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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Index Value</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>A first class and robust retirement income system that delivers good benefits, is sustainable and has a high level of integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>75–80</td>
<td>Denmark, Netherlands, Australia</td>
<td>A system that has a sound structure, with many good features, but has some areas for improvement that differentiates it from an A-grade system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>65–75</td>
<td>Norway, Finland, Sweden, Singapore, Switzerland, New Zealand, Chile, Canada, Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>60–65</td>
<td>Germany, Colombia, UK</td>
<td>A system that has some good features, but also has major risks and/or shortcomings that should be addressed. Without these improvements, its efficacy and/or long-term sustainability can be questioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>50–60</td>
<td>France, USA, Malaysia, Poland, Brazil, Austria, Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ten key policy recommendations

1. Increase public funding for social care by more than £2 billion from reformed taxation of property. There should also be an increase in property-based contributions towards care costs, but with strict limits so that no-one pays more than a quarter of their wealth towards their own care.

2. Introduce a £2 billion ‘NHSG levy’ via National Insurance on the earnings of those above State Pension age and limited National Insurance on occupational pension income.

3. Boost employment security via the right to a regular contract for those doing regular hours on a zero-hours contract, extended statutory rights for the self-employed, and minimum notice periods for shift work.

4. Introduce a £1 billion ‘Better Jobs Deal’ that offers practical support and funding for younger workers most affected by the financial crisis to take up opportunities to move jobs or train to progress, and £1.5 billion to tackle persistent under-funding of technical education routes. Both should be funded by cancelling the proposed corporation tax cuts.

5. Make indeterminate tenancies the sole form of private rental contract, with light-touch rent stabilisation limiting rent increases to inflation for three-year periods and disputes settled by a new housing tribunal.

6. Replace council tax with a progressive property tax with surcharges on second and empty properties; halve stamp duty rates to encourage moving; and offer a time-limited capital gains tax cut to incentivise owners of additional properties to sell to first-time buyers.

7. Pilot community land trusts so local authorities can bring more land forward for house building, underpinned by stronger compulsory purchase powers and introduce a £12 billion building precept allowing local authorities to raise funds for house building in their area.

8. Require firms contracting for self-employed labour to make pension contributions; lower the earnings threshold above which employees get auto-enrolled; and provide greater incentives to save among low- and middle-earners by flattening the rate of pensions tax relief and exempting employee pension contributions from National Insurance.

9. Develop a legislative framework for new ‘collective defined contribution’ pensions that better share risk and reform pension freedoms to include the default option of a guaranteed income product purchased at the age of 80.

10. Abolish inheritance tax and replace it with a lifetime receipts tax that is levied on recipients with fewer exemptions, a lower tax-free allowance and lower tax rates. Use the extra revenue to introduce a £20,000 ‘citizen’s inheritance’ – a restricted-use asset endowment to all young adults to support skills, entrepreneurship, housing and pension saving.
Earnings progress has stalled for young adults today. Millennials are earning the same as those born 15 years before them were at the same age.

Millennial families are only half as likely to own their home by age 30 as baby boomers were by the same age, and are four times more likely to rent privately.

Future pensioners are exposed to retirement income risks that current retirees are largely protected from around investment returns, longevity and price shocks. A 1 percentage point decline in investment returns would reduce retirement incomes for millennial men born in the mid 1980s by 8 per cent.

Household wealth has grown rapidly throughout the 21st century, but despite this no cohorts born since 1960 are accumulating more wealth than their predecessors.
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Royal Mail and CWU agree to introduce UK's first CDC scheme

House of Commons
Work and Pensions Committee

Collective defined contribution pensions

stage of their working life. We recommend the Government consult on achieving fair intergenerational risk sharing through CDC scheme design, learning from the experience in the Netherlands. This should be part of a wider consultation on benefit adjustment and risk sharing policies in CDC schemes.
Automatic Enrolment Review 2017: Maintaining the Momentum
Pensions dashboard – does it have a future?
Too ambitious? Insufficient commitment? Or just a waste of money?

Scapping ‘pensions dashboard’ could cost savers millions

Government denies providers to blame for dashboard delays

Why is the pensions dashboard still stuck on the blocks?

"Lights out for pensions dashboard?"

"Pensions dashboard belongs in cloud cuckoo land"
“That said, the department and government have been doing a feasibility study, they are then reviewing that, and a decision will be made . . . long and short of it is, you’ll understand that this is a matter on which the government has to make a decision. No decision has been made.”
Can we help consumers avoid running out of money in retirement?

