



**Consultation on the  
Proposed Scheme Governance and  
the draft Local Government Pension  
Scheme (Amendment) Regulations  
(Northern Ireland) 2014**

**Synopsis of Responses and the  
Departmental Response**

December 2014

## **Introduction**

1. The Local Government Pension Scheme in Northern Ireland (LGPS (NI)) is a statutory public service pension scheme which is available to employees of district councils, Education and Library Boards, non-teaching staff in schools and further education colleges, housing associations and other admitted bodies. The LGPS (NI) is administered by the Northern Ireland Local Government Officers' Superannuation Committee (NILGOSC).
2. On 25 August 2014 the Department launched a consultation on the proposed scheme governance arrangements and the draft Local Government Pension Scheme (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2014. The consultation sought comments on the proposals by 14 November 2014.
3. The Public Service Pensions Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 ("the Act") sets out the framework to be followed by all public sector pension schemes. The Act includes a number of provisions on governance of the public sector schemes including the requirement to establish a pension board and a scheme advisory board.

## **General**

4. A total of 12 responses were received. Of the 12 responses, 8 were from employing authorities, 3 from trade unions and 1 from the administering authority.
  
5. The full text of the individual responses to the consultations can be downloaded at:

[http://www.doeni.gov.uk/index/local\\_government/local\\_government\\_pension\\_scheme\\_2015.htm](http://www.doeni.gov.uk/index/local_government/local_government_pension_scheme_2015.htm)

## **Pension Board**

6. The Act requires that each scheme has a pension board which will be responsible for assisting the scheme manager in securing compliance with regulations and legislation relating to governance and administration of the scheme. The scheme manager for the LGPS (NI) is NILGOSC.
7. The consultation document set out two options for establishing the pension board.
  - Option 1 proposed that the Department designate NILGOSC as the pension board, as permitted under section 5 (2) of the Act.
  - Option 2 proposed that NILGOSC would establish a separate pension board which would include a chairperson, an equal number of representatives of scheme members and scheme employers, and additional members as it considered appropriate.
8. The consultation document also sought views on related issues, for example, the number of board members, whether there should be independent members, the remuneration of members, and annual reports.

## Appointment of Board

Option 1 – NILGOSC is designated as the Pension Board

Question 1 sought views on:

- a) whether NILGOSC should be designated as the pension board; and*
  - b) whether there could be any issues from that designation, as the Committee (NILGOSC) would be advising itself (as scheme manager) on compliance with legislation, requirements of the Pensions Regulator and other matters.*
9. Of the 12 respondents, 8 (67%) (4 employing authorities, 3 trade unions and the administering authority) agreed that NILGOSC should be designated as the pension board, and did not consider that there were any issues in NILGOSC advising itself (as scheme manager) on the compliance issues that the Board is responsible for.
10. The administering authority, a trade union and an employing authority suggested that there were no conflict of interest issues because the pension board only has an advisory role, and not one of accountability or compliance. Three other respondents (2 employing authorities and a trade union) commented that NILGOSC has been in operation for over 60

years and during that time had effectively fulfilled the role which is proposed for a pension board.

11. Of these 8 respondents, 2 trade unions raised concerns around the separation of the role of the Committee (NILGOSC) and that of the pension board if a separate pension board was appointed. They suggested there could be inefficiencies and duplication of roles with a separate pension board. Another trade union commented that the constitution of NILGOSC gave a fair representation across members and employers.
12. Three employing authorities considered that NILGOSC should not advise itself on compliance issues.
13. One of the 3 employing authorities suggested such advice would be better coming from a pension board or an independent section of NILGOSC. Another stated it was reluctant to advocate measures which would add additional cost to the LGPS (NI), but highlighted the compliance difficulties if NILGOSC carried out the role of the pension board. The third employing authority stated that it was bizarre to establish an arrangement where a single body had a statutory responsibility to advise itself and added that the separation of scheme manager and pension board roles were key ingredients to the pension reform process and the improvement in governance.

