Costings

Client: Terry Edwards, LG Employers

Date 9 September 2011

Subject: Options raising 3.2% of payroll or £600m from the LGPS

1 Data

1.1.1 We have used national salary data to estimate the possible savings. We have assumed a £30bn payroll split as shown below.

	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current Rate	Actual Salary
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	£465,749,324
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	£903,561,303
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	£4,336,702,797
Band 4	£18,901	£31,500	6.5%	£12,996,837,271
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	£6,132,933,585
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	£4,433,984,527
Band 7	£78,701	plus	7.5%	£730,231,193
Total				£30,000,000,000

1.1.2 This is the best available national data we have and is available in summary form only.

1.1.3 We note that contribution bands have changed but the overall shape of the salary distribution is assumed to remain relevant for this exercise. Any further up to date data becoming available should be used to update the calculations.

1.2 Core element 1 - increasing normal retirement age

1.2.1 Increasing the retirement age for all by one year reduces the ongoing cost of the Scheme by about 1% to1.5% of payroll though this will vary by fund. We have assumed that GAD may value this on detailed national data on an average set of fund valuation assumptions and have assumed that 1% of payroll will be saved by adopting this change. This is equivalent to £300m per year on the data shown above.

1.3 Core element 2 - accrual or contribution rate changes

1.3.1 We have therefore considered how we can raise the further £600m being required by HM Treasury.

1.3.2 There are infinite combinations of contribution increases that will provide the £600m provided there are no opt outs, the data remains as estimated above and at this stage we are considering that 60ths accrual remains.

1.3.3 We have shown 3 examples below. These show the impact and make no allowance for any further options being proposed.

Table 1.3	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution	a) same increase	b) same uplift	c) steeper increase
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	2.1%	1.9%	1.5%
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%	1.5%
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%	2.0%
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%	2.5%
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	2.1%	2.2%	2.5%
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	2.1%	2.3%	2.5%
Band 7	£78,700	plus	7.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Total raised				£600m	£605m	£605m

1.3.4 We have assumed that lower paid protection level is set at £15,000 and members with salaries below this level will not be required to increase their contribution levels going forward.

1.3.5 As can be seen, all these options will provide for the required income target. However, there is a higher risk of opt out for higher contribution increases, especially at lower salary levels. We consider that steeper patterns than option c) will effect much higher levels of opt out at higher salary bands, with the possible cascade effect as members follow behaviour patterns of their senior managers or directors.

1.3.6 Option c) also meets the patterns required for other public sector schemes in that a 1.5% limit it set for those with salaries up to £21,000.

1.4 Core element 3 - reduce accrual option

1.4.1 This section shows the possible savings from providing a reduced accrual option.

1.4.2 These savings assume that all members opt for the reduced accrual option.

Table 1.4	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution rate	Reduce accrual (67ths)	Reduce accrual (68ths)	Reduce accrual (69ths)
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Band 7	£78,700	plus	7.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Total raised				£600m	£675m	£715m

1.4.3 The accrual reduction that provides for £600m will depend upon both how the GAD value the reduced accrual change of the benefits on national detailed data.

1.4.4 It will also depend upon where the lower paid protection limit gets set and the above assumes that this is set at £15,000.

1.5 Core element 3 – the lower paid

1.5.1 The model suggested allows for lower paid members to pay reduced contributions if they choose the lower accrual route. We have used 68th accrual in the following table and assumed that a reduction in contributions of say 60/68 times the current rate would be a fair level of reduction.

Table 1.5	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution rate	Reduce accrual (67ths)	Reduced contributions	Net effect
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	2.4%	0.6%	1.7%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	2.4%	0.7%	1.7%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%			
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%			
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%			
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%			
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%			
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%			
Band 7	£78,700	plus	7.5%			
Total raised				£32m	£10m	£22m

1.5.2 As can be seen above the saving will depend upon how much a reduction in contributions is offered to the lower paid members and how many of the lower paid opt for reducing accrual compared to the status quo.

