

# **SOUTH YORKSHIRE PENSIONS AUTHORITY**

**1 October 2015**

## **Review of Pensions Administration since the Implementation of the UPM System**

### **1. Purpose of the Report**

To provide Members with a comprehensive review of the experience of the Pensions' Administration Division of the Authority since the implementation of the UPM Pensions Administration System in November 2014.

---

### **2. Recommendations**

**Members are recommended to consider the contents of the report with a view to:**

- **Commenting specifically on any areas of the Report giving rise to major concerns**
- **Commenting generally on the Authority's position as detailed in the Report**
- **Expressing views as to how Officers should continue to manage the project and the workloads described within the report**
- **Suggesting areas of priority for Officers to concentrate on**
- **Providing any other advice and guidance to Officers as Members deem appropriate**

### **3. Introduction**

3.1 There is no doubt that the switch to the UPM System has affected the Authority's ability to conduct its business at or near its accustomed service levels and standards since the November 2014 launch. The failings of Civica as a Company to:

- deliver a fully working and tested product
- react appropriately to product faults
- provide adequate training, support and resource both prior to and following the live launch
- provide crucial fixes in a timely manner at critical junctures,
- comprehend the sensitive nature of the Authority's business, and
- understand the imperative of statutory deadlines

has resulted in 11 months of reactive crisis management that has potential to be detrimental to the reputation of the Authority and its staff. At this juncture there are improvements to note but progress is slow and for the time being a return to our normal level of service for all aspects of work is still a number of months way.

### **4. Background Information**

4.1 Long-standing Members will be aware of the logic and reasoning behind the decision to purchase UPM, the drivers for change and the procurement framework that dictated the majority of the decisions in the process. However for the benefit of new members it is worth noting the following,

- The Authority had not tendered for a pensions administration system for many years due to no viable competition but had an obligation to do so given there were now a number of possible suppliers
- The Authority collaborated with other LGPS funds on a Framework Agreement which saved time and money with regard to the tender process.
- It was with great surprise that our previous system supplier chose not to participate on the Framework Agreement and an even greater surprise when they gave us notice to cease using their system with effect from 31<sup>st</sup> December 2014.
- The period implementation period was fixed at 10 months when in reality we needed twice that time period.

#### 4.2 What may be less clear to Members are the following:

- Despite demonstrations to the contrary the Authority purchased a concept rather than a working product, a fact that officers only became aware of after contracts were signed and the live launch date was imminent
- In hindsight, it now appears that this is why Civica were unable to release the product or any part of it far enough in advance of the launch date to allow thorough testing and familiarisation by staff and management
- They also simultaneously engaged with 8 other new client sites, also moving from the same product and supplier as SYPA, without sufficient resource to service and support all of the sites concerned
- They promised a timeframe for delivery, installation and launch that they were unable to keep and was apparently never realisable or feasible from the beginning given their over-commitment to the new client base
- The product eventually delivered and released was still in development and had major flaws and faults in many of its calculation routines and process maps that meant certain categories of casework could not be started, some cases required lengthy manual calculations and some calculations were not up to date with the New 2014 CARE Scheme requirements
- The bulk interface loading facility that SYPA and the District Councils had worked so long and hard to perfect no longer functioned under UPM meaning staff had to revert to the manual loading of scheme joiners and miscellaneous changes

4.3 As a result the Authority quickly found itself in a casework backlog situation. By February 2015, less than three months after the live launch, the Authority had over 11,000 cases awaiting commencement with the Year End and The Annual Pensions Increase exercises fast approaching. Civica had also failed to release at this point the bulk data processes to enable this work to be undertaken.

4.4 As Members may be aware, the end result of the Year End Annual Return Process, in simple terms, is a cleaner data base and the issue of Annual Benefit Statements to as many members as possible. This was the first Year End that the Year End Routines were to be performed under the CARE Scheme, which in itself was already proving problematical across the country for those Funds on their existing system without the added problems of using the UPM without the requisite tools to do so.