14. Another employing authority did not favour either of the options given in the consultation document because, in its view, they did not allow for independent membership.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department has considered the comments made and notes that the majority of responses favour Option 1. In view of this the Department has decided to make regulations to allow the Committee of the Northern Ireland Local Government Officers' Superannuation Committee (NILGOSC) to be designated as the pension board for the Local Government Pension Scheme (Northern Ireland). The regulations will make provision for that designation to be withdrawn in the event that there is evidence to suggest that it is not working properly. The Department will monitor how the arrangement is working in practice.**

*Question 2 sought views on whether the chairperson and members of the NILGOSC should receive remuneration for the additional responsibility and work as a member of the pension board and if so, what level of remuneration would be appropriate.*

15. A total of 10 consultees responded to this question. Five respondents (4 employing authorities and a trade union) were in favour of additional remuneration. The administering authority and a trade union were not. The respondents in favour of additional remuneration considered that the level

should be in line with similar arrangements in place across the public sector.

16. The 2 respondents (the administering authority and a trade union) which did not support additional remuneration, stated that there was no additional responsibility as the Committee is already responsible for compliance with the scheme regulations and already adopts the Pensions Regulator's guidance as best practice, when appropriate.
17. A further 3 employing authorities stated that Option 1 was not their preferred option, with one of the 3 commenting that where a senior manager of a council was undertaking board duties during their employment and receiving remuneration as a result, then such payments should be surrendered to their employing council. Also that it is understood that this is common practice for trade union officials to surrender any fees received to their trade union.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department has determined that NILGOSC will be designated as the pension board and the existing remuneration arrangements for the Chairperson and Committee members will continue in the interim. The Department will however, review the remuneration arrangements in the light of the current responsibilities for the Chairperson and Committee members.**

*Question 3 sought views on whether the pension board should produce an annual report and if yes, if the report should be included in the NILGOSC report or published as a separate document.*

18. A total of 12 respondents commented on this question. Five respondents (2 employing authorities, 2 trade unions and the administering authority) thought the annual report should be merged with NILGOSC's annual report and the administering authority noted that there was no requirement for an annual report in the Act.
19. Five employing authorities supported a regulatory requirement for a separate annual report in the interests of transparency. One of these employing authorities recommended that the regulatory requirement should be included if there was a separate pension board (Option 2).
20. Another employing authority thought it should be up to NILGOSC to decide whether a separate report was required. A trade union did not see any advantage in regulating this area and commented that the report could be made available in both formats.

### ***Departmental response***

**As NILGOSC will be designated as the pension board for the LGPS (NI) the Department considers that it would be**

appropriate for the pension board's annual report to form part of NILGOSC's Annual Report. The Annual Report is made available on NILGOSC's website.

## **Option 2 – NILGOSC establishes a Pension Board**

*Question 4 sought views on which of the two suggested methods of appointing an independent pension board was preferred. The two options were:*

- a) the scheme manager appoints the chairperson who in turn appoints the members, subject to the approval of the scheme manager; and*
- b) the scheme manager appoints the chairperson and members by an appointments process similar to that for public sector appointments.*

21. A total of 12 respondents commented on this question. Three respondents (2 employing authorities and a trade union) ruled out both options and suggested a third option, to seek nominations from organisations as may be recognised by the Committee as being representative of employing authorities and organisations representing scheme members. One trade union and an employing authority added that the chairperson and two independent members should be appointed by public competition.

22. One employing authority suggested the Department appoints the chairperson, who in turn appoints the employer/member representatives. If option 2 was preferred, another employing authority favoured the Committee consulting with organisations representative of employing authorities and members before it made the appointments.
23. A further employing authority did not support either method of appointment outlined at question 4, stating that consideration should be given to the Department appointing a new pension board independent of NILGOSC.
24. Four respondents (two employing authorities, a trade union and the administering authority) who preferred Option 1, responded to this question. Three (2 employing authorities and a trade union) stated that the pension board should be appointed under the public appointments guidance produced by the Commissioner of Public Appointments in Northern Ireland. Whilst agreeing with this the administering authority stated that there should be one appointment process for both chairperson and members.
25. One employing authority stated that the only way the aims of section 5 of the Public Service Pension Schemes Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 can be achieved is to establish a board comprising of persons who are both independent of the scheme's employing authorities and scheme members and who have the necessary mix of skills and experience to provide competent and authoritative advice and guidance.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department has determined that NILGOSC will be designated as the pension board. The Department notes the comments received in relation to the alternatives for appointing the pension board. In the event that the designation of NILGOSC is withdrawn, the comments received will be used to inform the method of appointment of an independent pension board.**

