

Report for:	Corporate Comr 23 rd January 201		Item number	
Title:	Pension Fund q	uarterly	update	
Report authorised by :	Director of Corp		esources	2
Lead Officer:	Nicola Webb, Henicola.webb@ha			sury & Pensions
Ward(s) affected: N/A		Report	f or Non Key	Decision

- 1. Describe the issue under consideration
- 1.1 To report the following in respect of the quarter to 30th September 2011:
 - Investment asset allocation
 - Investment performance
 - Responsible investment activity
 - Budget management
 - Late payment of contributions
- 2. Cabinet Member Introduction
- 2.1 Not applicable.
- 3. Recommendations
- 3.1 That the information provided in respect of the activity in the quarter to 30th September 2011 is noted.
- 4. Other options considered
- 4.1 None.



5. Background information

- 5.1 This report is produced on a quarterly basis to update the Committee on a number of Pension Fund issues. The Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations require the Committee to review investment performance on a quarterly basis and sections 13 and 14 provide the information for this. Appendix 1 shows the targets which have been agreed with the fund managers.
- 5.2 The Pension Fund has a responsible investment policy and section 15 of this report monitors action taken in line with it. The remainder of the report covers various issues which the Committee or it's predecessor body have requested they receive regular updates on.

6. Comments of the Chief Financial Officer and Financial Implications

- 6.1 Volatility in the value of the Pension Fund's investments is to be expected due to the high proportion invested in equities. This volatility will not impact on the employer contribution rate payable, as the Fund Actuary takes a long term view of the Fund.
- 6.2 The Pension Fund budget monitoring shows an underspend at the mid point of the financial year due to a better level of investment income from dividends than anticipated at the beginning of the year.

7. Head of Legal Services and Legal Implications

- 7.1 The Council as administering authority for the Haringey Pension Fund has an obligation to keep the performance of its investment managers under review. In this respect the Council must, at least every three months review the investments made by investment managers for the Fund and any other actions taken by them in relation to it;
- 7.2 Periodically the Council must consider whether or not to retain the investment manager;.
- 7.3 In carrying out its review proper advice must be obtained about the variety of investments that have been made and the suitability and types of investment;.
- 7.4 All monies must be invested in accordance with the Council's investment policy;
- 7.5 Members of the Committee should keep this duty in mind when considering this report and have regard to advice given to them.



- 8. Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments
- 8.1 There are no equalities issues arising from this report.
- 9. Head of Procurement Comments
- 9.1 Not applicable
- 10. Policy Implications
- 10.1 None.
- 11. Use of Appendices
- 11.1 Appendix 1: Benchmark and Target information
- 12. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
- 12.1 Northern Trust performance monitoring reports Fund Managers' Quarterly investment reports Local Authority Pension Fund Forum bulletins



13. Investment Update

13.1 Fund Holdings at 30th September 2011

	Market £0	1	% of Fund
UK Equities		165,425	24.8%
held in individual shares	27,948		
held in pooled funds	137,477		
Overseas Equities		246,900	37.0%
held in individual shares	80,630		
held in pooled funds	166,270		
Index linked Gilts		113,509	17.0%
held in individual shares	49,687		:
held in pooled funds	63,822		
Corporate Bonds		26,830	4.0%
held in pooled funds	26,830		
Property	51,357		7.7%
Private Equity	28,246		4.2%
Cash		35,233	5.3%
held by Fund Managers	5,933		
held in-house	29,300		
TOTAL		667,500	100.0%

13.2 The value of the fund fell by approximately £60m during the quarter to 30th September 2011 as the markets reacted to issues in the Eurozone. By the end of November 2011 the value had recovered approximately £40m of this.

14. Investment Performance Update: to 30th September 2011

Appendix 1 provides details of the benchmarks and targets the fund managers have been set.

14.1 Whole Fund

	Return	Benchmark	Target	(Under)/Out
Quarter	-9.10	-8.65	-8.24	(0.86)
Year	-0.96	-0.32	1.32	(2.28)
Since 01/04/07	0.13	1.99	3.63	(3.50)

- Total Value at 30/09/11: £667.5m
- As the reduction in market value in section 13 shows, returns in the quarter were negative in absolute terms. Poor relative returns from most of the Fund's portfolios resulted in an overall underperformance in the quarter. A positive



Haringey (

return from the private equity portfolio partly offset the underperformance in the other portfolios.