4.5 Historically, the Authority has dealt with its Year End Returns, and investigations of queries arising, as one exercise before moving on to the issuing of member statements. Under CARE and UPM the journey from Annual Return to Annual Statement follows a compulsory trail of interdependent tasks within one overall

process. This means that all members must have their record updates performed in the following specific sequence. No part of the sequence can be omitted or left:

- Contributions and pay posted to the record
- A CARE Benefit Pension Account created and recorded
- The Treasury Revaluation Order applied to the CARE Account
- The Annual Statement Calculation Routine performed and recorded
- The Annual Allowance Calculation Routine performed and recorded

An error or warning at any point in the sequence is a potential showstopper for that member in terms of being able to issue them with a benefit statement. Each and every error has to be investigated and resolved before that member can be moved on to the next step in the overall process. This has proved virtually impossible to achieve as yet given the late release of the programs and process maps and the fact that when released they have not been error free.

- 4.6 As this report is being written the Authority has failed to issue any annual statements by the statutory deadline of 31 August. It is unlikely now that the Authority will be in a position to issue the bulk of its statements to members before the end of December. Because other funds including non-UPM clients were in a similar position the LGA undertook to contact the Pensions Regulator to ascertain the Regulator's likely view on this failure and whether Funds will need to self-report these breaches. Fortunately it would appear that self-reporting will be unnecessary this year given that the Regulator's Code of Conduct specifically provide justifiable dispensations where a fund has 'teething problems' as a result of the implementation of a new system. However this will hold good for one year only and next year, deadlines will have to be met or sanctions will be likely.
- 4.7 The Pensions Increase bulk process was released to the Authority only a month before the program need to be run. Much of that time was spent in resolving errors in the running process before deadlines meant that the program had to be run in the live environment. Whilst the live run allowed the Authority to pay about 43,000 of its 45,000 pensioners their correct increases in April it also meant that staff were left with about 2,000 cases to investigate where the program had not calculated the correct increases.
- 4.8 To exacerbate matters there was no single logical reason for the errors and so each case required detailed investigation to identify the problem and its cause. Remedial action requiring manual intervention was then required to correct the errors. Some members had no increase calculated at all, whilst some had increases applied to the wrong pay elements, others received incorrectly calculated increases on the correct pay elements whilst yet others simply received too much of an increase. Some errors occurred as a result of member GMP data and the interaction with Pensions Increase rules and some cases had no discernible reason for being incorrect and simply had to be amended to the manually calculated correct payment figure. Some overtime resource was necessarily used on this issue alone because of the imperative to complete the exercise and pay people correctly as quickly as possible.
- 4.9 The pensions increase bulk process also had a negative impact on the payroll elements that we directly recharge to some employers. The data conversion from the old system transferred the payments correctly but some of the descriptions and rules behind them were incorrect. Whilst the total payment to the individual continues to be correct the split between the amount charged to the pension fund and the amount charged to the employer is now incorrect. There are over 2000 of these and these need to be

corrected before the year-end to ensure employers are correctly recharged and also to ensure the problem does not reoccur when we apply the 2016 increase.

## **5. Payroll**

- 5.1 The Pensions Payroll amounted to £16.363M in August and paid 45,102 members and dependants. A small proportion of Pensioner Members are paid annually or quarterly but the vast majority are paid monthly. Reputationally, and for the financial welfare of Payroll Members, It is vital that the payroll runs smoothly, quickly, efficiently and accurately. Regrettably, this is currently not the case, although every payroll since November 2014 has been paid on time.
- 5.2 However, the Payroll Process performance is affecting the way the Authority has to conduct its business. In order to allow sufficient time for the payroll to run through to period closedown and allowing for the errors that invariably crop up, the interventions and assistance required of Civica each month, and the time that the RTI submission takes, the Authority is having to close its Pensioner Payroll approximately 5 days earlier on average than it did previously. This impacts on new entrants to the Payroll where members retire later in the month or their retirement documentation is received later in the month and also impacts upon leavers from the payroll as a result of member deaths where death or notification occurs in the latter part of the month..
- 5.3 RTI – the Real Time Information submission to HMRC invariably errors each month requiring Civica intervention and assistance. In addition the File “hangs” meaning that a submission through the Government Gateway facility that should take perhaps 20 to 30 minutes takes a minimum of 4 or 5 hours and in August took several days.
- 5.4 Closing the tax period – This also presents problems each month and can be difficult to close without consistently erroring and requiring Civica assistance. The corollary of this is that until the tax period is closed no further transactions can take place on the payroll meaning, effectively, that Payroll can be closed for a week instead of a few hours.
- 5.5 Single Payments – there are a number of problems still ongoing with the single payments facility. Chief amongst these is the tendency for non-members to appear on the single payments file and also for retirement lump sums not to be paid if the new pensioner has not yet been created on Payroll. Despite Civica assurances that there is no co-relation between the payroll and the single payments file process the Authority has proven that there actually is and the matter has now been formally logged with them for resolving.
- 5.6 Mini Payruns – this is a facility that the Authority was very keen to use and was promised was fully developed and working. This was not the case. In 10months the Authority has attempted to use the facility only once and it caused more problems and errors than it solved. It currently remains unusable.
- 5.7 Accounts Reporting – despite concerted efforts by the Head of Finance this is a vital part of the system that is still not functioning as it should and in reality is far short of ideal although we now have our own reports and workarounds in place.
- 5.8 Effects on the rest of the System – although there should be no performance problems with the Server for the new System and staff should be able to access it and continue to process work during payroll closedown, a big selling point originally, the opposite has in fact been found to be true. The system has crashed on a number of occasions when payroll processes have been run, staff have been thrown out of the system in the