*Questions 5 and 6 sought views on the appropriate number of members, including the chairperson, for the pension board and if the regulations should provide for a minimum and maximum number of employer and member representatives on the pension board.*

26. The Act requires the scheme regulations to provide that the board includes an equal number of employer and member representatives.
27. Of the 10 respondents who commented, 2 trade unions and an employing authority endorsed the current composition of NILGOSC, 13 members, i.e. a chairperson, two independents and five member and employer representatives.
28. The administering authority commented that if it is determined that it should establish the pension board (as in Option 2) then the pension board should be limited to a

maximum of 3 members (1 employer representative, 1 member representative and a chairperson). An employing authority suggested a minimum of 3 members.

29. Two employing authorities considered that 7 would be the ideal size of the pension board. This would include a chairperson, 3 employer representatives and 3 member representatives. One of the two employing authorities added that if this was not the case, the pension board should have at least a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 11 members. Another employing authority considered a membership of 11 would be appropriate.
30. A further employing authority proposed a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 9 members if the Department was minded to have a specified chairperson position.
31. One trade union commented that in the event of a pension board established under Option 2, there should be 10 members. This would include 5 member and 5 employer representatives, with the position of chairperson alternating between the two groups.
32. Two employing authorities did not comment on an appropriate number of members for the pension board although one added that it was appropriate to continue with representation from members, employers and independents.

33. Eleven respondents commented on the minimum and maximum numbers of member and employer representatives. Five (46%) respondents (3 trade unions and 2 employing authorities) considered that the pension board should have a maximum of 5 representatives from employers and a maximum of 5 representatives from members. Of these, one employing authority stated that there should be a minimum of 3 representatives from employers and 3 representatives from members.
34. An employing authority and the administering authority stated that there should be a minimum of 1 representative from employers and 1 representative from members.
35. Two other employing authorities proposed that the minimum number of member or employer representatives should be two, with one of the two expressing a preference for a maximum of four. Another employing authority also favoured a maximum of 4 member and 4 employer representatives.
36. A further employing authority suggested that it would be appropriate to give NILGOSC the flexibility to decide the make-up of its pension board.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department has decided that NILGOSC will be designated as the pension board for the LGPS (NI). In the event that the designation of NILGOSC is withdrawn, the comments**

**received will be used to inform decisions on the membership of an independent pension board.**

**To comply with the Public Service Pensions Act (NI) 2014, the Department will include in its scheme regulations that the pension board will have equal numbers of member and employee representatives.**

*Questions 7 and 8 sought views on whether the pension board should include members other than those representing employer and employees and if the chairperson should be independent of member and employee representatives.*

37. All of the 12 respondents commented on whether the pension board should include members other than those representing employers and members. Seven (58%) respondents (5 employing authorities, a trade union and the administering authority) supported the inclusion of independent members.
38. Three respondents (2 employing authorities and a trade union) endorsed the current composition of NILGOSC which has an independent chairperson and two additional independent members.
39. Three respondents (2 trade unions and an employing authority) suggested membership should be limited to employers and member representatives. One of these respondents (an employing authority) commented that independents were not required because the purpose of the

board is to assist the scheme manager and provide a level of scrutiny and accountability to scheme employers and members. A trade union suggested independent members were unnecessary and would have a possible unsettling influence.

40. All of the 12 respondents commented on question 8 of the consultation document which asked if the Chairperson should be independent of the member and employer representatives. Seven (58%) respondents (5 employing authorities, a trade union and the administering authority) thought the chairperson should be independent.
41. Three of the responses (2 employing authorities and a trade union) endorsed the current composition of NILGOSC which has an independent chairperson.
42. Three respondents (2 trade unions and an employing authority) suggested that the chairperson should be appointed from within the board and the position should rotate annually between employer and employee representatives.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department welcomes the comments it has received on board membership and the inclusion of members which are not representative of members and employers. The Department has decided that NILGOSC (which has an**

**independent chairperson and includes two additional independent members) will be designated as the pension board for the LGPS (NI). Again the comments received will be used to inform decisions on the membership of an independent pension board in the event that the designation of NILGOSC is withdrawn.**

*Question 9 sought comments on whether remuneration should be paid to the chairperson and members of an independent pension board and if so, what level of remuneration would be appropriate.*

43. All of the 12 respondents commented on remuneration in regard to establishing a pension board under Option 2. Five respondents (3 trade unions, an employing authority and the administering authority) reaffirmed their preference for Option 1 in that NILGOSC should be established as the pension board. Of these, the administering authority and a trade union added that expenses should be payable in the event that a board was established under Option 2.

