

MINUTES OF THE MEETING Pensions Committee and Board HELD ON Monday 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2025, 7:00 – 10:30pm

PRESENT: Councillors: George Dunstall (Chair), John Bevan (Vice-Chair), Matt White, Randy Plowright, Pattinson, John Raisin (Advisor), Anna Lawton, Keith Brown, Rebecca Moore and Eamonn Kenny, Cllr Iyggkaran.

## **1. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein.

## **2. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Da Costa

## **3. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business

## **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

## **5. BREACHES OF THE LAW**

The pension fund self reported to the pensions regulator, notifying them of the McCloud determination made and that the project will conclude on August 2026, as opposed to the initial regulatory deadline of August 2025. TPR has acknowledged the report and have responded that they are satisfied with our self report and no further action will be taken on the matter.

## **6. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS**

There were none.

## **7. RECORD OF TRAINING UNDERTAKEN SINCE LAST MEETING**

It was stated that Councillors Bevan and Iyggkaran completed all the training provided under the Hymans LOLA solution.

## **8. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Pensions Committee and Board meeting held on 24th July were approved as a correct record.

## **9. RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT POLICY**

The Fund has finalised its draft Responsible Investment Policy to ensure that it remains aligned with best practice, regulatory requirements, and the long-term interests of members and stakeholders. Responsible investment has become an increasingly important aspect of pension fund governance, reflecting the need to integrate environmental, social, and governance (ESG) considerations into investment decision-making.

Councillor White raised concerns about the Responsible Investment policy and stated that he was not happy with the current version.

There was a 5-minute adjournment.

### **Recommendations:**

The Pensions Committee and Board:

3.1. Noted and provided any comments regarding the draft responsible investment policy (Appendix 1)

3.2. That the draft Responsible Investment Policy to be brought back to the committee in January for approval to go out to consultation

## **10. PENSIONS ADMINISTRATION UPDATE**

This report provided the Pensions Committee and Board (PCB) with the following updates regarding Pension Fund's administration activities:

- a. Pension Fund membership update
- b. Online Member Self Service portal update
- c. Update on Service Level Agreement (SLA) statistics
- d. Pensions Dashboard Project (PDP) update
- e. Approval of new Admission Agreements
- f. Collection of Employer and Employee Contributions update
- g. Internal Disputes Resolution Procedures (IDRPs)
- h. Update on Annual benefit statements
- i. McCloud Project update
- j. Ongoing Consultations

The Fund had finalised its draft Responsible Investment Policy to ensure alignment with best practice, regulatory requirements, and the long-term interests of members and stakeholders. Responsible investment had become an increasingly important part of pension fund governance, highlighting the need to integrate environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors into investment decisions.

The Pension Fund had reviewed its investments, modelled ESG risk thresholds, and finalised a Responsible Investment Policy with a clear engagement framework. The policy had embedded ESG principles into decision-making, provided mechanisms for influence or divestment, and prepared for implementation in April 2026 following consultation with LCIV and the pensions community.

- Data inconsistencies had been identified against the Pensions Dashboard Programme standards, though they had not involved member-level data affecting benefits. Instead, the issues had related to communication details such as home and email addresses, where certain symbols and formatting had not been compatible with the standards. These data queries had been corrected, and all address records were subsequently brought into compliance with the programme requirements

### **Recommendations:**

The Pensions Committee and Board:

3.1. Noted this report and the information provided regarding the Pension Fund's administration activities for the quarter ending 30 September 2025.

3.2. Noted and approve the admission of the entities listed in Section 6.15 of this report, as new employers participating in the Haringey Local Government Pension Scheme.

3.3 Delegated authority to the Corporate Director of Finance and Resources to negotiate, agree and enter into any admission agreements with admission bodies and schools for the purposes of joining the Local Government Pension Scheme

## **11. GOVERNANCE REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

The paper had been prepared to provide an update on the progress made in implementing the Fund's governance review recommendations, following the review conducted by the Fund's independent advisor. Officers had invited comments from the Pensions Committee and Board on the actions achieved to date.

Following the governance review conducted by the Fund's independent advisor, 26 recommendations had been presented to the Pensions Committee and Board. These had been grouped into three categories: **Fundamental and Urgent, Easily Implementable**, and **To be Implemented from 2025/26**.

Officers had subsequently reviewed all 26 recommendations and prepared an implementation plan, taking account of the categories to which each recommendation had been assigned.

- At the last investment review meeting, a point had been raised about aligning the decision-making process with the responsibilities of board members. This suggestion had been well received, with general agreement that it was a good idea. It had been noted that the addition to the list would be straightforward, and a commitment had been made to record and include it.

### **Recommendations:**

The Pensions Committee and Board:

3.1. Noted and provided any comments regarding the implementation of the fund governance review recommendations.

## **12. FUND RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY**

The paper had been prepared to provide an update on the progress made in implementing governance review recommendations 10, 11, and 12, all of which related to risk management. Officers had invited the Pensions Committee and Board to comment on the actions achieved to date.