middle of processing casework, exacerbating the problems already being experienced and creating additional recovery work for both Member Services staff and the UPM Development Team. In effect the Authority has had to reintroduce its Policy of making the system unavailable to any but payroll personnel until such time as the payroll is complete.

## **6. Member Services**

- 6.1 Backlog situation - as mentioned earlier in this report by mid-February the Authority had a backlog of over 11,000 cases. A situation very foreign to staff and management alike. An overtime strategy has been in place since late January and through the efforts of staff on Saturdays, (every Saturday falling within a Bank Holiday since January has also been worked so a number of staff have not had the benefit of a two day weekend for over 8 months let alone a three day weekend break), the backlog was first kept in check and then slowly reduced to the levels reported below.

<b>Total Cases Outstanding</b>	<b>8,192</b>
<b>Cases commenced and awaiting further information/decisions</b>	<b>2,230</b>
<b>Cases awaiting commencement</b>	<b>5,962</b>

At the time of writing this report 10,300 cases had been completed on Saturdays alone at a cost of £30,985.11. This equates to an enhanced overtime cost per case of £3.01. However, this needs to be measured against the position the Authority would be in now were it not for the efforts of staff on Saturdays and the cost to the Authority of being in that worse position.

Officers have also devised a further strategy to support the overtime effort and over the next month it is hoped to have made some major headway with the numbers. This supporting strategy is being monitored and reviewed on a weekly basis but the initial results are encouraging. In just one week, including Saturday 1736 processes were completed relating to personal details changes and GMP loading.

### 6.2 Performance

Performance for the period 1 December 2014 to 14 September 2015

<b>Work Category</b>	<b>Number Completed</b>	<b>Within Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
Priority Casework	<b>6,531</b>	<b>66.16%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Non-Priority Casework	<b>37,655</b>	<b>54.44%</b>	<b>96%</b>
All casework	<b>44,187</b>	<b>56.17%</b>	<b>97%</b>

By contrast, the performance for August 2015 was as detailed in the next table below:

<b>Work Category</b>	<b>Number Completed</b>	<b>Within Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
Priority Casework	<b>725</b>	<b>77.93%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Non-Priority Casework	<b>5,503</b>	<b>60.29%</b>	<b>96%</b>
All casework	<b>6,228</b>	<b>62.35%</b>	<b>97%</b>

By further contrast the overall performance for January 2015 was **48.12%** from **4,437** cases completed. August saw an increase of **40%** in casework produced and an increase of **14%** in cases completed within target when compared to January. As at 17 September overall performance was running at **65.12%**, a small but important improvement demonstrating that the Authority is making headway and getting back on track, from a similar number of cases to August, (pro-rata).

- 6.3 As can be seen, progress is being made and the latest performance figures are somewhat encouraging and promise a more optimistic future. However, because all of the non-priority work in the backlog is already out of time it will be some months at the earliest before the performance is of a more acceptable level and back towards where the Authority wants it to be. The further updated performance for September will be reported verbally at the meeting where, hopefully, further progress will be demonstrated. True performance figures will only be available when the backlog is clear and staff are able to concentrate solely on the new work arriving in the office.
- 6.4 Although Officers have now developed some of the detailed reports required the Report Suite itself is still incomplete. Despite this it was felt appropriate that Members be provided with some additional detailed information about some of the priority category casework and the extent to which those cases had either been completed within, or outside, of their target performance times and how close or otherwise targets were to being achieved. That information is provided below.

