

## 1. tPR Data performance measures

*(Note: There is no change since the last meeting, but data has been included for completeness)*

Measure	Score	Change since last period
Common Data	98.7% (at 1 Nov 2021)	-0.5% since July 2021
Conditional (Scheme Specific) Data	95.0% (at 1 Nov 2021)	+0.1% since July 2021
Annual Benefit Statement production rate	99.5% (at 31 Aug 2021)	+2.6%

### Explanatory

The Pension Regulator (tPR) helps regulate each LGPS's Fund compliance with various legislation. It has various enforcement powers such as setting improvement plans and fining.

In respect of administrative performance, tPR focuses on two types of measures as explained separately below. The Fund is required to submit its scores against this measures each year as part of its Scheme Return.

tPR target's for all of these scores is 100% although there is an informal acceptance that scores are likely to often be slightly less.

#### a). Common and Conditional/Scheme Specific data scores

Common data scores test the Fund's data quality (existence and accuracy of data) against various data measures it expects all Pension Funds to hold (e.g. name, address etc). Conditional/Scheme Specific data scores are those data types which are needed for the administration of that specific scheme. For the LGPS, the Scheme Advisory Board (SAB) has determined the relevant data items.

Note: It was somewhat onerous and costly to do this analysis so at present the Fund only revisits these scores annually, normally in August-October, in order to complete it's annual return to the tPR.

#### b). Active Annual Benefit Statement (ABS) production

The Fund is required under the LGPS Regulations to produce active ABSs by the 31 August of each year (related to the member's pension as at 31 March of that same year). The Fund currently uploads all ABSs to the MSS member portal (My Wiltshire Pension). It only sends out paper statements to members who have opted in to receiving paper statements.

Both sets of scores are reviewed annually

### Performance commentary for the year

The **common and conditional scores** for this year have remained close to last year.

The Fund is already above average and some of the remaining gap to 100% is hard to fill due to factors outside of the Fund's control.

For the Common Data metric, virtually all the remaining data issues relate to missing postal addresses, where the member has failed to keep us up to date when they have changed address. Furthermore, as the Fund's main form of communication is now electronic, the member's postal address is becoming less important and it is more difficult to identify if it is correct.

For the Scheme Specific measure, many of the errors are of a technical nature due to the way the metric is calculated but these require further review.

The active Annual Benefit Statement score for this year has exceeded the business plan target of 99% and it follows a pattern of steady improvement since 2018 (2020: 96.9%, 2019: 95.0%, 2018: 93.9%). Due to improved systems (e.g. i-Connect) and processes, and despite additional checks being added, this has also been achieved using reduced levels of resources from previous years.

## 2. Internally set targets (Fund)

The Fund's internally set administration targets are set to help meet the goals of the Fund's business plan. The Fund also must meet certain disclosure targets but these will now only be monitored on an exceptions basis (i.e. if we are failing).

### a). Administration payment processing scores (higher priority administrative tasks)

The following table shows the Fund's process times against the timeframes set out in the administration strategy. It covers the high priority tasks, processing data on lower priority administrative tasks (such as deferrals and aggregations) will be shared at a later date. The tasks which are deemed as higher priority are the ones which relate to making a payment to the member (or a beneficiary). Members are now able to instantly access benefits estimates and therefore there is no longer a disclosed target related to this.

**Table 1: Performance over the period 1 April to 30 June 2022**

**Performance over the period 1 April to 30 June 2022**

Priority Category	Process	SLA (Working days)	Tolerable Performance	Cases Open at Start	Cases received	Cases processed	Cases open at end	Case volume difference	Completed on target
High	Deaths	5/10/20 days	95%	350	349	374	325	-25	63%
High	Retirements	10/20 days	95%	382	821	826	377	-5	81%
High	Refunds	10 days	95%	1	124	119	6	5	97%
Medium	Transfers Out	10/20 days	90%	177	179	208	148	-29	30%
Medium	Transfers In	10/15/20 days	90%	16	42	28	30	14	68%
Medium	Aggregations	23 days - 1 year	90%	3788	622	610	3800	12	76%
Medium	Leavers	23 days - 46 days	90%	2914	1595	822	3687	773	59%
Medium	Divorce	20 - 25 days	90%	24	42	59	7	-17	92%
All	All	Various	Various	7652	3774	3046	8380	728	

**Table 2: Monthly breakdown of completion on target percentage**

Priority Category	Process	SLA (Working days)	Tolerable Performance	April 2022	May 2022	June 2022
				Completed on target	Completed on target	Completed on target
High	Deaths	5/10/20 days	95%	72%	48%	60%
High	Retirements	10/20 days	95%	73%	40%	86%
High	Refunds	10 days	95%	98%	79%	100%
Medium	Transfers Out	10/20 days	90%	62%	10%	29%
Medium	Transfers In	10/15/20 days	90%	100%	41%	80%
Medium	Aggregations	23 days - 1 year	90%	77%	31%	72%
Medium	Leavers	23 days - 46 days	90%	48%	48%	68%
Medium	Divorce	20 - 25 days	90%	95%	41%	100%

**Table 3: Cases volumes analysis**

Priority level	Open at start	Open at end	Ready to go	Of which: Within SLA	Of Which: Already beyond SLA	Pipeline percentage
High	733	708	115	80	35	70%
Medium	6919	7672	7097	1329	5768	19%

**Table 4: 'Ready to go' aging analysis**

Priority level	Age analysis (working days)						Total
	1 - 5	5 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	21-40	2 months +	
High	35	32	13	12	10	13	115
Medium	35	93	392	63	548	5966	7097

**Commentary:**

**Table 1:** Shows the Fund is working within tolerance for Refunds and Divorce cases over the quarter but below tolerance for other areas. The Fund has a strategy in place to improve all performance areas but focussing on the high priority ones first however in the short-term this has been hampered by staff shortages due to sickness leave amongst several key staff in the processing team.

