

Chris Megainey
Deputy Director, Workforce, Pay and Pensions
Department for Communities and Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

18 February 2016

Dear Chris,

Local Government Pension Scheme: Investment Reform Criteria and Guidance (DCLG, November 2015)

1. This response to the above criteria and guidance is sent on behalf of London LGPS CIV Limited (the “**London CIV**”) and the 31 London local authorities (the “**boroughs**”, listed at Attachment 1 for reference) that are currently active participants in establishing the Collective Investment Vehicle arrangements (the “**CIV**”).
2. We note that the government requires all LGPS Administering Authorities to respond, collectively and/or individually, by 19 February 2016. We also note that this initial response should include a commitment to pooling and a description of the progress made towards that outcome. A refined and completed submission is required, and will be provided by London CIV, by 15 July 2016.
3. London Councils’ Leaders’ Committee had the foresight in 2012 to commission London Councils to facilitate work looking at what might be done to drive down the cost of pension’s investment through greater collaboration. Since then the boroughs and London Councils have been at the forefront of working through the detail and laying the ground for others that are now starting to follow in our footsteps.
4. The CIV has taken two years to implement (facilitated by London Councils, for and on behalf of the boroughs), but is now established and operational. London CIV is fully authorised by the FCA as an Alternative Investment Fund Manager (“**AIFM**”) with permission to operate a UK based Authorised Contractual Scheme fund (the “**ACS Fund**”). The ACS Fund, which is tax transparent in the UK and benefits from international tax treaties in other jurisdictions, is structured as an umbrella fund with a range of sub-funds providing access, over time, to the full range of asset classes that the boroughs require to implement their investment strategies.

5. The first sub-fund has been opened, an active global equities fund, and three authorities are the initial seed investors with £500m of assets transferred in on 2 December 2015. A further eight sub-funds, comprising a mix of active and passive equity funds, are being opened over the coming months, by the end of which it is anticipated that around £6 billion of assets will have been migrated into the ACS Fund delivering fee savings for the investing boroughs of some £3 million per annum.
6. London CIV's ambition is to be...

the investment vehicle of choice for Local Authority Pension Funds, through successful collaboration and delivery of compelling performance.

7. In summary, the key achievements we aim to deliver between now and 2020 are:
 - **At least £23 billion of assets under management;**
 - **Annual fund management savings rising to more than £30 million per annum;**
 - **Greater access to and investment in infrastructure;**
 - **Increased fund management industry influence;**
 - **Wider benefits of collaboration and knowledge sharing;**
8. Turning to the specifics of the four criteria:
 - A. Asset pool(s) that achieve benefits of scale:**
9. In consideration of the government's expectation that proposals will demonstrate commitment and be ambitious, it would seem clear that with 31 of the 33 London local authorities actively engaged in the development of the CIV such commitment and ambition is amply demonstrated.
10. The 31 boroughs participating at this time in the London CIV have assets under management, at 31 March 2015, totalling £27.6 billion. If all London LGPS funds were to participate, which it is hoped they will, total assets would increase to £29.1 billion. Clearly investment markets over the period since 31 March 2015 have been volatile and therefore assets may fall short of the above numbers. Nonetheless, if it is assumed that at least 90 per cent of borough assets will eventually be invested through the CIV (recognising that boroughs may wish to make the case for up to 10 per cent of their assets to remain outside of the CIV) then the government's threshold of each pool having assets of at least £25 billion will be met.
11. To date development of the CIV and the ACS Fund has been based on a three phase strategy as described below. This strategy reflects the principles that have been adopted to steer implementation (see Attachment 2) and the voluntary nature of participation, however it is recognised that the government's criteria and guidance have significantly changed the environment which has led to the strategy coming under review by London CIV's Board and the boroughs.
12. Despite this, London CIV and the boroughs still believe that individual boroughs should have the choice and flexibility to invest through the CIV or not, putting the onus on the CIV to demonstrate and prove its value through compelling performance, but allowing boroughs to

maintain investments outside of the CIV where they have specific needs that are not available through the Fund.

13. It should be noted that, at this stage, sub-funds will either be invested into 3rd party pooled funds or will be segregated funds with fund management being delegated to 3rd party Investment Managers (“IM”). However, London CIV is fully authorised to operate in-house fund management and this option will be explored at a later stage to assess whether it would deliver additional efficiencies and performance.