Following the governance review conducted by the Fund's independent advisor, a series of recommendations had been presented to the Pension Committee Board (PCB). These had been intended to strengthen oversight, improve decision-making, and ensure alignment with best practice in pension fund governance.

Several of the recommendations had focused on risk management. Recommendation 10 had called for the preparation of a Pension Fund Risk Policy for PCB approval. Recommendation 11 had required a review and revision of the Risk Management Process to implement a cycle in line with CIPFA's 2018 guidance. Recommendation 12 had proposed redesigning the Risk Register, with risks listed under the seven headings set out in that guidance.

The Pension Fund Risk Policy had outlined the framework for identifying, assessing, managing, and monitoring risks that could affect the Fund's long-term objectives. It had ensured practices were aligned with regulatory

guidance and industry standards, supported informed decision-making, and promoted transparency and accountability in managing pension assets.

The Pension Fund Risk Management Strategy and Process had set out the approach officers would take in preparing the redesigned Risk Register, as required by recommendation 12. This updated register had been scheduled for presentation to the PCB at its January 2026 meeting for comment and approval.

Recommendations:

The Pensions Committee and Board:

3.1. Noted and provided any comments regarding the implementation of recommendations 10, 11 and 12 of the Governance review, relating to the Risk Management Policy.

3.2. Approved the Fund Risk Management Policy which has been prepared in response to recommendation 10 of the Governance review.

### **13. RISK REGISTER**

The Pension Fund's risk register had been presented to give the Pensions Committee and Board an opportunity to further review the allocation of risk scores.

The Pensions Regulator had required the Pension Committee and Board (PCB) to establish and implement internal controls for the Fund to ensure compliance with scheme rules and legal requirements. A complete version of the risk register had been approved in September 2016, and since then different sections had been reviewed at each subsequent meeting, with changes agreed to keep strategic risk monitoring current.

The risk register had covered administration, governance, investment, accounting, funding, and legislative risks. Funding-Liability risks had been reviewed and updated for PCB feedback, with other areas scheduled for future meetings. Risks had been scored on impact and likelihood, using a 1–5 scale and a Red-Amber-Green rating system. Directional indicators had shown whether risks were worsening, stable, or improving compared to previous assessments.

Key risks identified in the short to medium term had included:

- **LGPS pooling changes (INV9):** Officers, with advisors, had worked with LCIV to implement recommendations following MHCLG's consultation response.

- **Legislative and regulatory changes (AD7):** The 2025 valuation had been underway, requiring significant resources, with further changes expected from government consultations on benefit entitlements.
- **Financial market volatility (INV1):** Global tensions and inflation above target had sustained volatility. The Fund had maintained a diversified portfolio, with officers monitoring developments and consulting managers.
- **Adequacy of LCIV resources (INV5):** Increased workload from consultation outcomes had required LCIV to expand resources, with officers engaging through working groups and business planning.
- **ESG risk (INV3):** Pressure to review responsible investment policies had led to a draft policy being prepared, amended, and scheduled for PCB approval, with ongoing monitoring of stakeholder feedback.

Officers had confirmed that the Fund's risk register would remain under constant review.

- Councillors had asked whether there were any comments on IMV One and market volatility, including the perceived risks around the AI bubble. It had been explained that such risks would be managed under the rebalancing policy. Equities had still been viewed as attractive long-term assets, but allocations should not exceed target levels.
- By the end of September, the Fund had been around 7% overweight in equities, a position likely to have increased due to strong performance. The currency hedging position in the portfolio had also been noted. Overall, it had been considered a sensible approach to rebalance, secure profits, and reduce exposure to equities.

### **Recommendations:**

The Pensions Committee and Board:

3.1. Noted and provided any comments on the Fund's risk register. The area of focus for review at this meeting will be Funding-Liability Risks.

## **14. PENSION FUND QUARTERLY INVESTMENT AND PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

The report had provided the Pensions Committee and Board (PCB) with updates on the Pension Fund's performance for the quarter ending 30 September 2025. These updates had included an overview of fund performance and the funding position, investment manager performance, asset allocation, investments with the pool, the LAPFF engagement update, and the independent advisor's market commentary.

- Concerns had been raised that members were not always provided with the right kind of information to view performance in proper context.

Arbitrary dates had not been considered helpful, given the complexity of the business. Instead, custom benchmarks had been used to measure asset allocation, showing whether managers were delivering within their respective sectors. Flaws in reporting had been acknowledged, and it had been agreed these needed to be addressed to properly assess sector performance.