44. Two employing authorities suggested that the chairperson should receive remuneration, with expenses paid to other board members. One of these employing authorities considered that remuneration is unavoidable where the chairperson is to be a specified position but did not anticipate that the number of meetings would be significant, and consequently, the remuneration should be modest (no more than £5,000). Where the position of chair is determined from within the employer and member representatives, it

suggested that remuneration should not extend beyond expenses. Another employing authority also proposed that expenses should be paid to pension board members.

45. Four other employing authorities made general comments about remuneration. One recommended that remuneration should be commensurate with other government boards. Another employing authority considered that payments to the chairperson and members should be in line with current public sector remuneration practice for similar activities, although it did not consider option 1 or 2 as appropriate for the establishment of the pension board.
46. Another employing authority considered it appropriate for the chairperson and members to receive remuneration at a realistic level, but not more than the fees that are currently paid to NILGOSC. The fourth employing authority commented that an additional responsibility allowance, at a level commensurate with the level of commitment required, would be appropriate.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department notes the comments on the remuneration for pension board members it has received as part of this consultation exercise. The Department has determined that NILGOSC will be designated as the pension board for the LGPS (NI). The comments received will be used to inform**

**decisions on remuneration of an independent pension board in the event that the designation of NILGOSC is withdrawn.**

*Question 10 sought comments on the introduction of a regulatory requirement that the pension board produce an annual report and publish it on the NILGOSC website if the Committee establishes a pension board (Option 2).*

47. All 12 respondents responded to this question. Five (41%) of the respondents (4 employing authorities and a trade union) agreed that the pension board should produce an annual report and that the requirement to produce an annual report should be included in regulations. One of these employing authorities added that this requirement would be in the interests of transparency. The trade union supported this given that the current reporting arrangements by NILGOSC had proved successful.
48. Another employing authority suggested that it would be beneficial for the pension board to produce a separate annual report rather than merging with the annual report from NILGOSC.
49. Six (50%) of the respondents (3 employing authorities, 2 trade unions and the administering authority) agreed that there was no need for regulations to provide that the pension board produces an annual report.

50. The administering authority and a trade union commented that there was no requirement in the Act for an annual report. Two of the employing authorities suggested that it would be sufficient for the pension board to contribute to the NILGOSC Annual Report. A trade union and an employing authority commented that the NILGOSC Annual Report meets all the necessary requirements.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department notes the comments it has received as part of this consultation exercise on the annual reporting arrangements for the pension board. The Department has determined that NILGOSC will be designated as the pension board for the LGPS (NI). The Department considers that it would be appropriate that the work of the pension board is to be included in the annual report of NILGOSC. However the Department does not consider it necessary to include this in scheme regulations.**

### **Scheme Advisory Board**

*Question 11 sought views on the most suitable option to establish a scheme advisory board. The first option would be that the scheme advisory board could have a similar structure and membership to the LGPS Review Group. The second option would be that the Department could advertise for a chairperson together with employer and member representatives for the scheme advisory board.*

51. All 12 respondents commented on this question. Nine (75%) of the responses (5 employing authorities, 3 trade unions and the administering authority) were in favour of the scheme advisory board having a similar structure to the current LGPS Review Group. Three of the 9 (2 trade unions and an employing authority) added that there was no reason to change the current composition of 4 representatives of members and employers, 2 advisers from NILGOSC, and the chairperson from the Department.
52. One employing authority added that neither option was optimal but that a scheme advisory board with a similar structure to the Review Group was the better of the two.
53. Two employing authorities preferred the second option because the process involved would reinforce independence from the Department which it would be advising.
54. Another employing authority suggested the scheme advisory board should consist of an independent chairperson with two members from NILGOSC, one each from the employer and employee representatives. Additional members should be made up of those deemed to have the relevant skills and expertise.