Phase 1 – Implementation and fund launch

14. Phase 1 is being delivered through what has become known as the “commonality” strategy. This broadly involves seeking to aggregate borough investments where two or more boroughs are invested with the same IM in the same or a very similar mandate, the aim being to increase efficiency and drive down cost.
15. The commonality strategy is a pragmatic approach that quickly delivers scale benefits for the boroughs and fee income for London CIV to cover operating costs.
16. Phase 1 is the prime focus of activity in terms of fund opening through the first half of 2016.
17. Implementation of the strategy began with the analysis of investment data gathered from across the boroughs in 2014, the aim of which was to discover which IMs the boroughs were invested through, in what asset classes and the underlying mandate strategies. This analysis showed that the 33 funds had holdings with close to 90 IMs through around 250 separate mandates. It also showed that while there was significant commonality in some asset classes (e.g. passive equity) other classes (e.g. fixed income) showed a high degree of dispersion.
18. Early discussions were held with 14 IMs where commonality could be seen, but over time, as the detail was explored, all but four decided to drop out of the process or were discounted. There were several influencing factors for this, the most prevalent of which was capacity constraint, but also included an unwillingness to reduce fees, especially for those IMs that have a ‘most favoured nation’ clause in their mandates.
19. In summary, the launch phase will deliver nine sub-funds:
 - 2 x UK passive equity
 - 2 x World Developed ex UK passive equity
 - 2 x Emerging Markets passive equity
 - 1 x Diversified Growth Fund (hard closed but nonetheless delivering lower fees for the boroughs currently invested)
 - 2 x Global active equity
20. In aggregate, the Phase I sub-funds will account for £6.1bn, or around 23% of the boroughs’ total assets under management and will involve 20 of the 31 participating authorities.
21. Total fee savings are estimated to be a minimum of £2.8 million per annum (simply through reduced IM Annual Management Charges) but could be £3 million or more per annum based

on assumptions about additional benefit derived from the tax efficient nature of the ACS Fund structure. These fee savings will not be spread equally across all the boroughs and this is largely influenced by each borough's current fee position – some boroughs have negotiated better fees than others at this point.

22. It should be noted that since passively managed equities generally have low fee scales, the ratio of fee savings to assets under management (“**AUM**”) will increase as the more ‘alternative’ investments such as property and private equity are brought onto the fund.
23. In addition to the fee charged by each IM the London CIV will also apply a fee to each sub-fund as part of the company's cost recovery. These charges are applied at a rate appropriate to the nature of each sub-fund and range from 0.005% for the UK passive equity funds to 0.025% for the active funds.

Phase 2 – Establishing London CIV and developing the ACS Fund

24. The strategy for Phase 2, which has already commenced but with implementation starting in 2016-17, falls into two categories:
 - i. Revisiting the Phase I ‘commonality’ strategy with those IMs that had early discussions but did not progress; and
 - ii. Beginning the process of developing the fund with new manager selections in new asset classes.
25. In addition, the original nine launch sub-funds will be opened to investment from ‘new’ investors enabling any of the 11 boroughs (and indeed any other LGPS Fund) not included in the launch phase to transition assets from their current holdings should they wish to.
26. Attachment 3 presents analysis of the boroughs' current allocation by asset class, and from this it can be seen that the major asset classes by AUM are equities (active and passive), fixed income (active and passive) and multi-asset.
27. Category (i) will essentially follow the same process as was described in Phase I and will be applied to four Multi-Asset managers and, subject to on-going discussions with IMs and potentially one further passive equity manager.
28. The Multi-Asset products are significantly heterogeneous, and therefore it is sensible to present a fairly wide range of choice to the boroughs so that they can select a strategy which fits their particular risk appetite and investment strategy.
29. Category (ii) is driven by analysis of the borough's current holdings and the need to build AUM to deliver fee income that supports London CIV's operating costs. By reference to Attachment 3 it is clear that the focus should be on targeting the remainder of the passive and active equity assets and opening initial opportunities for Fixed Income sub-funds.
30. Passive Fixed Income mandates will be targeted in 2Q 2016-17. Earlier data collected from the boroughs suggests that the Fixed Income asset class has little in the way of commonality and conviction, so on current projections there may be approximately £500 million being transitioned each for Active and Passive. However, the active fixed income mandates are

likely to require more intensive search and selection, and therefore the bulk of the fixed income mandates will fall into the Phase 3 category (below).