- It had been noted that overall asset allocation was not questioned, but comparisons over different periods illustrated the impact of allocation choices. For example, over three years, the benchmark had shown a 10.4% return, while an all-equity allocation would have produced 16.2% and an all-bond allocation –2%. The point had been made that the environment in which the Fund operated needed to be considered, so performance could be understood in context, identifying diversification and delivery across exposures.
- This issue had first been raised years earlier, leading to the establishment of the Investment Working Group, though progress on developing a new reporting format had not been made. Work with Tim on producing a different format had begun but not been completed, and it had been suggested that this should be revisited to provide clearer contextual reporting.
- Councillors had also asked about the Fund's five-year return of 7.2%, specifically whether this had met the targets set five years earlier. Officers had responded that they would need to check records, noting the best comparison would be between the expected return from the last reviewed investment strategy and the actual experience, focusing on the aggregate picture.

### **Recommendations:**

The Pensions Committee and Board:

3.1. Noted the information provided in section 6 of this report regarding the Fund's investment performance and activity for the quarter ended 30 September 2025.

## **15. Haringey Pension Fund Draft Annual Report 2024/25**

The report had presented the Haringey Pension Fund Annual Report and unaudited accounts for 2024/25 to the Pensions Committee and Board for

approval, subject to the successful completion of the external audit. The outcome of the external audit had been scheduled for presentation to the PCB in January 2026.

According to the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Regulations 2013, LGPS funds had been required to produce an annual report each year. The report had served as a key means of communication between the pension fund and its stakeholders and had to be published by 1 December following the end of the financial year.

- It had been assumed that the report was only available online for members and not issued in hard copy. Concerns had been raised about accessibility, particularly text size, and whether checks had been carried out to meet standards for people with impaired vision. Officers had confirmed the report was uploaded to the pension fund website, with no hard copies produced, and agreed to review the accessibility of the online version.
- Questions had also been raised about management expenses, with confirmation given that all investment and administration fees were included in Table 11, with a breakdown of investment management expenses in Table 11A. A suggestion had been made to present costs as a proportion (e.g., per £1 million) to give members clearer context, which was considered potentially useful but not standard practice. Officers had explained that while administration costs per member were shown, investment and management fees were not typically presented in this way.
- It had been noted that the accounts followed strict guidance and standard formats, limiting flexibility. However, officers agreed to consider whether proportional cost information could be added in future reports, possibly within the narrative sections rather than the formal tables. Clarification had also been provided that the cost per member figure referred only to administration costs, including staff, software, and other ad hoc expenses.

## **Recommendations**

The Pensions Committee and Board:

3.1. Noted and approved the draft Haringey Pension Fund Annual Report for 2024/25 appended as Appendix 1 to this report.

3.2. Approved the upload of the Haringey Pension Fund Annual Report to the Haringey Pension Fund's website.

## **16. FORWARD PLAN**



The purpose of the paper had been to identify topics expected to come before the Committee and Board over the following twelve months and to seek members' input into future agendas. It had also requested suggestions for future training.

The PCB had reviewed key priorities for the next 9–12 months, including the Responsible Investment Policy, asset transition to the pool, and the Pension Fund Business Plan. Members had been encouraged to complete training via LOLA, and attendance at the LAPFF conference had been confirmed. The Responsible Investment Policy had been deferred to January, and progress on priorities and governance review implementation had been noted.

### **Recommendations**

The Pensions Committee and Board:

3.1. Noted and provided any comments on the progress made towards the agreed key priorities outlined in Table 1 of this report, specifically in regarding the responsible investment policy development and implementation of the fund governance review recommendations.

3.2. Identified additional matters and training requirements for inclusion within the Pensions Committee and Board's forward plan.

## **17. HARINGEY PENSION FUND ACTUARIAL VALUATION 2025**

The report had provided the Pensions Committee and Board (PCB) with information on the 2025 actuarial valuation exercise, which had been underway and scheduled to recur at several upcoming PCB meetings. It had also included initial advice on assumptions from the Fund's actuary, Hymans Robertson, the preliminary valuation results for the entire fund, an overview of the Funding Strategy Statement review, and a general update on progress to date.

### **Recommendations**

The Pensions Committee and Board:

3.1. Noted Hymans Robertson's Advice on Assumptions paper, appended as Confidential Appendix 1, and the advice contained therein.

3.2. Agreed the methodology and valuation assumptions proposed by the Pension Fund's actuary, Hymans Robertson as outlined in Confidential Appendix 1 to this report.

3.3. Noted Haringey Pension Fund's draft Actuarial Valuation Results paper, prepared by the Pension Fund's Actuary, Hymans Robertson and appended as Confidential Appendix 2, and the advice contained therein.

3.4. Noted Asset Liability Management paper appended as Confidential Appendix 3 to this report.

3.5. Noted the overview of the draft Funding Strategy Statement, appended as Confidential Appendix 4 to this report.

## **20. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Items 21-27 was subject to a motion that excluded the press and public from the meeting as they contain exempt information as defined in Section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended by Section 12A of the Local Government Act 1985); para 3 – namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and para 5 – information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.