#### 6.5 Priority performance detail

Case Type	Target Days	Numbers Completed	In Target	Outside Target
Retirement	5 days	2069	1471	598
Death In Service	4 days	24	5	19
Pensioner Death	4 days	1091	639	452
Divorce Quote	5 days	226	93	133

Case Type	Outside Target by:										
	1 Day	2 Days	3 Days	4 Days	5 Days	6 Days	7 Days	8 Days	9 Days	10-20 Days	over20 Days
Retirement	82	42	43	33	35	38	36	28	26	144	92
Death in Service	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	10
Pensioner Death	44	22	29	24	23	17	14	17	12	122	128
Divorce Quote	10	8	6	5	6	6	7	3	3	32	47

#### 6.6 To put some of the above figures in context:

- For Divorce quotations, the legislation allows three months in which to provide the information requested for the financial settlement negotiation whilst the

Authority target is only 5 days, yet 80% of these cases were still completed within 20 days which is more than two months inside the time allowed by law

- For retirements, over 95% of first time retirees received their lump sum retiring allowance and benefit details within 20 days and their first payment of pension on the first available payroll following receipt of their retirement documents
- Death processes and their associated process maps have been amongst the most problematical on UPM and this is reflected in the performance with 42% of cases done out of time. The Authority's target time is a very demanding 4 days and it is pleasing to note that 88% of cases were still done within 20 days indicating that most dependants and benefit recipients would have received their first pension payments on the earliest available payroll anyway.

## **7. Information Technology**

- 7.1 Even at this late stage of the implementation project there is as yet no working Web facility for Members or Employers. This has led to a number of complaints from members.
- 7.2 Civica have repeatedly failed to deliver a viable Web facility within its product despite this being one of the more important aspects of the system that the Authority wished, and needed, to exploit given its history of providing this facility to members already under the old system.
- 7.3 Progress to date has been a painfully slow process and it has taken the withholding of funds to generate a positive response from Civica.
- 7.4 Despite this flaws and time taken to date we are almost there and is looking good thanks to the personalisation we have been able to apply to the product. We are hoping for a limited mid-October release provided the system passes an independent security test.

## **8. Technical & UPM Development**

- 8.1 Bulk Data Importer Processes – many of the annual exercises that the Authority is required to perform across its member base are bulk exercise routines that, under the UPM regime, require a process to be followed through the use of what is termed a “Bulk Data Importer Process”. The following work requires a UPM BDIP in order to be able to perform the updates, calculations and reports required. Some are interdependent and prevent the next step in the process being taken if the predecessor step fails. The Technical Team have been and continue to be dedicated to familiarising themselves with these processes, testing them as thoroughly as time allows, training staff in their use and the investigation and examination of results and finding solutions in conjunction with Civica to those that do not work:

<b>Exercise and schedule for completion</b>	<b>Process Release date</b>	<b>Testing Regime</b>	<b>Problems caused</b>
Pensions Increase to Pensioner and Deferred Member Benefits  <b>In between March Payroll closedown and April Payroll closedown</b>	23/02/2015	Poor. Time constrained Early testing resulted in errors, limited support from Civica, the testing process	2000 Pensioner cases not processed (Approx'), no increases, wrong pay element(s) increased, too small an increase, too large an increase, GMP

		<p>became a cycle of clear one error, test, clear the next error and so on. Process became time critical and high level pressure had to be applied and testing was complete for Pensioner Members with two days to spare and the live run only one day before April Payroll closedown</p>	<p>issues and so on.</p> <p>The range of errors and non-logical reasons for them meant that twelve separate reports had to be run to identify them. Each had to be individually investigated and manually resolved and checked.</p> <p>Incorrect pension recharge.</p>
<p>Annual Return Posting</p> <p><b>1 April onwards and prior to 30 June to enable the ABS process</b></p>	N/A	<p>Poor. Time constrained</p> <p>There was an existing process available but, upon testing, it became apparent that this was not fit for purpose as the standard Product Process Map did not work properly.</p>	<p>Validation not working properly, a half day Civica on-site support effort resolved this but further issues appeared including the actual posting of data which had to be referred back to Civica. Live posting began on <b>20 July</b>. Further problems experienced required Civica resolutions as well as in-house developed script fixes. Limited training provided to the Management teams only</p>
<p>CARE Benefit Posting</p> <p><b>1 April onwards and prior to 30 June to enable the ABS process</b></p>	N/A	<p>Adequate but problematical</p> <p>Forms part of the annual return process.</p> <p>Standard map did not work.</p> <p>A mixture of fixes had to be applied including Civica assistance, in-house script development and help from other Funds on UPM</p>	<p>No training yet provided to staff</p> <p>The process appears to work now</p>
<p>Treasury Revaluation Order</p> <p><b>ASAP following the posting of contributions and pay</b></p>		<p>Poor.</p> <p>Again, this forms part of an overall process commenced by the Annual Return Posting</p>	
			The process does not work