31. It is anticipated that every participating borough will have opportunities to migrate to the CIV by March 2017.
32. As currently planned Phase 2 will conclude by March 2018. In terms of AUM, the end of Phase 2 will deliver an estimated £19 billion or 70 per cent of borough assets. However, the government should note that the opening of sub-funds is complex and time consuming and growth at that pace cannot be guaranteed.

Phase 3 – Business as Usual (“BAU”)

33. BAU will be focussed initially on a continuation of developing the fund’s offering and then its ongoing maintenance and enhancement. This phase will include:
 - i. Opening of new asset classes (e.g. infrastructure);
 - ii. The ongoing process of monitoring sub-funds, closing poor performers and opening new offerings; and
 - iii. Development of the CIV’s role in ‘thought leadership’ and being seen as a trusted source of support and advice for the boroughs.
34. Phase 3 could be seen as starting from April 2018 (i.e. the end of Phase 2), but in reality the transition from Phase 2 to Phase 3 is unlikely to be linear and there will be an overlap.
35. The successful migration of the boroughs’ fixed income mandates together with the other mandates as detailed above, will lead to the asset base of London CIV increasing to an estimated £23 billion, or 86 per cent of total borough assets, by the end of 2019-20. Growth to the £25 billion threshold would be expected to happen over the following two or three years as more alternative asset classes are addressed.
36. Based on the fact that we are seeing fund management costs dropping by as much as 50 per cent (and in some cases more), and that we expect to have more negotiating power as the Fund develops, we expect to be delivering in the region of £30 million of fund management savings by 2020 (based on current fund management costs of £109 million). In addition we will be delivering other savings and benefits through greater tax efficiency, reduced procurement costs and lower fees for, for example, custody and brokerage.
37. In considering the extent to which boroughs may hold assets outside of the CIV, it can be seen from Attachment 3 that around 10 per cent of assets are held in property, private equity and infrastructure and it is in these asset classes that one would expect to find long term investments that may take several years to mature before transition to the CIV. It is of course for individual boroughs to make the case to government for holding assets outside of the CIV.
38. London CIV is focussed on delivering value for money for the participating boroughs and as such resources are tight and many tasks and activities are outsourced to 3rd parties. London CIV’s current organisational structure is shown at Attachment 4. This in-house resource is augmented by expertise provided by members of the IAC (see paragraph 38) and the use of

3rd party providers including the Custodian, the Depositary, the Operating Reporting Partner, and Investment Consultants and Advisors.

39. Over time the level of resource will increase and more activity will be brought in-house, which might include in-house fund management. The company's business strategy is being reviewed at this time and more detail will be provided in the July submission.

B. Strong Governance and decision making:

40. Attachment 4 provides a diagram of the core governance structures for the CIV. Strong governance and mechanisms to ensure that participating boroughs have the assurance that they need to be confident that their investments are being managed appropriately by the pool have been critical factors in the design of this structure.

41. Taking each of the core governance structures in turn; the participating local authorities (London boroughs and potentially other non-London funds) continue to be responsible for their investment strategy and the asset allocation decisions to deliver it. As the CIV's ACS Fund develops the expectation would be that more and more of the underlying investments would be made through the CIV. Each participating borough is an equal shareholder in London CIV and a signatory to the Shareholders Agreement that sets out the relationship between and the responsibilities of each shareholder.

42. Representing the borough level, a Sectoral Joint Committee ("**PSJC**") has been established under the governing arrangements of London Councils. The PSJC effectively fulfils two roles, one is as a mechanism for convening elected Member representation from each borough (generally the borough's Pension Committee Chair), and the other is as the route to convening the boroughs as shareholders in London CIV. The committee meets most often in its first guise and has met five times since December 2014 to provide oversight and guidance as the CIV has been established. Going forward the PSJC will be the channel through which borough views about how the ACS Fund might be developed will be passed to London CIV and as a general reporting route for London CIV back to the boroughs. The committee's Terms of Reference are provided as Attachment 5. Agendas and minutes of the PSJC are published on London Councils' website and its meetings are held in public.

