee meeting and a verbal update will be given on the response from those groups.

Committee Role

10. This Committee meets next on 20 October 2025 and a full update of progress will be provided then but also an interim progress report will be supplied in the interim period to allow the Committee to be sighted on progress before the next time it meets. We expect to have made significant progress and be able to outline the main elements that the guidance documents will cover. We expect also to have had sight of the necessary draft amendments to the 2013 Regulations.
11. The Committee workplan will be extended to cover the project plan for this set of projects, and any changes in the expected timeline will be communicated to the Committee at the time at which they become clearer.

Recommendation

That the Committee notes the update as set out above.

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

HYBRID MEETING – 23 June 2025

ITEM 6 PAPER C

Peer Support Offer

Background

1. The proposal for a LGPS specific peer support offer – derived from the proposals in [SAB's original Good Governance Report](#) - was agreed at the [24 June 2024](#) CRC meeting. Initial objectives were also agreed, which were:
 - To allow LGPS administering authorities (AA's) to gain external assurance support for its governance activities
 - To share, promote and increase good governance practices
 - To facilitate access to an expert network of LGPS peer members
2. In February 2025, the CRC agreed the following initial milestones for this project:
 - November 2024 – Board approval of workstream (**completed**)
 - January 2025 – March 2025 – project scoping, including creation of working group and initial engagement with MHCLG on proposals (**completed**)
 - March 2025 – Terms of Reference and other project documentation proposed to the Board (**completed**)
 - April, June, and September 2025 – working group meetings arranged (**majority completed, September to be organised**)
 - June 2025 – initial findings presented to CRC (**this paper**)
 - July 2025 – project update to Board (**to be drafted following this meeting**)
 - October 2025 – draft framework and models of a LGPS peer support offer, including consideration of budget and other constraints (**ongoing**)
 - November 2025 – project proposal delivered to the Board (**ambition**)

Current position

3. This paper outlines the work of the Secretariat since the February 2025 meeting and includes at Annex A our initial findings on a peer support process for the LGPS.
4. The Secretariat has reviewed the Government's [Fit for the future consultation](#) issued on 29 May 2025 which covered the proposal for peer support for the LGPS, specifically stating in the context of the proposed Independent Governance Review (IGR) that:

233. After the reviews are completed and submitted to MHCLG, the government envisages that for most AAs, the review will have identified recommendations to be taken forward locally. For some, the LGA's peer support offer, which is

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

currently being developed, may be appropriate. If government has concerns about certain cases, they may bring them to the attention of TPR, who will consider the information in line with their usual approach. For the most serious cases, intervention may come through direction by the Secretary of State under the Public Service Pensions Act 2013, including the power clarified in the Pensions Bill to allow for compulsory merger.

Peer Support is also covered at point 148 in the consultation response:

148. Failure to comply with legal requirements by the deadline and subsequently on an ongoing basis, could lead to AAs being directed by the Secretary of State to undertake a governance review with immediate effect. In cases where the governance review process and any peer support are not successful at delivering change, it would be open to the Secretary of State to make use of powers under the Public Service Pensions Act 2013 and the Investment Regulations 2016 to issue a direction or to wind up a fund

5. The Secretariat welcomes that the IGR and peer support have been noted as separate processes (with peer support noted as an option to assist funds with IGR recommendations) and identified peer support as a potential outcome of an IGR. In line with the recommendations in this paper IGR is one route into peer support, but crucially not the only route.
6. Since the last CRC meeting the Peer Support Working Group has met twice: on 7 April 2025 and 12 June 2025. At the April meeting the Secretariat provided background and scene setting of the proposals and the Terms of Reference were agreed. An overview was provided of the Local Government Association (LGA) Corporate Peer Challenge (CPC) which is delivered to Councils. This presentation explained how that extensive and well-established process works for member Councils within the LGA, the benefits of peer support, the CPC process and what happens before and after a CPC has been completed.
7. It was proposed that the Secretariat would continue to use as its starting point the principles of the LGA's valued improvement and assurance tool offer to councils, including the established resources, practices and expertise.
8. At the April working group, feedback was given from the group on what a LGPS peer support offer could look like for the LGPS. The main themes of discussions were questions and comments, and an overview is provided below:
 - If the peer support would be restricted to certain areas such as administration and governance
 - If there would be a dedicated LGA support officer for the administration of the support service
 - Whether peer support needed to be in-person, given fund officers are home based now or don't have central officers to attend
 - A clear framework should be established for the support offer
 - Importance on having peers from more than one fund for each peer support event, to reflect the different ways of doing things across the scheme