14.2 Fidelity Equities

	Return	Benchmark	Target	(Under)/Out
Quarter	-15.50	-14.76	-14.33	(1.17)
Year	-5.34	-4.90	-3.20	(2.14)
Since 01/04/07	0.21	0.60	2.30	(2.09)

- Total Value at 30/09/11: £130.2m
- Underperformance in North America and Europe in particular was the reason for the overall underperformance in this portfolio.

14.3 Fidelity Bonds

	Return	Benchmark	Target	(Under)/Out
Quarter	5.01	7.02	7.17	(2.16)
Year	7.96	8.54	9.14	(1.18)
Since 01/04/07	8.77	7.72	8.32	0.45

- Total Value at 30/09/11: £90.6m
- 70% of this portfolio is held in index linked gilts and the remainder in corporate bonds. The underperformance this quarter was across both asset classes and has been significant enough to result in underperformance in the year, despite the previous two quarters of outperformance.

14.4 Capital Equities

	Return	Benchmark	Target	(Under)/Out
Quarter	-15.03	-15.12	-14.62	(0.41)
Year	-6.42	-5.23	-3.23	(3.19)
Since 01/04/07	-0.37	0.69	2.69	(3.06)

- Total Value at 30/09/11: £129.0m
- The most significant contributor to the underperformance in this portfolio was in Japanese equities.

14.5 Capital Bonds

	Return	Benchmark	Target	(Under)/Out
Quarter	7.66	7.76	8.01	(0.35)
Year	10.77	11.14	12.14	(1.37)
Since 01/04/07	7.29	7.88	8.88	(1.59)

- Total Value at 30/09/11: £49.8m
- 100% of this portfolio is now held in index linked gilts and therefore the underperformance in the quarter is attributed to stock selection.



14.6 Legal & General Equities

	Quarter	Year	Since Inception
UK Fund	-13.46	-4.25	12.07
World Fund	-14.73	-4.03	11.56

- Total Value at 30/09/11: £158.6m
- Variation from benchmark limited to 0.03% in the quarter.

14.7 ING Real Estate – CBRE Global Investors from 1st October 2011

	Return	Benchmark	Target	(Under)/Out
Quarter	-1.03	1.70	1.95	(2.98)
Year	4.92	7.50	8.50	(3.58)
Since 01/04/07	-5.70	-4.41	-3.41	(2.29)

- Total Value at 30/09/11: £51.7m
- The European element of the portfolio has again resulted in an overall underperformance against target, despite the UK element outperforming the target.
- The sale of the ING Real Estate team to CBRE Global Investors concluded on 1st October 2011. Representatives of CBRE have met with the Assistant Director of Finance and other officers to discuss what the impact will be on the portfolio. The new team have confirmed that they are happy with the majority of the current portfolio and there are only a limited number of changes they will make when possible.

14.8 Pantheon

	Return	Distributions in period	Drawdowns in period	% drawndown
Quarter	0.46	£0.55m	£1.62m	
Year	9.11	£0.55m	£5.87m	
Since inception	1.86	£0.55m	£24.24m	49

- Total Value at 30/09/11: £28.3m
- The first distribution from the private equity portfolio was received from the US fund during the quarter.

14.9 In house cash

	Value	Average	Average	Return
		Credit Rating	Maturity (days)	
At 30/09/11	£29.3m	AA	6	0.72%
At 30/06/11	£59.0m	AA	58	0.78%
At 31/03/11	£61.4m	AA -	76	0.74%
At 31/12/10	£62.2m	AA	90	0.75%