43. Alongside the PSJC an Investment Advisory Committee ("**IAC**") has been established. This committee is comprised of representative borough Treasurers and Pension Fund Managers, and provides Officer level input to the oversight and development of London CIV.

44. These two committees ensure that the links with local democratic accountability for the London CIV are maintained.

45. The CIV itself is comprised of two parts, the operating company (London LGPS CIV Limited) and the ACS Fund, this structure is described in brief at paragraph 4 above.

46. As government will be aware, London CIV already has dedicated resources working for the company with a Chief Executive, Investment Oversight Director, and Chief Operating Officer, as well as support staff. In addition the Company has a highly respected Non-Executive Board in place, meeting the requirements for strong governance arrangements to be in place.

47. As an AIFM London CIV must comply with the Alternative Investment Manager Directive (“**AIFMD**”) and falls under the regulatory scrutiny and reporting regime of the Financial Conduct Authority (“**FCA**”). This includes the requirement for robust systems and processes and for these to be documented appropriately in policies and manuals. Risk management is a particular focus for the FCA and London CIV has developed a risk framework and risk register covering all areas of its operations, including fund management.
48. In addition to the oversight and scrutiny arrangements described above, it is a requirement for London CIV to engage a Depositary to provide oversight of the Fund Custodian and London CIV as the fund operator. Northern Trust have been contracted to provide this service, which is effectively there to provide additional assurance and protection to the boroughs as investors.
49. As described above the participating boroughs will be closely involved in the development of the ACS Fund, including in the decisions about what new sub-funds might be opened and in what asset class. The IAC is also expected to be involved in the search and selection process for IMs. However, the final due diligence consideration and appointment of IMs falls under the regulatory responsibilities of London CIV through its Investment Oversight Committee and Board. Boroughs will decide which of the sub-funds they wish to invest in to best deliver their investment strategy.
50. The processes for London CIV to report on fund performance to the investing boroughs are still being developed, but in broad terms will include regular written and verbal reports to the PSJC, the IAC and to individual borough Pension Committees as required. However, the development of final arrangements for reporting is likely to be an iterative process to ensure that they are efficient and fit for purpose for both the investors and for London CIV. It is the intention that every borough will receive performance reporting across every sub-fund (regardless of whether they are invested in that sub-fund or not), in this way boroughs will be able to easily compare performance of sub-funds they are invested in with other similar sub-funds.
51. With regards to providing assurance on environmental, social and governance issues and how this will be handled by the CIV, this has already been the subject of consideration by the company and the PSJC with an agreement that the London CIV should be a separate member of the Local Authority Pension Fund Forum (the “**LAPFF**”) – a body which represents the majority of views of local authority pension funds on these matters. Discussions have commenced with the LAPFF to put this arrangement in place.
52. London CIV is also currently considering how it will meet the requirements of the Stewardship Code and anticipates being a signatory to this in due course.
53. The IAC has also established a working group to look at the whole issue of ESG matters and how funds can best access this through the London CIV and how to assist funds in acting as long term responsible shareholders.
54. For individual funds, they will of course need to maintain their own policies in respect of ESG matters and this will comprise part of their new Investment Strategy Statement which replaces the Statement of Investment Principles later this year.

