

# MINUTES OF ADMINISTRATORS FORUM 01/05/08

## Present:

Lorraine Brodie (LB) – Argyll & Bute Council  
 Angela Gilchrist (AGC) – Argyll & Bute Council  
 John Sheridan (JS) - East Ayrshire Council  
 Donna Dewhurst (DD) - East Ayrshire Council  
 Cameron Rawle (CR) - East Dunbartonshire Council  
 Pauline Cameron (PC) - East Renfrewshire Council  
 Anne Bryan (AB) - East Renfrewshire Council  
 Eleanor McAlpine (EMC) - Inverclyde Council  
 Paul Doak (PD) - North Ayrshire Council  
 Jim Morton (JM) - North Ayrshire Council  
 Wallace Turpie (WT) - North Ayrshire Council  
 Stephen McAnaw (SM) - North Lanarkshire Council  
 Eida Wheeler (EW) - North Lanarkshire Council  
 Catherine Young (CY) - Renfrewshire Council  
 Tricia McPhail (TMC) – Renfrewshire Council  
 Mel McConnell (MM) - South Ayrshire Council  
 Brian Milligan (BM) – South Ayrshire Council  
 Bill Graham (BG) - South Lanarkshire Council  
 Vicki Aitken (VA) - South Lanarkshire Council  
 Maureen McAllister (MMC) - South Lanarkshire Council  
 Iain Shaw (IS)- Strathclyde Fire & Rescue  
 Sharon McKechnie (SMK) - SPFO  
 Alistair Gray (AG) - SPFO  
 Marie Hunter (MH) – Strathclyde Police  
 Linda Murray (LM) – Strathclyde Police  
 Louise Donnelly (LD) – West Dunbartonshire Council  
 Cathy Douglas (CD) – SPFO  
 Andy Knox (AK) –SPFO  
 Juan C Fernandez (JCF) – SPFO  
 Nicola Smith (NS) – SPFO  
 Doreen Shannon (DS) - SPFO

## Apologies:

Aileen McCosh – Argyll & Bute Council  
 Vincent Gardner - West Dunbartonshire Council

ITEM	CONTENT	ACTION BY
<b>1.</b> <b>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING</b>	No issues.  <b>ACTION POINTS</b> SMK thanked everyone for the quick response to the request for starters and leavers data. Also thanked East Renfrewshire for	

	<p>submitting their year-end posting information ahead of schedule. Request for a software specification was brought up at SPLG meeting on 29/2/08. SMK will raise this again at next SPLG meeting. SMK commented that the SPLG sub-group had held their first meeting. The request for a volunteer from payroll to attend to give technical advice on tiered contributions had met with no success. All attendees had returned details of software suppliers. Only 4 main suppliers.</p>	<b>SMK</b>
<b>2. YEAR-END DATA</b>	<p>MH asked JCF if year-end data requirements contained anything which was outwith Heywood standard spec as her Cyborg system would not be able to provide any additional information. JCF assured her there had been no requests which were not in the Heywood specifications.</p>	
<b>3. LEAVERS DATA</b>	<p>SMK gave a brief resume of the information received and cases outstanding. Data team have cleansed 4532 cases which equates to 69% of the cases for which information was received. NS explained that, although Data staff had estimated service and salaries wherever possible, there were cases where contributions were too erratic to estimate service. Also where there had been a massive increase or decrease in salary or breaks in service Data team will need further information in order to process a leavers calculation. A list of these queries will be sent to each employer. BG asked for timescale for receipt of these queries. SMK advised that it was not possible to give a date at present. SMK asked attendees to give thought to the problem of multiple employments. This matter will be dealt with in more detail after the year-end posting is complete.</p>	
<b>4. STARTERS DATA</b>	<p>SMK outlined the project plan which was to complete leavers details and correct valuation errors. Starters will be dealt with as soon as possible. The target for leavers was 50% cleansing which has been exceeded. SMK confident that we will attain 50% cleansing for starters also.</p>	
<b>5. VALUATION PROJECT</b>	<p>SMK gave brief resume of valuation project document. Red alerts and final validation queries (especially those which arise as a result of year-end) are being prioritised. Excellent progress had been made on red alerts by Data team, with 10342 cases having been investigated. There were 18 red alerts totalling 15084 member queries. Data team have cleared 15 red alerts and have 7762 cases left to cleanse from the 3 remaining. SMK drew attention to the timescales involved and to the Communication Plan contained in document. Stressed the importance of employers' involvement</p>	