Policy briefing

Key findings

1. What are the most important factors to consider in order to minimise the risk of consumers' pensions running out during retirement?
   Consumers must balance the amount of income they withdraw against how long they might live to avoid running out of money.
We recommend the Government takes forward FCA proposals to introduce default decumulation pathways. Any provider offering drawdown would be required by FCA rules to offer a default solution that is targeted at their core customer group. The
Limitations

Why haven’t TPR “done better”?

142. The Pensions Regulator’s feeble response to the underfunding of Carillion’s pension schemes was a threat to impose a contribution schedule, a power it had never—and has still never—used. The Regulator congratulated itself on a final agreement which was exactly what the company asked for the first few years and only incorporated a small uptick in recovery plan contributions after the next negotiation was due. In reality, this intervention only served to highlight to both sides quite how unequal the contest would continue to be.

143. The Pensions Regulator failed in all its objectives regarding the Carillion pension scheme. Scheme members will receive reduced pensions. The Pension Protection Fund and its levy payers will pick up their biggest bill ever. Any growth in the company that resulted from scrimping on pension contributions can hardly be described as sustainable. Carillion was run so irresponsibly that its pension schemes may well have ended up in the PPF regardless, but the Regulator should not be spared blame for allowing years of underfunding by the company. Carillion collapsed with net pension liabilities of around £2.6 billion and little prospect of anything being salvaged from the wreckage to offset them. Without any sense of irony, the Regulator chose this moment to launch an investigation to see if Carillion should contribute more money to its schemes. No action now by TPR will in any way protect pensioners from being consigned to the PPF.
The Pensions Regulator – statutory objectives

Sustainable growth objective added in 2014

The Pensions Regulator

The Government will provide The Pensions Regulator with a new objective to support scheme funding arrangements that are compatible with sustainable growth for the sponsoring employer and fully consistent with the 2004 funding legislation. The precise wording of this new objective will be set-out in legislation that the Department for Work and Pensions will publish later this spring.

The Pensions Regulator is the regulator of work-based pension schemes in the UK. We have objectives to: protect members’ benefits; reduce the risk of calls on the Pension Protection Fund (PPF); to promote, and to improve understanding of, the good administration of work-based pension schemes; and to maximise employer compliance with automatic enrolment duties.
Wide-ranging powers
But rarely used

Pensions Act 2004

CHAPTER 35

231 Powers of the Regulator

In any of those circumstances the Regulator may by order exercise all or any of the following powers—

(a) it may modify the scheme as regards the future accrual of benefits;

(b) it may give directions as to—

(i) the manner in which the scheme’s technical provisions are to be calculated, including the methods and assumptions to be used in calculating the scheme’s technical provisions, or

(ii) the period within which, and manner in which, any failure to meet the statutory funding objective is to be remedied;

(c) it may impose a schedule of contributions specifying—

(i) the rates of contributions payable towards the scheme by or on behalf of the employer and the active members of the scheme, and

(ii) the dates on or before which such contributions are to be paid.
Approach to scheme funding regulation

Behaviour driven by objectives

- Understands closed schemes
- Prefers
  - Secure funding
  - shorter recovery periods
  - manageable investment risk
- Accepts
  - Contingency plans
  - guarantees
  - asset-backed contributions
Current concerns
Some prompted by BHS / Carillion

Fair treatment

- Growing disparity between dividends and DRCs
- Need robust negotiations to secure a fair deal
- Covenant leakage can happen in many forms
- Pension deficits are corporate liabilities

A strong covenant in itself is not a sufficient reason to accept a recovery plan with lower contributions than would otherwise be considered reasonable.

Where dividends are disproportionate relative to DRCs, we would consider affordability not to be an issue.

The Pensions Regulator

Source: The Pensions Regulator
INSOLVENCY AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Government response

consideration to ways in which directors could provide stronger reassurances for shareholders and stakeholders that proposed dividends will not undermine the affordability of any deficit reduction payments agreed with pension fund trustees. This will be looked at as part of the consideration of fuller disclosure of capital allocation decisions and the case for a review of the UK’s dividend regime.
Protecting workplace pensions

TPR Future – a review of the way we work

The Pensions Regulator

July 2017
Protecting Defined Benefit Pension Schemes

We will:

- Strengthen the Regulator’s ability to enforce Defined Benefit scheme funding standards, through a revised Code, focusing on:
  - how prudence is demonstrated when assessing scheme liabilities;
  - what factors are appropriate when considering recovery plans; and
  - ensuring a long-term view is considered when setting the statutory funding objective.

- Require the trustees of Defined Benefit pension schemes to appoint a Chair and for that Chair to report to the Regulator in the form of a Chair’s Statement submitted with the scheme’s triennial valuation.