1.5.3 However, we feel it remains equitable to offer this reduced cost option, setting the possible accrual level at the same level as the higher paid to provide the lower paid with a similar choice.

1.5.4 Any savings made from the above will depend on members choice so should not be included as certain in the total costs.

1.6 Core element 3 – the higher paid

1.6.1 The model suggested that higher paid members will retain their current 60th accrual by paying more into the scheme. However we recognise that this will not be attractive and perhaps unaffordable for some.

1.6.2 In this section therefore we have shown possible reduced accrual options that would provide these members with an alternative allowing their current contribution rates to remain.

1.6.3 We have shown three cases below corresponding to the tables of proposed contribution increase tariffs within section 1.4.

Table 1.6 a	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution rate	a) same increase	Reduce accrual (67ths)
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	2.1%	2.1%
Band 7	£78,700	plus	7.5%	2.1%	2.1%
Total raised				£600m	£600m

Table 1.6 b	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution rate	b) same proportionate increase	Reduce accrual (68ths)
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	1.9%	2.4%
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	2.2%	2.4%
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	2.3%	2.4%
Band 7	£78,700	plus	7.5%	2.4%	2.4%
Total raised				£605m	£675m

Table 1.6 c	Lower Band	Upper Band	Current contribution rate	c) steeper increase	Reduce accrual (69ths)
Band 1	£0	£12,600	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 2	£12,601	£14,700	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Band 3	£14,701	£18,900	5.9%	1.5%	2.5%
Band 4a	£18,901	£21,000	6.5%	1.5%	2.5%
Band 4b	£21,001	£24,000	6.5%	2.0%	2.5%
Band 4c	£24,001	£31,500	6.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Band 5	£31,501	£42,000	6.8%	2.5%	2.5%
Band 6	£42,001	£78,700	7.2%	2.5%	2.5%
Band 7	£78,700	plus	7.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Total raised				£605m	£715m

1.6.4 Of course there is no way of telling which way members will opt and most will need some help and financial advice to make the correct decision but the above shows that we can design a scheme which meets the required target.

1.6.5 As there is a risk of members selecting the option that does not raise sufficient income the accrual rate for a steeper contribution increase pattern than 1.3 c) will mean the accrual that can be offered as an option will become very unattractive.

1.7 Stepping any changes

1.7.1 We understand that stepping any changes over the three year period may be acceptable. Administratively no changes will be very straightforward but stepping changes to the contribution patterns will be possible whereas stepping the reduction in accrual will not be feasible.

1.7.2 A possible spread of increase in step of 20%/40%/40% will defer much of the change until the new scheme takes shape.

1.8 Summary

1.8.1 Therefore we have the following patterns or options.

- Steeper stepping patterns for contributions than we have considered in section 1.3 which incur very high opt out risk, especially at middle to high salary bands. We have rejected this option due to opt out risk at all levels that may cascade throughout the workforce in general.

- Contribution patterns considered like those in section 1.3, which also have the appeal of being more easily phased in over a three year period.

- Contribution patterns with a suitable accrual reduction depending upon the upper contribution bands to ensure the required savings are met. As accrual reduction cannot be phased in it would need to be accepted that this change would only be practical in say year 2014.

1.8.2 Due to administration simplicity and the ability to step the costs it seem that an option like 1.3 c) may be most favourable.

1.8.3 However if options and choice for members are consider a more key factor then 1.6 b) would appear to offer a good solution as the accrual reduction is minimised.

1.8.4 Alternatively, option 1.6 c) meets the contribution increase limits applying to other public sector funds, whereby the increases at lower salary bands are restricted. It also offers flexibility and choice for members, perhaps being an advantage outweighing the simplicity of 1.3c)

1.8.5 I trust this helps show possible saving patterns and the consequences of the options for the members.

1.8.6 I look forward discussing this with you in due course.

Regards

Alison Hamilton FFA

Partner, Barnett Waddingham LLP