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

- How peer support fits with the Independent Governance Review
 - How the costs of the peer support were to be met and the role of consultants in the process
 - How it overlaps with local pension board responsibilities and workplans
 - How it overlaps with the Pensions Regulators' (TPR) General Code of practice
 - That peer support is not a benchmarking process/league table, instead it should build on existing networks of sharing best practice and collaboration.
9. Due to the timings of the publication of this paper, a verbal update on the discussion at the working group meeting on the 12 June 2025 will be provided to the CRC.
10. To further develop understanding of the LGA Corporate process and to gauge the work involved in setting up a peer support service, two members of the Secretariat Team recently took part in a four-day Corporate Peer Challenge Event with two separate Councils. Reflections of this process from the team members involved are below:
- The LGA clearly has a well-established, robust thought-out process
 - Peer reviews are based on open, honest conversations conducted via a team of experienced professionals in a 'critical friend' manner
 - The peer support observed occurred by invitation by the organisation
 - Rules and boundaries for conversations are clear and well set out – all comments received are non-attributable
 - It is a process that initially looks at the overall corporate "health" of the organisation and incorporates views from all stakeholders
 - Background information and pre-reading is key 'scene setting' but also important is triangulation with common themes arising from the sessions/focus groups/meetings
 - Ownership and buy-in of the peer support process by the organisation receiving the support is crucial
 - Key foundations for discussions are whether the key corporate aims are being met
 - Organisational relationships (front line staff, management, key partners and management) are all included in the process
 - The experienced and background of the peers is tailored for each event and needs of the receiving organisation
11. To further bring this to life for the CRC, an example timetable and desensitised guidance document of a LGA Corporate Peer Challenge has been shared

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

separately (and confidentially) with the CRC for information. However, the final reports are made publicly available on the [LGA's website](#).

Recommendation

That the Committee notes the progress of this workstream and notes the timeline of actions as set out above and provides views/comments on initial findings in Annex A.

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

Annex A – Initial findings for Peer Support Offer for the LGPS

Purpose

12. It seems appropriate to learn from (in a proportionate and manageable way) the principles and format of the [LGA](#)'s valued sector-led improvement and assurance offer to LGA member Councils, but tailored to a LGPS context. Recognising however the long-term journey to establish such a process as industry recognisable at the LGA's offering.
13. Peer support offer should help reflect with respected peers on current processes, practices and performance through the lens of good governance and by recognising and celebrating excellence.
14. A standard framework of principles to shape discussions assists in the delivery of a peer support offer, although to meet specific needs should be able adapt and can involve other areas agreed with the organisation receiving the support.
15. Peer support can provide targeted support to help an organisation undertaking their statutory (or non-statutory) duties or plan for change/improvement via a cohort of experienced, skilled and qualified individuals from other AAs.
16. It consists of matching an organisation who wish to learn from others and receive the support provided by peers. The type of support is generally led and determined by the needs of the recipient.

Access and route into peer support

17. It is anticipated there could be various routes for AAs to access peer support:
 - Administering Authorities' self-referring to access peer support
 - To assist with recommendation(s) following an Independent Governance Review
 - Referral made by The Pension Regulator.
 - Rolling programme
18. As demonstrated in the list above, there may be several reasons and routes why an AA may want access peer support. The Secretariat believes it is not helpful to restrict the reasons or circumstances leading into peer support but acknowledges that the Government's proposed IGR will be one determined route, but not the only route. Below are some examples of when peer support could be a support the sector to bring to life the offering. Below are illustrative examples only.

Example 1

19. A Pension Committee has new membership and with a mixture of new and experienced Pension Committee members. As part of this period of change, the Pension Committee Chair wishes to explore and identify how the current

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

governance structure and procedures compare with similar and varying sized funds. With established and new roles in place, the LGPS Senior Officer believes the fund could benefit from the extensive LGPS network for the newly formed Pension Committee to learn from. This could be to reflect on the funds achievements to date and to establish the ambitions and future needs of the fund, whilst identifying the challenges and emerging issues.