Haringey

15. Responsible Investment Activity in quarter ended 30th September 2011

Fidelity	Capital International	Legal & General	LAPFF
15.1 Environmental Issues			
Fidelity have been having	Capital International met with Oil	As part of Legal & General's	LAPFF updated its best
discussions with an Australian oil &	Search, an energy company with	ongoing dialogue with Vedanta	practice framework for
gas company, Santos Ltd., about	significant operations in Papua	Resources on environmental	ranking airlines in terms of
the impact Liquified Natural Gas	New Guinea. The operations are	and social issues facing their	their climate change
projects are having on the	spread throughout the country	operations in India, they met	strategy. British Airways
environment, in terms of the water	and so the company has built	with the CEO and Chief	was at the top of this but
table, the ability to grow crops on	extensive road networks. Capital	Sustainability Officer. Greater	beria who they have now
the land and on the communities	were pleased to see this has	transparency and harmonisation	merged with was a
living in the areas. Fidelity have	been done in conjunction with	of policies surrounding water	"laggard". LAPFF
been encouraged by the dialogue	the local people, many of whom	management, Health & Safety,	representatives met with
the company is having with local	now work for Oil Search and the	biodiversity, local and	the new International
farmers.	company have also built a	resettlement management,	Airlines Group to discuss
	community school and given	waste management and	how they plan implement
	financial support to the local	grievance mechanisms were	good practice across the
	hospital.	requested. The company	group.
		highlighted to Legal & General	
		that there will be an immediate	1
		alignment of Environmental	
		Impact Assessments to	- 1
	-	international standards.	



Fidelity	Capital International	Legal & General	LAPFF
15.2 Governance / Remuneration Issues	sens		
Fidelity met with Tesco	At the Cable & Wireless AGM	Legal & General voted against a	Dialogue has continued with
management in advance of their	Capital was joined by 40% of	motion at the First Group plc	News Corp over its poor
AGM to discuss their plans for their	shareholders in voting against	AGM to pay a retention award	governance arrangements.
senior executive remuneration	the company's proposed long	to the new CEO. In total 38%	News Corp has been on the
policy, in particular the performance	term incentive plan	of shareholders voted against	LAPFF's focus list of
measures being used for the long	questioning the generosity of	this motion. Since then Legal &	companies to prioritise
term incentive plan. The policy	it. Despite this level of	General have been engaging	engagement with since
subsequently proposed at the AGM	opposition, the company went	with the company and they	2010. LAPFF
was in line with best practice and	ahead. Since then Capital has	have now agreed that non-	representatives have had a
was approved at the meeting.	been engaging with the	executives and the CEO receive	number of calls and
	company to discuss best	part of their pay in the form of	meetings with News Corp in
	practice in remuneration	shares, which more closely	the light of the phone
	policies.	aligns them with shareholder	hacking scandal. At the
		interests.	recent AGM 75% of
			independent shareholders
			voted against the re-
			election of Rupert Murdoch
			as combined chairman and
			CEO, however due to the
			number of shares held by
			family members, he was re-
			elected. Engagement will
			continue.



Fidelity	Capital International	Legal & General	LAPFF
15.3 Other Engagement activity			
Fidelity have been examining the	Since 2010 it has been a	Legal & General opposed the	The LAPFF met with
Impact of the German government's	requirement for voting results in	remuneration policy at Thomas	Greags, the bakery
decision to phase out the country's	AGMs in Japan to be disclosed.	Cook's AGM and had concerns	company, to discuss with
nuclear reactors on energy	Capital are seeing more pressure	about poor performance.	them how they
companies directly impacted. In	being brought to bear on	Following this they met with the	incorporate public
addition to examining the impact on	companies by shareholders as a	Board Chair to discuss the	nutrition concerns into
energy companies directly affected,	result of this. A particular	issues. The following day the	their business strategy.
Fidelity have also been considering	example is Keyence, an	company announced that the	The company provided
the impact on companies who's	electronics company, which has	CEO would be stepping down	information about how
operations will be significantly	been paying very low dividends	and a full review of operations	they are working behind
impacted by increases in energy	to shareholders in spite of a	would be undertaken.	the scenes to reduce the
prices which are likely to arise as a	strong balance sheet and free		fat and salt content of
result.	cashflow. At the last AGM, 43%		their products. They have
	of shareholders voted against the		adopted this subtle
	low dividend rate and this action		approach as they find that
	has assisted Capital in		direct labelling alienates
	progressing engagement with the		their customers.
	company.	the control of the co	



16. Budget Management - position at 30th September 2011

	Budget	Actual	Variance	
· ·	Budget £000	£000		
	5000			
Contributions & Benefit related expenditure				
Income				
Employee Contributions	4,125	3,847	278	
Employer Contributions	14,792	14,995	(203)	
Transfer Values in	2,600	3,137	(537)	
Total Income	21,517	21,979	(462)	
Expenditure				
Pensions & Benefits	(22,650)	(24,094)	1,444	
Transfer Values paid	(2,000)	(2,422)	422	
Administrative Expenses	(375)	(249)	(126)	
Total Expenditure	(25,025)	(26,765)	1,740	
Net of contributions & benefits	(3,508)	(4,786)	1,278	
Returns on investment				
Net Investment Income	5,800	7,975	(2,175)	
Investment Management Expenses	(1,500)	(1,527)	27	
Net Return on investment	4,300	6,448	(2,148)	
			31	
Total	792	1,662	(870)	

• The key reason for the underspend at the mid point of the financial year is a better than anticipated level of investment income.