<p><b>6. MULTIPLE POSTS</b></p>	<p>SMK suggested that new scheme could be used as a driver to solve the problems. As only 4 key software suppliers provided systems for all of the councils (Cyborg, Northgate, Oracle and Frontier) SMK suggested arranging a meeting with a representative from each company to discuss possible solutions to multiple posts and also new scheme issues.</p> <p>Inverclyde will inform SMK when they make a decision on which company they choose.</p> <p>MH said her Cyborg contact would be happy to meet. CY stated Northgate also wish to meet. The group agreed that this would be a good approach.</p>	<p><b>EMC</b></p>
<p><b>7. TIERED CONTRIBUT- IONS</b></p>	<p>AK stated that, in the absence of a volunteer from any local authority, GCC had agreed to look at papers produced by SPLG regarding tiered conts.</p> <p>SPPA had been asked to provide a software specification or, at the very least, an outline of one. For legal reasons, Scottish Ministers would provide guidance.</p> <p>AK informed attendees that comments on the consultation document were on the SPFO website.</p> <p>Tiered contribution look-up table and summary of SPLG sub group meeting were handed out and discussed.</p> <p>Pensionable pay would be determined at 31 March each year and rate set at this time for following year. BG commented that, for weekly payrolls, this timescale was very tight.</p> <p>Contribution table could be used to determine rate. Alternatively there was an excel spreadsheet which could be used. AK can provide copies to anyone requiring this.</p> <p>AK talked through summary points: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part-time emoluments to be left at actual rate- not grossed up.</li> <li>• Part-time employees – full-time salary to be used to determine % rate.</li> <li>• Retrospective pay awards to be ignored when calculating pensionable pay but it may be necessary to take these into account if the pay award spans previous tax years.</li> <li>• Multiple employments must be identified and each employment treated in isolation.</li> <li>• No requirement for annual member notification of % rate – payslip will suffice.</li> <li>• 5% preservation rate will be abolished</li> </ul> <p>BG queried the definition of multiple employments in Local Government Regulations. AK referred BG to regulations 8 and 15 of the draft administration regulations which deals with separate and concurrent employment.</p> <p>BG queried the fact that retrospective pay awards were not to be used when calculating pensionable pay. MH also stated that this seemed to be contrary to definition of pensionable pay. AK to clarify with SPPA.</p> <p>IS commented that such queries should have been solved earlier</p>	<p><b>AK</b></p>

	<p>than 9 months prior to going live. AK stated that it was for this reason that having a payroll practitioner at the SPLG sub-group would have been helpful.</p> <p>SMK stated that it was important that members were informed as soon as possible of the contribution rate changes. Any articles/reports which SPFO develop for SSC will be passed to all other employers.</p> <p>MH deals with seven pension schemes and advised that SPLG should aim for consistency when discussing optional methods of processing. Also commented on how complex the Scottish tiered system was in comparison to England and Wales. 57 different employee rates also meant that there would be 57 different employer rates. MH asked how SPFO would reconcile pensionable pay to contributions. AK stated SPFO would possibly need more information to be provided on year-end specification.</p> <p>SMK asked employers to provide feedback within 2 weeks in order that it can be discussed at next Liaison Group meeting. AK stated that there were already enough issues to justify another meeting of the SPLG sub-group and would be proposing this at the next SPLG meeting. AK asked again for an employer to attend if such a meeting takes place.</p>	
<p><b>8. TECHNICAL BULLETINS</b></p>	<p>SMK stated that technical bulletins will be a standing agenda item as it was expected there will be many in the coming months.</p> <p><b>STRAIN COSTS</b></p> <p>JM asked whether employers would have the opportunity to express their views on the strain costs for over 60's. AK explained that Strathclyde is the only authority which didn't charge these costs and Actuary may insist. If so, we must comply. Decision will not be known until April 09. VA commented that SLC retrial age was 70. Would maximum age for costing purposes be 65? AK explained that strain costs are dependant on whether there would have been an actuarial reduction had the member not retired on redundancy or efficiency grounds. If the employer agrees to waive the reduction in other circumstances, a strain cost will also apply. VA also requested that employers be permitted to consult on this change as would have a cost impact for flexible retirement cases. SMK to speak to Richard McIndoe.</p>	<p><b>SMK</b></p>
<p><b>9. AOCB</b></p>	<p>SM asked if any other councils apart from SLC use flexible retiral policy. EAC are developing the policy. They have received several enquiries from employees.</p>	
<p><b>10. NEXT MEETING</b></p>	<p>MM suggested waiting until regulations are received. Next meeting possibly end of June.</p> <p>HR representatives all felt it had been useful to attend the meeting despite the emphasis on payroll developments.</p>	