Example 2

20. A new Local Pension Board chair has been appointed, and they want to gauge how the Local Pensions Board has contributed to supporting the Pension Committee in the past and be proactive as to whether it could do so more effectively in the future.

Scope

21. The scope of the peer support is to focus on the pertinent issues affecting that organisation, to reflect on current processes and practice but also to champion change and improvement through good governance and by recognising and celebrating excellence. The ultimate aim and role of peer support is to cover all aspects of LGPS management activity which an AA needs support with and including administration, governance and investments functions. Due to the scale and depth of LGPS fund management, a framework needs to be developed and possibly incrementally to deliver the needs of the entire LGPS function.

Framework

22. It is thought that the specific scope and themes explored in peer support will largely be determined by the specific route into the support (i.e the recommendations made following the Independent Governance Review or an AA self-referring). However, a process framework would need to be developed to provide a starting point for a particular peer support event. This is a key part of the peer support process and which needs to be explored by the Peer Support Working Group. As an example, the LGA's successful peer support program is based around five 'themes which are:

- Local priorities and outcomes
- Organisational and place leadership
- Governance and culture
- Financial planning and management
- Capacity for improvement

23. Views are encouraged on the use of themes suitable for the LGPS, how these could be applied to the LGPS or whether new or adapted themes could be used. As an example, an LGPS framework could focus on specific themes such as: People, Management, Processes, Partnership, Decisions and Performance. These are some high-level examples only, there is an option to more closely relate these themes to modules in the TPR's General Code or Independent Governance Review criteria (once more is known on that).

24. The Secretariat are continuing to scope out the work involved to create a peer

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

review service and identified the following next steps for 'fact finding' but believe this list will continue to evolve:

- Understand how peer support works for service-specific functions (such as [Planning Advisory Service](#))
- Identifying the potential frequency/demand of peer support offering and funding options*
- Establishing framework options and themes
- Identify administrative support requirements
- Recruitment options and scope for establishing a peer network
- Facilitation support options
- Training requirements of peers

25. One area the Secretariat will focus on, will be to try and calculate initial demand for a peer support service in the first 12 initial months from April 2026 and how this compares with the project proposal to be delivered to the Board later in the year.

*The Secretariat have been given initial indications of costs for a peer support event, and it is likely that, dependent on frequency and sector demand of the support, extra funding through a grant or levy to do the initial work and piloting will be needed.

25. The Secretariat are currently working to the project milestones as set out in paragraph 2, however, as number of the project deliverables are known and understood, this timetable will be revisited.

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

HYBRID MEETING – 23 June 2025

ITEM 7 PAPER D

Workplan update

Current position

1. This paper summarises the meetings and work undertaken by each of the CRC's workstreams since the last CRC meeting in February 2025. All of the working group meetings were held shortly before the June 2025 CRC meeting to allow the Government's response to the Fit for the Future consultation to be the main focus of discussion.

Audit

Meeting Chair	Nemashe Sivayogan (Merton LB)
Supported by	Melanie Stokes (Staffordshire); Sara Maxey (Essex); Nick Harvey (CIPFA); Melissa Kelly (Cornwall); Peter Worth (TAS Accounting); Joana Marfoh (Islington); Bola Tobun (Southwark); Jack Bower (The Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW)); Ben Lavelle (MHCLG) and Jelena Peet (Wiltshire)
Start date	August 2022
Target completion date	April 2026 (will be reviewed once more information on decoupling timetable and outputs is confirmed)
Meetings since February 2025:	10 June 2026

Current position

In April 2025, the government response to the consultation for the published ['Strategy for Overhauling the Local Audit System'](#) committed the government to the decoupling of pension fund accounts from administering authority main accounts.

Both before and since this announcement the audit working group have been invited by MHCLG to share their views on the proposals, the timetable and process for implementation. A working group meeting was held on the 10 June and MHCLG gave a presentation on the policy proposals. Although the majority of the time in the working group was spent discussing the Local Audit proposals, the recent announcement on the [Virgin Media case](#) was discussed with the view that more information is needed to understand how this would impact the LGPS. At a future meeting, proposals in Fit for the Future specifically affecting audit and accounting issues would be discussed.