C. Reduced costs and excellent value for money:

55. London CIV anticipates significant fee savings arising over time, from scale and increased negotiating power with managers. As described above, Phase 1 of the Fund development is expected to deliver around £3 million of savings p.a. for the 20 boroughs that will be invested. It should be recognised that the first phase represents relatively low cost asset classes with the majority being in passive asset classes, it is inevitable that as more complex and expensive assets are added then fee savings will significantly increase. To date London CIV has seen fee reductions of up 50 per cent.
56. In addition to the anticipated fee savings, we also expect to accrue significant advantages from the tax transparent nature of the ACS structure and savings across the entire spectrum of investment costs, including reduced custodian fees, lower procurement costs etc. In 2012 the Society of London Treasurers in 2012 had the foresight to commission a report from PWC that estimated that an additional £85 million could be derived in terms of improved investment returns by delivering superior performance. Whilst clearly this figure is open to some debate, it does give an indication of what might be achieved for funds through greater collaboration and delivering improved performance overall.
57. London CIV will be working with the participating boroughs to gather the data necessary to provide the requested assessment of investment costs and fees as at 31 March 2013, the current position and estimated savings over the next 15 years. This information will be provided in the July submission.
58. Transition costs are complex and extremely difficult to estimate in isolation from the case by case detail of each specific transition. Costs in this area can accrue from fees (e.g. transition managers, custodians and tax advisors) and transaction costs (e.g. the cost of buying and selling assets, including unavoidable tax in some jurisdictions). London CIV is working hard to bear down on transition costs and will continue to do so. It is anticipated that more detail can be provided in the July submission.
59. In addition to reduced costs and fees the wider governance benefits from information sharing and improved access to expertise at all levels should not under estimated as significant advantages from collaboration.
60. LGPS funds clearly understand the need to look at the risk adjusted returns over the longer time frame and that it is the net value-add that impacts on the fund's ability to pay pensions over the longer term. It is clear that avoiding knee jerk reactions when managers experience periods of underperformance is an important factor and we are pleased to see the government has recognised this in asking for funds to consider what is achieved over an appropriate long term period, rather than solely focusing on short term performance comparisons. London CIV is firmly of the view that 'churn' of IMs will be reduced through the CIV as part of the enhanced governance arrangements and knowledge sharing that is being established.

D. An improved capacity to invest in infrastructure:

61. One of the big opportunities from creating the CIV is the potential to use the benefit of scale to enable the boroughs to access infrastructure as an asset class. London CIV and the

boroughs have begun to consider infrastructure as an asset class and what different and innovative approaches might be taken to deliver benefits both in London and nationally. Detailed proposals are likely to fall towards the end of Phase 2 of our development. Early discussions have been had with a number of IMs in this area and also with the Pensions Infrastructure Platform.

62. As can be seen from Attachment 3, LGPS funds across London currently have little or no assets invested in infrastructure. Most boroughs have limited resources to dedicate to considering this complex asset class and experience shows that there is a general lack of suitable investments at the scale that the average borough would wish to invest and with the required risk/return profile. However, there appears to be no evidence that any London LGPS fund is strategically opposed to infrastructure investment as an asset class per se.
63. Nonetheless, pooling of each borough's allocation to infrastructure and opening the opportunity for those that currently have no allocation will generate a greater capacity to invest, enabling the CIV to look at opportunities either direct or as co-investments that would not have been open to individual funds, often simply because of the cost of entry.
64. Determining the proportion of assets to allocate to infrastructure will be a decision for each investor to take as part of their Asset Allocation strategy. These decisions will depend on the opportunities that can be made available and on the level of risk and reward generated from those opportunities when compared against risk/reward in other asset classes.

In conclusion

65. London CIV believes that the work that has been undertaken by those London Boroughs that have contributed to the development of the CIV demonstrates a clear commitment to the principles of collaboration and collectivisation. The creation of London CIV has been instrumental in driving forward the investment reform agenda in London. The scale of asset pooling that we anticipate will be achieved in London is sufficiently large for the London CIV to meet the criteria for scale over the timescales being required. We believe that we have developed both the appropriate structure for London funds and that the governance structures in place mean that local accountability and decision making on asset allocation are retained.
66. Consequently we strongly believe given the willingness shown and progress made by the London funds over the last 2 years means that we are able to meet the criteria to be confirmed as one of the final pools of assets under the government's reform agenda.
67. We recognise that further work is required, but that London CIV and the participating boroughs are in a strong position to be able to come forward with comprehensive proposals to meet the government's criteria and guidance when submitting these in July 2016.
68. Despite the scale, complexity and untested nature of the London boroughs collaborations, the London CIV has successfully navigated these challenges and is now well on the way to achieving the government's four criteria of scale, costs savings, governance and access to infrastructure

Local Government Pension Scheme: Revoking and replacing the Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2009 (the “Regulations”)