<p>Annual benefit Statement calculation</p> <p><b>By 31 July each year</b></p>		<p>Testing commenced week beginning 1 September 2015</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>correctly and is causing a number of errors, chief of which is the creation and storage of statements for members for whom the Authority does not wish to issue a statement because of queries with the records</p>
<p>Annual Allowance calculation</p> <p><b>By 31 August each year</b></p>		<p>Testing commenced week beginning 1 September 2015</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>It is not yet known what reports will be possible from this process and in what format compared to previous years and how this will impact on the Authority's ability to identify potentially affected members and to then perform more detailed work for them</p>
<p>Bulk Redundancy Calculation</p> <p><b>As required by employers</b></p>	<p>See text in right hand column</p>	<p>Adequate Time constrained</p> <p>This was required as a matter of urgency for 3 employers</p>	<p>Released for use on individual members on 4 August following development and acceptance by Civica of the Mercer cost specification</p> <p>However, the urgency was for the bulk release which had not included employer costs, probably the most important aspect.</p> <p>Two exercises performed for employers using a mixture of the bulk process and a manual input process to a separate reckoner to obtain costs. This was extremely time consuming, liable to input and transposition errors and required careful checking</p> <p>Released for bulk jobs in late August and work is about to commence on a bulk exercise for Sheffield CC.</p>
<p>Valuation calculation extract</p> <p><b>By 3 September</b></p>	<p>04/08/2015</p>	<p>Poor – trial and error Time constrained</p> <p>Many errors have been</p>	<p>In addition to the process errors the routine takes for ever to run</p> <p>A brand new process is</p>

		<p>found as the process has been run, these have required Civica intervention and resolution</p> <p>Testing has just commenced on the Active Member extract for RMBC</p>	being developed by Civica
Bulk Joiner Process		Rigorous but problematical	This is a process that is simple in concept and extremely complex in reality. It is still not fully functional despite it being a vital requirement of the Authority's work strategy and, when working properly, will facilitate the interfacing of new starters from Employers and reduce dramatically the manual effort required by staff

8.2 Although process testing is all about identifying and resolving errors and issues with the process, so that when used in a live environment work can be performed with confidence, the fact that many of these bulk processes depend on the first part of a larger overall process being completed and, because the individual processes themselves have consistently failed and been full of errors, there has been an impact on the time available for testing the next stage. Testing itself has been very much a trial and error regime run in a race against statutory deadlines, some of which had already passed before testing could start. A further effect has been that training provided to staff has either been rushed, non-existent or not comprehensive enough with staff learning as they go in a live environment which is less than ideal.

## **9. Customer Service/Complaints**

9.1 The Authority has received 23 Formal Complaints since the live launch of UPM in November 2014; a ten month period at the time of writing this report. This equates to 27 or 28 for a full year which is between three and four times the number the Authority would expect to receive in normal circumstances. If it were not for the staff having the patience and making the effort to diffuse many other irate members the numbers could have been a lot higher. It would be fair to say that large volumes of unhappy members have called the office, adding to the pressure that staff are under, but have stopped short of then making a formal complaint after speaking to an officer.

9.2 However, it would not be fair to say that all the received complaints are UPM related. The following is a simple breakdown of those received to date and gives a flavour of the main issues:

- 9 Formal Complaints were received in relation to delays in providing information or dealing with a case. Of these 7 were directly attributable to failures and problems with the UPM System. The remaining two were occasioned by Employer delays.

- 3 Formal Complaints were received about the lack of a Member-Web facility
- 4 Formal Complaints were made about erroneous retirement estimate figures. Whilst this is not an overly unusual number when measured against the history of this types of complaint it is a little high and it is felt that had the Authority not been under such severe pressure from backlogs and a new unfamiliar system, (as well as the introduction of a new scheme and new Regulations), where staff were unsure as to what calculations were correct and which were not, then these cases may well have been picked up before they were sent out. One of the 4 was directly attributable to a system error with the calculation and was not spotted by the staff issuing the estimate.
- 7 of the complaints received covered a general mix of issues that members felt they had cause to write in about

9.3 To place these numbers in context, 14 complaints, either directly or indirectly resulting from the new system, is probably twice as many as Officers would have hoped to receive within that period across all categories of the service.