The main aim of this working group is to feed into the policy work for the proposed changes to the decoupling of pension fund accounts. The group

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

also agreed it would also be beneficial for the Secretariat to organise an meeting of the next Audit Roundtable group, possibly for September 2025.

Knowledge and Skills

Meeting Chair	John Jones (Local Pension Board Chair at Dyfed Pension Fund and Tower Hamlets Pension Fund)
Supported by	Karen Gibson (Dorset); Nick Harvey (CIPFA); Heidi Catherall (Cheshire); Justin Bridges (Shropshire); Amanda Crawford (Essex); Will King (MHCLG); Ian Colvin (Hymans), Catherine Pearce (AON) and Alison Murray (Barnett Waddington)
Start Date	December 2022
Target Completion Date	Ongoing
Meetings since February 2025	9 June 2025

Current position

The group met on 9 June 2025 to discuss the Government response to the Fit for the Future consultation. A presentation was provided by MHCLG and views sought from the group on the priority and content for guidance. More information can be found in Item 5, Paper B.

Good Governance

Meeting Chair	Jeff Dong (Swansea)
Supported by	Kevin Gerard (Carmarthenshire); Nick Harvey (CIPFA); Will King (MHCLG); Nemashe Sivayogan (Merton LB); Jo Quarterman (Norfolk); Matt Mott (West Yorkshire) and Amanda Crawford (Essex)
Start Date	November 2022
Target completion date	Ongoing
Meetings since February 2025:	10 June 2025

Current position

The group met on 9 June 2025 to discuss the Government response to the Fit for the Future consultation. A presentation was provided by MHCLG and views sought from the group on the priority and content for guidance. More information can be found in Item 5, Paper B.

Peer support

Meeting Chair	Becky Clough (currently)
---------------	--------------------------

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

Supported by

Vicky Jenks, Peter Chadderton (Shropshire), Yvonne Thompson (Houslow), Miriam Adams (Hackney), Sarah Hargraves (Lambeth), Karen Williams (Clwyd), Nick Gannon (The Pensions Regulator), Glen Cossey, Jo Quarterman (Norfolk), Alistair Wickens (Warwickshire), Vickie Hampshire (West Sussex), Mukhtar Master, Anna Lloyd (Oxfordshire), Martin Griffiths (Berkshire), Gillian Taberner (South Yorkshire Pension Authority), Lisa Garton (East Riding), Gemma Farley, Andrew Boutflower (Hampshire), Yunus Gajra (West Yorkshire), Jayne Brown, Junaird Laly (Lancashire), Mala Visram (London Pension Fund Authority) and Nick Orton (Tyne and Wear Pension Fund).

Start Date

November 2024

Target completion date

December 2025 (initially)

Current position

Update provided at item 6

Recommendation

For the Committee to accept the actions as set out in this report and at annex A.

Annex A - The below workplan outlines the work for each live (and proposed) working group for 2025/26.

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)

Workstream	Details	Timescales
Audit issues	<p>To share views of administering authorities and scheme employers and input expertise to government to assist in shaping the proposal and implementation for decoupling the pension fund accounts from the main administering authority accounts</p> <p>To recommend agenda items for the Audit Roundtable meetings.</p>	Target completion date is March 2026 - to be reviewed once timetable confirmed with MHCLG
Knowledge and skills	To feed views and expertise into updated knowledge and skills statutory guidance and assist the Board when developing guidance for creating a Training Strategy	Implementation date for new guidance March 2026
Good Governance	To input into the updates required to governance statutory guidance	Implementation date for new guidance March 2026
Peer Support	To scope out the feasibility of creating a LGPS peer support offer	November 2025 for a proposal to be delivered to the Board which has been approved by the CRC and discussed by the working group
Administration Strategy Guidance	To be confirmed	To be confirmed
Annual Report guidance	To consider any changes needed to the guidance, considering the outcome of the Fit for the Future consultation and feedback from funds	To be confirmed

Compliance and Reporting Committee (CRC)