DB chair’s statement

Commitment to TPR about the scheme

The Chair’s Statement is intended to drive improved accountability and to demonstrate collaborative decision-making between trustee and sponsoring employer. Trustees will be required to inform the Regulator about their approach to managing risks to the scheme, including information on how the trustee is meeting the clearer funding standards and how the SFO is being set in line with a long term funding objective. The Chair will also be required to reflect on and learn from past decision-making to ensure their plans are optimal. This will also enable the Regulator to get better information to assess risk, and to provide appropriate support or take enforcement action if necessary.

Source: DB White paper
A stronger Pensions Regulator?
Consultation on enhanced regulator powers
Finance Act 2004

At a cost of £165 million by 2008, I will replace the eight existing tax schemes for pensions with a single lifetime allowance. I will set the allowance at £1.5 million for the first year of the scheme, from April 2006, and will set the allowance now for the years until 2010 when the figure will be £1.8 million.¹
Pension freedoms lead to more transfers

Change in transfer activity since 2014

Annualised quotation rate per 1,000 deferred members

https://insight.lcp.uk.com/acton/attachment/20628/f-0718/1/-/-/-/-/Transfer%20Analysis%20Q2%202018.pdf
A hot topic

Carillion

Final Salary Pensions | True Potential

Online Calculator
Use Our Online Calculator To Get A Final Salary Valuation Estimate

Real Life Examples
Testimony From Our Customers And How Transferring Benefited Them

Why now is the time to cash in your final salary pension

The Telegraph

There Has Been No Better Time | Transfer Your Defined Benefit
Figure 8: Steps schemes are taking to help members considering transferring out of the scheme

- Reviewing member communications about their options at retirement: 42% in place, 25% planned, 18% considering, 14% neither planned nor considering.
- Putting transfer values on benefit statements: 15% in place, 10% planned, 36% considering, 39% neither planned nor considering.
- Appointing independent financial advisors: 14% in place, 8% planned, 26% considering, 52% neither planned nor considering.
- Putting transfer values (and retirement quotations) online: 10% in place, 10% planned, 24% considering, 56% neither planned nor considering.
(1) A firm must ensure that advice on pension transfers, pension conversions and pension opt-outs is given or checked by a pension transfer specialist.

(2) When a firm is making a personal recommendation for a retail client who is, or is eligible to be, a member of a pension scheme with safeguarded benefits and who is considering whether to transfer, convert or opt-out, a firm should start by assuming that a transfer, conversion or opt-out will not be suitable.

To prepare a comparison, a firm must:

(1) compare the benefits likely (on reasonable assumptions) to be paid under the ceding arrangement with the benefits afforded by the proposed arrangement;

(e) alternative ways to achieve the retail client’s objectives instead of the transfer, conversion or opt-out.
New FCA Rules from 1 October 2018 – including TVC

Table 1
This table belongs to COBS 19 Annex 5 1.1R.

You have been offered a cash equivalent transfer value of £120,000 in exchange for you giving up any future claims to a pension from the scheme.

Will I be better or worse off by transferring?

- We are required by the Financial Conduct Authority to provide an indication of what it might cost to replace your scheme benefits.
- We have done this by looking at the amount you might need to buy the same benefits from an insurer.

It could cost you £140,000 to obtain a comparable level of income from an insurer.

This means the same retirement income could cost you £20,000 more by transferring.
Improving the quality of pension transfer advice

Consultation Paper
CP18/7**

March 2018
Don’t let a scammer enjoy your retirement

Be ScamSmart:
Check who you’re dealing with
Consolidation

The Pension SuperFund
Stressed schemes and RPI/CPI

The greatest good for the greatest number

An examination of early intervention strategies for trustees and sponsoring employers of ‘stressed’ defined benefit schemes

A Pensions Institute discussion paper for DB trustees, sponsoring employers, advisors, policy-makers and regulators

Debbie Harrison
David Blake

December 2019

Lords Select Committee

New inquiry launched into use of RPI as a measure of inflation
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This generic presentation should not be relied upon for detailed advice or taken as an authoritative statement of the law. If you would like any assistance or further information, please contact the partner who normally advises you. While this document does not represent our advice, nevertheless it should not be passed to any third party without our formal written agreement.

Our experts work in pensions, investment, insurance, energy and employee benefits.

Join us at our next event
www.lcp.uk.com/events

Share our insights and opinions on our viewpoint
www.lcp.uk.com/our-viewpoint

Watch and listen to our comments on topical issues
Our YouTube channel

Connect with us for updates
@LCP_actuaries
LinkedIn
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