## ***Departmental response***

**In view of the level of support for an arrangement similar to the existing LGPS (NI) Review Group, the Department proposes to use this model for the scheme advisory board.**

**The scheme advisory board will be chaired by a senior official in the Department. The membership will consist of an equal number of employer and member representatives. Two officers from NILGOSC will attend meetings of the scheme advisory board as advisors to scheme advisory board.**

**Members of the scheme advisory board will hold and vacate their position on that board in accordance with the terms of their letter of appointment.**

*Question 12 asked respondents if there was a more suitable method to appoint the scheme advisory board and if so what was it.*

55. Eleven of the 12 respondents to the consultation commented on this question, with WELB opting not to. Nine (82%) of the respondents (5 employing authorities, 3 trade unions and the administering authority) commented that there was not a more suitable method of appointing a scheme advisory board.

56. One employing authority suggested that the scheme advisory board in shadow form for the Local Government Pension Scheme (England and Wales) should be extended to

Northern Ireland, as the Minister and the Department would have access to high level advice and information across a range of very similar schemes. This advice would be common to that being provided to other responsible authorities and facilitate the transfer of information regarding best practice and benchmarking performance. This employing authority went on to comment that by grouping this activity across nations it should provide a highly effective and cost effective means of meeting the requirements of the responsible authority and scheme.

57. Another employing authority suggested that the selection process adheres to the Commissioner for Public Appointments' Code of Practice.

***Departmental response***

**The Department notes the comments received on possible alternatives to establishing a scheme advisory board.**

**The Department will appoint members to the scheme advisory board for the LGPS (NI) and this will have a similar structure to the existing LGPS (NI) Review Group.**

*Question 13 asked if the chairperson of the scheme advisory board should be independent of member and employer representatives.*

58. The Department received comments on this from all 12 respondents to this consultation. Eleven (92%) of the

responses (8 employing authorities, 2 trade unions and the administering authority) agreed that the chairperson should be independent of member and employer representatives, with the exception of a trade union which commented that the chairperson should alternate between member and employer representatives.

59. The administering authority and an employing authority suggested that if a change was necessary, then co-chairs (where an employer nominee and a trade union nominee jointly chair each meeting) should be considered.

60. Another employing authority stated that it would be preferable for the chairperson to be independent of employer and member representatives. This employing authority added that if the Department accepted its proposal for the LGPS (NI) to be advised by the shadow scheme advisory board for England and Wales, then the chairperson would be Joanne Segers (OBE), an independent who is CEO of National Association of Pension Funds.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department notes the comments received with regard to the independence of the chairperson of the scheme advisory board.**

**The Department has determined that the scheme advisory board will have the same structure as the current review**

**group for the LGPS (NI). The scheme advisory board will be chaired by a senior official from the Department and have an equal number of member and employer representatives. Officers from NILGOSC will attend meetings in an advisory capacity.**

*Question 14 sought views on whether the scheme advisory board should have equal employer and member representatives and if so what number.*

61. All 12 respondents to the consultation agreed that there should be equal numbers of employer and member representatives on the scheme advisory board.
62. Seven (58%) of the respondents (3 employing authorities, 3 trade unions and the administering authority) suggested that there should be 4 member and employer representatives.
63. One employing authority proposed 3 representatives along with an independent chairperson and four professional pension administrators with experience of pension administration, finance and investments.
64. Another employing authority referred to the existing shadow board for the Local Government Pension Scheme (England and Wales) which has 6 employer and 6 member representatives.

65. A further employing authority suggested one representative of employers and members respectively.
66. Two employing authorities did not specify a particular number of employer and member representatives.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department notes the comments received with regard to an appropriate number of member and employer representatives for the scheme advisory board.**

**The Department has determined that the scheme advisory board will have the same structure as the current review group for the LGPS (NI). The scheme advisory board will have four representatives from members and employers respectively.**

*Question 15 sought views on whether the scheme advisory board should include other representatives.*

67. Seven (58%) of the 12 respondents (3 employing authorities, 3 trade unions and the administering authority) suggested that the existing arrangements should continue. Six of the 7 acknowledged the advisory role provided by NILGOSC officers to the Review Group.
68. Four employing authorities (33%) supported the inclusion of other members with relevant skills and expertise.