17. Late Payment of Contributions

17.1 The table below shows the employer who paid contributions relating to July to September 2011 late.

	Occasions	Average	Average monthly
	late	Number of	contributions
		days late	
John Loughborough	2	31	£5,500

17.2 John Loughborough School paid their July and August contributions late due to the school being closed over the summer, but contributions in the following months were paid on time.



Appendix 1 – Benchmark and Target information

Whole Fund Benchmark

Asset Class	Benchmark	Percentage
UK Equities	FTSE All Share Index	30.5
European Equities	FTSE All World Developed Europe ex UK index	10.5
North American Equities	FTSE All World North America index	12.6
Japanese Equities	FTSE All World Japan index	5.7
Pacific Equities	FTSE All World Developed Asia Pacific ex Japan index	2.6
Emerging Markets Equities	MSCI Emerging Markets Free Index	3.1
UK Gilts	FTSE Gilt Blended Index	7.0
Corporate Bonds	Merrill Lynch non gilt blended Index	7.0
Index Linked Gilts	FTSE Index linked (over 5 years)	6.0
Property	IPD Monthly Property Index	10.0
Private Equity	MSCI World GDR plus 500bps	5.0

Target: Benchmark plus 1.64% per annum

Fund Managers Benchmarks and targets

Manager	Mandate	Benchmark	Performance Target
Capital International	Global Equities	Customised see (a) below	+2.0% gross of fees p.a over a rolling 3 yr period
Capital International	Bonds	Customised see (b) below	+1.0% gross of fees p.a over a rolling 3 yr period
Fidelity International	Global Equities	Customised see (c) below	+1.7% gross of fees p.a over a rolling 3 yr period
Fidelity International	Bonds	Customised see (d) below	+0.6% gross of fees p.a over a rolling 3 yr period
Legal & General	UK Equities	FTSE All Share	Index (passively managed)
Legal & General	Global Equities	FTSE AW World Index	Index (passively managed)
CBRE Global Investors (previously ING Real Estate)	Property	IPD UK Pooled Property Funds All Balanced Index	+1% gross of fees p.a. over a rolling 5 yr period



(a) Capital International Global Equities

Asset Class	Benchmark	Percentage
UK	FTSE All Share	25
North America	FTSE AW Developed North America	25
Europe -Ex UK	FTSE AW Developed Europe (ex UK)	24
Japan	FTSE AW Developed Japan	13
Pacific(Ex Japan)	MSCI Pacific (ex Japan)	6
Emerging Markets	MSCI Emerging Markets	7

(b) Capital International Bonds

Since 1st June 2011:

Asset Class	Benchmark	Percentage
Index Linked	FTSE Index linked (over 5 years)	100

Previously:

Asset Class	Benchmark	Percentage
UK Gilts	FTSE All Stock over 15 year gilts	30
Corporate Bonds	Merrill Lynch Sterling non gilt all maturities	20
Index Linked	FTSE Index linked (over 5 years)	50

(c) Fidelity Global Equities

Asset Class	Benchmark	Percentage
UK	FTSE All Share Index	25.3
US	S&P 500	25.4
Europe –Ex UK	MSCI Europe ex UK Index	23.9
Japan	Topix Index	12.7
Pacific(Ex Japan)	MSCI Pacfic ex Japan index	6.0
Emerging Markets	MSCI Emerging Markets Index	6.7

(d) Fidelity Bonds

Since 1st June 2011:

Asset Class	Benchmark	Percentage
Corporate Bonds	Merrill Lynch Eurosterling over 10 year index	30
Index Linked	FTSE Index linked (over 5 years)	70

Previously:

Asset Class	Benchmark	Percentage
UK Gilts	FTSE All Stock over 15 year gilts	20
Corporate Bonds	Merrill Lynch Eurosterling over 10 year index	50
Index Linked	FTSE Index linked (over 5 years)	30