69. It is recognised that in application the Regulations do not apply directly to London CIV but do determine the way that the boroughs manage and invest their funds and therefore have an influence over how London CIV and its investors will operate in the future. As such London CIV expects that each borough will respond to the consultation and this response only covers issues that relate, or could relate to London CIV specifically.
70. London CIV is broadly supportive of relaxing the regulatory framework for LGPS investments and the move to a ‘prudent’ basis, but as a principle does not support wide ranging powers for the Secretary of State to intervene. This concern about powers of intervention is especially true in circumstances where the guidance setting out how the power will be used has not been published.
71. In the context of LGPS Funds being required to invest through pooling arrangements (e.g. London CIV) it is not clear whether the Funds would be required to apply Section 9 of the Regulations when deciding to invest through a pool. London CIV is structured as a Private Limited Company (wholly owned by the participating authorities) and is authorised by the FCA as an AIFM with permission to operate an ACS, effectively this means that London CIV is an Investment Manager. London CIV believes that ‘recognised’ pools should be explicitly addressed in the regulations to avoid confusion, prevent unnecessary bureaucracy and to give reassurance to individual LGPS Funds – especially in this period of change.
72. In addition, London CIV is of the view that care should be taken over the wording of Section 7(4) which, as currently drafted, may have the effect of preventing LGPS Funds from investing in pools where Members or officers of the authority have decision making roles in those pools as a part owner of that pool. Again specific measures relating to recognised pools would provide clarity.
73. On the question of the use of derivatives; it should be recognised that derivatives can be used to control outcomes in many ways, it is not just about risk per se. Derivatives can be used to produce more certain outcomes, be more efficient as an instrument to use as an investment than an actual asset due to increased liquidity and visibility of pricing; be more liquid than some real assets might be; and allow investment managers to reflect macro-economic views without having to churn large parts of the portfolio. Although controlling these outcomes is all about balancing risk and return it is not just risk management – there is a clear difference between the two and accordingly we would urge that the regulations should not be explicit that derivatives should only be used as a risk management tool.

London CIV would welcome the opportunity to discuss this submission in more detail with government officials and Ministers.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hugh Grover', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Hugh Grover
Chief Executive

Hugh.grover@londonciv.org.uk
020 7934 9942

Attachment 1: Participating local authorities

City of London Corporation

London Borough of Barnet

London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

London Borough of Bexley

London Borough of Brent

London Borough of Camden

London Borough of Croydon

London Borough of Ealing

London Borough of Enfield

London Borough of Hackney

London Borough of Haringey

London Borough of Harrow

London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham

London Borough of Havering

London Borough of Hounslow

London Borough of Islington

London Borough of Lambeth

London Borough of Lewisham

London Borough of Merton

London Borough of Newham

London Borough of Redbridge

London Borough of Southwark

London Borough of Sutton

London Borough of Tower Hamlets

London Borough of Waltham Forest

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Royal Borough of Greenwich

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames

Wandsworth London Borough Council

Westminster City Council

Attachment 2: London CIV guiding principles

1. Investment in the ACS should be voluntary, both entry and withdrawal.
2. Boroughs choose which asset classes to invest into, and how much.
3. Boroughs should have sufficient control over the ACS Operator.
4. Investing authorities will take a shareholding interest in the Operator.
5. Shareholders will have membership of the Pensions Joint committee.
6. ACS Operator will provide regular information to participating boroughs.
7. ACS will not increase the overall investment risk faced by boroughs.

Attachment 3: Analysis of current borough holdings


Current asset allocation

The breakdown of the pension fund assets as of 31 March 2015 for the 31 participating London boroughs can be seen below:

Table 1


Allocation	£m, March 2015	Percentage
UK equities	5,077.39	18.9%
overseas equities	6,560.63	24.4%
unallocated	2,748.31	10.2%
total equities	14,386.33	53.6%
UK fixed interest	2,636.29	9.8%
overseas fixed interest	808.32	3.0%
unallocated	863.04	3.2%
total fixed interest	4,307.65	16.0%
UK index linked	312.52	1.2%
overseas index linked	30.01	0.1%
unallocated	80.43	0.3%
total index linked	422.96	1.6%
UK property	1,350.87	5.0%
overseas property	56.85	0.2%
unallocated	517.01	1.9%
total property	1,924.73	7.2%
UK hedge funds	32.40	0.1%
overseas hedge funds	-	0.0%
unallocated	256.56	1.0%
total hedge funds	288.96	1.1%
UK other	783.74	2.9%
overseas other	963.62	3.6%
Multi-asset	2,214.31	8.2%
Total unallocated	3,961.67	14.8%
infrastructure	193.53	0.7%
commodities	57.43	0.2%
private equity	525.05	2.0%
derivatives	2.28	0.0%
currency overlay	-	0.0%
cash	777.37	2.9%
Total investment assets	26,843.38	100.0%