## **10 Conclusion and current position**

- 10.1 Officers hope that the report demonstrates to Members that the introduction of the UPM Computerised Administration System, whilst unavoidable and vital, has affected the Authority across the whole range of its Pensions Administration Business and that as a result there are real and genuine reasons for the poor performance and the casework backlog. It is hoped that Members understand that there has been no lack of effort and dedication by the staff whom Management commend for their determination to do their best in extremely trying circumstances.
- 10.2 The position is improving slowly as the figures for August and September show and with the continued overtime effort and the supporting strategy in place during normal office hours officers remain optimistic about clearing the backlog by the end of December this year as was always the original intended target.
- 10.3 It is worth noting that the South Yorkshire Fund is not alone in having a backlog situation. One Metropolitan Fund of a similar size has a casework backlog of 13,000 at the time of writing. Another Metropolitan Fund, the largest, has nearly as many cases in just two categories of work as this Fund has in total. One of these Funds is a UPM user whilst the other uses the latest system offered by this Authority's old provider. Users of that system have told us that they have had issues as a result of introduction of LGPS 2014 leading to backlogs of work and we now understand that they have been given notice that they will have to move to another new product in a couple of years time. Had SYPA chosen that product over UPM, not only would potentially still have backlogs of work but we would also now be facing the prospect of a further system change if the reports we have heard are accurate..
- 10.4 The regrettable aspect of this report is that on far too many occasions, efforts by SYPA have been hampered by a broken product and delays by Civica in fixing the system or by processes not having been developed at all at the point of requirement or not ready when needed. Management definitely feel that better progress towards normality can only be achieved by improving the speed and efficiency with which Civica respond and support the Authority through any problems, release new or revised components of the

system in time to allow for rigorous testing and release a much cleaner product at all times when new versions are made available. It is also felt that this can only be achieved by Civica resourcing themselves properly and retaining their experienced staff, an issue beyond the control of SYPA. The feeling is that they are very much overstretched with a high turnover of senior staff which affects continuity and the service they are able to provide to SYPA.

- 10.5 Throughout the pre and post installation period we have not been restrained in our criticism of the supplier and have continually pressed for resolution of our outstanding issues from senior managers at Civica. We are aware that all the other LGPS UPM clients both new and old share our frustrations and a user group has been set for 8<sup>th</sup> October at which we will come together as a united force to demand improvements in all areas.
- 10.6 It should be noted that Employers have been very patient and understanding throughout this difficult 10 month period and we will need this to continue for at least the near future . Officers are extremely grateful for this and a provisional date of 24 November has been pencilled in for this year's Employers' Forum where it is hoped to provide them with, amongst other things, a full review of the year.
- 10.7 It should also be noted that despite staff determination to do their best there is no doubt that they are feeling the stresses and strains of having to cope in extremely difficult circumstances. Morale is low in some quarters and frustration is office wide as staff who are used to providing excellent customer service are struggling to come to terms with the poorer service now being provided as a matter of routine, with little or no visible light at the end of the tunnel yet.
- 10.8 Officers welcome Members comments or questions.

## **11. Implications**

- **Financial** - There are financial implications to this report in that:
  - The Authority is not yet receiving value for money from the product it has purchased
  - Over £30K has been spent on overtime to date to combat the backlog of casework. Further overtime expenditure is still required. However total cost of UPM still less than cost of staying with the old supplier.
  - Additional funds are having to be expended on the system where the Standard Product requires specific development, outside of that planned by Civica, to cater for the Authority's working practices and policies in some areas
- **Legal** The Authority is at risk of censure by the Pensions Regulator for failing to comply with certain statutory deadlines for notifying members of their entitlements and for issuing annual benefit statements

- **Diversity** - None

**Gary Chapman**  
**Head of Pensions Administration**  
Phone 01226 772954  
E-mail: [gchapman@sypa.org.uk](mailto:gchapman@sypa.org.uk)

**Background papers** used in the preparation of this report are available for inspection in the Pensions Administration Unit.