**Table 2:** Shows the performance dipped most in May, which was again related to the staff shortages experience during this time.

**Table 3:** Whilst the KPI performance is at an undesirable level, this table shows that only 115 high priority cases are currently 'in office' (i.e. "ready to go") and therefore workloads are at a level that KPIs could increase materially with moderate actions over the next few months. Table 1 and 3 also illustrates the volume of the backlog cases. This will mostly be addressed by outsourcing this work. The tender is currently out and ready for responses.

**Table 4:** Shows the aging of 'ready to go' cases, which highlights the backlogs sit in medium priority areas and that many of the cases are significantly overdue.

**b). i-Connect onboarding progress (18 July 2022)**

The following table shows the progress in onboarding employers on to i-Connect. The long-term target is now to onboard all employers on to i-Connect as soon as possible.

	<b>Number onboarded</b>	<b>Number left to onboard</b>	<b>Completion rate</b>
Active members	14,166 (+ 1,123)	c9,000 (total =c 23,000)	61.6% (+5.1%)
Employers	134 (+12)	48, -9 (total = 182, +3)	73.6% (+5.4%)

The comparison figure is to 22 April 2022.

Outstanding employers updates (major employers)

\***Swindon Borough Council (SBC) and FS4S** joined and then left i-Connect initially due to reporting issues and then to changing payroll system. Officers are still working closely with both organisations to resolve the remaining issues. If these two organisations were added again, this would add an additional 21 employers, as they provide payroll services for other employers, and around another 25% of active members.

SBC has also been experiencing other payroll issues, which has meant i-Connect has been de-prioritised, but good recent progress has been made which suggests it may be possible to onboard them with the next 2-3 months.

\***New College** has also merged payroll systems, which has delayed onboarding and officers are escalating matters with **Wiltshire Police** over the delays to date (also related to changing payroll systems)

\***Other smaller employers** are gradually being onboarded but each one requires a significant amount of support and hence progress is slow.

### c). MSS (My Wiltshire Pension) take up

	RECORDS
<b>ACTIVE</b>	<b>13 July 2022</b>
Registered	10,834
Total	23,298
Percentage	<b>46.5% (+0.3%)</b>
<b>DEFERRED</b>	
Registered	12,665
Total	31,606
Percentage	<b>40.1% (+1.6%)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	
Registered	23,499
Total	54,904
Percentage	<b>42.8% (+0.8%)</b>

---

## 4. Internal targets - Employers

### a). i-Connect submission performance

**Note:** Newly onboarded employers are not included with the performance statistics as typically more support is needed in the initial months and therefore the normal deadlines do not apply.

#### i). Timeliness measure of submissions

All employers onboarded on to i-Connect are required to submit their return by the 19<sup>th</sup> of the month following the month the data relates to.

Month		Apr			May			Jun		
		On-time	Late	% on time	On-time	Late	% on time	On-time	Late	% on time
iConnect Submissions	Large (250>)	6	0	100%	6	1	86%	6	0	100%
	Medium (50-250)	21	3	88%	23	2	92%	24	1	96%
	Small (10-50)	29	2	94%	26	3	90%	31	0	100%
	X Small (<10)	47	4	92%	48	8	86%	50	0	100%
<b>Total</b>		<b>103</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>99%</b>

#### ii). Quality measures

**Data quality gradings:** The Fund categorises each employer into one of three quality measures depending on the quality of the returns being produced. The middle category of Silver is the starting category. Gold means good quality returns are consistently produced, Silver means that good quality returns are mostly produced by some issues and errors occur while Bronze means that there are a number of concerns with the quality of data produced which requires frequent intervention, more checks and escalation with the employer. These categories are regularly monitored internally but not reported here.

**Contributions vs data comparisons:** Additionally, as part of its control checks, officers undertake a cross comparison between the data and the contributions received. A failure of this check for an employer indicates that either the contribution payment or the membership data submitted was incorrect (or both are incorrect) and further investigation with the employer is required.

The current breakdown of employers against this measure is as follows:

Month		Apr				May				Jun			
		Incorrect, Underpayment	Incorrect, Overpayment	Correct	Accuracy %	Incorrect, Underpayment	Incorrect, Overpayment	Correct	Accuracy %	Incorrect Underpayment	Incorrect Overpayment	Correct	Accuracy %
Monies Received Contributions total Comparison	Large (250>)	2	2	2	33%	2	2	3	43%	3	1	2	33%
	Medium (50-250)	1	6	16	70%	3	7	14	58%	1	6	17	71%
	Small (10-50)	2	6	23	74%	3	0	21	88%	1	4	26	84%
	X Small (<10)	8	5	37	74%	7	0	45	87%	6	6	41	77%
<b>Total</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>75%</b>