NB the multi-asset allocation is done on a "best efforts basis" due to conflicting and out of date data.




Attachment 4:

London CIV governance diagram



London CIV organisation chart



Attachment 5: Pensions Sectoral Joint Committee Terms of Reference

Constitution

- 1.a.1 The Pensions CIV Joint Committee is a sectoral joint committee operating under the London Councils governance arrangements.¹
- 1.a.2 Each London local authority participating in the arrangements shall appoint a representative to the Pensions CIV Joint Committee being either the Leader of the local authority or the elected mayor as applicable or a deputy appointed for these purposes.²
- 1.a.3 The Pensions CIV Joint Committee shall appoint a Chair and Vice-Chair.
- 1.a.4 The Pensions CIV Joint Committee shall meet at least once each year to act as a forum for the participating authorities to consider and provide guidance on the direction and performance of the CIV, In addition, members of the Pensions CIV Joint Committee shall meet at least once each year at an Annual General Meeting of the ACS Operator in their capacity as representing shareholders of the ACS Operator.
- 1.a.5 Subject to Clause 1.1.4 above, meetings of the Pensions CIV Joint Committee shall be called in accordance with London Councils' Standing Orders and the procedure to be adopted at such meetings shall be determined in accordance with those Standing Orders.
- 1.a.6 If the Pensions CIV Joint Committee is required to make decisions on specialist matters in which the members of the Pensions CIV Joint Committee do not have expertise the Pensions CIV Joint Committee shall arrange for an adviser(s) to attend the relevant meeting to provide specialist advice to members of the Pensions CIV Joint Committee.

Quorum

- 1.a.7 The requirements of the Standing Orders of London Councils regarding quorum and voting shall apply to meetings of the Pensions CIV Joint Committee.

¹ The London Councils' Governing Agreement dated 13 December 2001 (as amended), London Councils' Standing Orders, Financial Regulations and other policies and procedures as relevant.

² Clause 4.5 of the London Councils' Governing Agreement dated 13 December 2001 (as amended).

Membership

[As amended from time to time]

Terms of Reference

1.a.8 To act as a representative body for those London local authorities that have chosen to take a shareholding in the Authorised Contractual Scheme (ACS) Operator company established for the purposes of a London Pensions Common Investment Vehicle (CIV).

1.a.9 To exercise functions of the participating London local authorities involving the exercise of sections 1 and 4 of the Localism Act 2011 where that relates to the actions of the participating London local authorities as shareholders of the ACS Operator company.

To act as a forum for the participating authorities to consider and provide guidance on the direction and performance of the CIV and, in particular, to receive and consider reports and information from the ACS Operator particularly performance information and to provide comment and guidance in response (in so far as required and permitted by Companies Act 2006 requirements and FCA regulations).

1.a.10 In addition, members of the Pensions CIV Joint Committee will meet at least once each year at an Annual General Meeting of the ACS Operator to take decisions on behalf of the participating London local authorities in their capacity as shareholders exercising the shareholder rights in relation to the Pensions CIV Authorised Contractual Scheme operator (as provided in the Companies Act 2006 and the Articles of Association of the ACS Operator company) and to communicate these decisions to the Board of the ACS Operator company. These include:

1.a.10.1 the appointment of directors to the ACS Operator board of directors;

1.a.10.2 the appointment and removal of auditors of the company;

1.a.10.3 agreeing the Articles of Association of the company and consenting to any amendments to these;

1.a.10.4 receiving the Accounts and Annual Report of the company;

1.a.10.5 exercising rights to require the directors of the ACS Operator company to call a general meeting of the company;