

## Appendix 1 – Results from the effectiveness review of the Cambridgeshire Pension Committee and Investment Sub-Committee

**Key to rating:**     **1**     **totally disagree**  
                               **4**     **wholly agree**

Statement	Average rating	Additional comments
There is sufficient time allocated to agenda items to ensure sufficient discussion and informed decision making.	<b>3.6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally agree BUT meetings are carefully timed on agenda papers but sometimes discussion requires a variation (extension) which is not always possible if the Chairman is committed to finishing the meeting 'on time'. This may result in some items being hurried through.</li> </ul>
There are a sufficient number of meetings for the Pension Committee and Investment Sub-Committee?	<b>3.4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a generalisation there are sufficient meetings but greater flexibility should be built in so that additional meetings between scheduled quarterly meetings could be built in should the need arise. For example in 2015/16 with major reform (pooling of assets etc.) an additional meeting might have been very beneficial.</li> </ul>
Members of the Pension Committee and Investment Sub Committee are satisfied that matters requiring further clarification after the meeting are dealt with in a timely manner?	<b>3.4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not always. It is good that promises are made to keep members apprised of information requested between quarterly meetings but the information is not always circulated</li> </ul>
The quality of the Pension Committee and Investment Sub-Committee reports always meet the expected standards?	<b>3.2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hugely repetitive. Unnecessarily long</li> <li>• Quality excellent but quantity too great. To assimilate 100 + pages in a week before the meeting is too great a requirement</li> </ul>
Members of the Pension Committee and Investment Sub-Committee are satisfied that the risks identified on the covering reports adequately identify the risks involved in taking a particular	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members of the Pension Committee and Investment Sub-Committee are led by the nose and given only an illusion of power. We do as we are told.</li> </ul>

decision?		
The Pension Committee and Investment Sub-Committee are provided with sufficient information in order to make effective and timely decisions at meetings?	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any dissent is buried under a welter of technicalities</li> <li>• Quality excellent but quantity too great. To assimilate 100 + pages in a week before the meeting is too great a requirement.</li> </ul>
Members of the Pension Committee and Investment Sub-Committee are sufficiently aware of the risks facing the Pension Fund?	<b>3.2</b>	<i>No Comments</i>
Members of the Pension Committee and Investment Sub-Committee recognise their fiduciary duties to make decisions that are in the best interests of the scheme members?	<b>3.8</b>	<i>No Comments</i>
Members of the Pension Committee and Investment Sub-Committee are able to articulate their responsibilities to the Administering Authority, participating employers and the members of the Pension Fund?	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the responsibilities are so technical that I doubt any of us would be able to articulate the lot.</li> <li>• Only after the appropriate training and experience.</li> </ul>
The Knowledge and Skills Framework adopted by the Pension Committee and Investment Sub-Committee is adequate for achieving the required level of knowledge to enable effective decision making?	<b>2.8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are not given the key decisions to make.</li> </ul>
An adequate number of relevant training events and conferences are available to support learning?	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be lots of events and course. I have never been on any.</li> </ul>

<p>There is a sufficient coverage of professional advisors, such as Actuary and Investment Advisors?</p>	<p><b>3.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have an overabundance of expensive advisors none of whom seem capable of facilitating our scheme to achieve benchmark results</li> </ul>
<p>There is sufficient engagement with stakeholders (e.g. employers and scheme members) by the officers on behalf of the Pension Committee?</p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't know. Have you tried asking them?</li> <li>• I do not feel sufficiently 'in the know' to answer this question with any certainty.</li> </ul>