69. Another employing authority supported the inclusion of other representatives only in exceptional circumstances.

***Departmental response***

**The Department notes the comments received with regard to the inclusion of other representatives on the scheme advisory board.**

**The Department has determined that the scheme advisory board will have the same structure as the current review group for the LGPS (NI). Two officers from NILGOSC will continue to provide specialist pension advice to the scheme advisory board.**

*Question 16 asked if there should be a limit on the number of terms the chairperson and members of the scheme advisory board should serve, and if so, what number of terms is appropriate.*

70. Eleven respondents commented on this question. Nine (82%) respondents (6 employing authorities, 2 trade unions and the administering authority) considered it appropriate to limit the number of terms a member should serve on the scheme advisory board. Of these, 8 respondents suggested a limit of two terms and one suggested 3 terms of 4 years.

71. The administering authority and an employing authority added that there should be no limit in the terms of office for the chairperson, if the Department is undertaking this role.
72. A trade union and an employing authority commented that there should not be a limit placed on the number of terms because there will be a natural turnover of member and employer representatives and the Departmental official in the role of chairperson.
73. Another employing authority did not comment specifically on the number of terms, other than to suggest the selection process adheres to the Commissioner for Public Appointments' Code of Practice.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department notes the comments from respondents to this consultation on the terms of office for members of the scheme advisory board. The Department will put in place the necessary arrangements to establish the scheme advisory board. In line with recommended practice for appointments to boards, the Department will consider limiting the maximum period of appointment of a particular member to a maximum of two four year terms.**

*Question 17 sought views on whether the Chairperson or the members of the scheme advisory board should be remunerated and if so what level of allowance would be appropriate?*

74. Nine (75%) of the 12 respondents agreed that remuneration should be paid, and 3 respondents (2 trade unions and an employing authority) stated there was no case for remuneration.
75. Five of the 9 (3 employing authorities, 1 trade union and the administering authority) suggested that members should receive travel expenses. Two employing authorities also commented on how the chairperson should be remunerated. One of those two employing authorities stated that if the chairperson role is undertaken by the Department then expenses would be appropriate, and the other suggested that the level of remuneration should be agreed with the chairperson on appointment.
76. Another employing authority suggested that remuneration should be set at a level commensurate with other Government Advisory Boards and a further employing authority considered that it must be based on a realistic valuation and capped at the level of the NILGOSC members' remuneration.
77. The consultation had proposed that any remuneration paid to the scheme advisory board would be met from the pension fund. Five respondents (3 employing authorities, a trade

union and the administering authority) did not agree with this, with 4 of the 5 (2 employing authorities, a trade union and the administering authority) expressing the view that the Department should fund any remuneration because the purpose of the scheme advisory board is to advise the Department, not the pension fund.

### ***Departmental response***

**The Department notes the comments received on remuneration for the scheme advisory board. The advice provided to the Department should ultimately be of benefit to the members of the LGPS (NI) and consequently the scheme regulations will make provision for remuneration to the scheme advisory board to be met from the pension fund. Members of LGPS (NI) Review Group do not receive any remuneration or expenses. As this arrangement has worked well in practice, and mindful of not imposing unnecessary costs on the fund, the Department will consider continuing this arrangement for the scheme advisory board.**

### **Other matters**

78. The Department received a number of comments on the existing remuneration for members of NILGOSC. This matter is outside the scope of this consultation, however the Department acknowledges the comments received.

79. The administering authority commented that it would be more efficient if the remuneration of members of the NILGOSC was changed from the current meeting fee to an annual amount in line with other public bodies to recognise the effort required of each member over the year.
80. Two trade unions and an employing authority proposed that the meeting fee paid to members of the Committee should continue with one trade union and the employing authority adding that the fee should be reviewed in the context of other similar public appointments in Northern Ireland.

### ***Departmental Response***

**The Department notes the comments received in relation to the remuneration of NILGOSC. A review of the remuneration arrangements for the chairperson and members of NILGOSC will be undertaken in light of their current responsibilities.**

### **Next Steps**

**The Department will finalise the regulations which will give effect to the governance arrangements for the LGPS (NI). The regulations will be made as soon as possible before the revised pension scheme comes into operation on 1 April 2015.**