No.	Key Indicator	Examples of level for concern	Examples of good practice for high performing fund	Fund score	Evidence and comments
1	Risk management	No or only a partial and/or an unclear risk register with no or poorly specified or un-implemented mitigation actions over time leading to increased fund risk.	Comprehensive risk register covering the key risks (in accordance with current CIPFA guidelines) with prioritisation, robust mitigation actions, defined deadlines, with action tracking to completion.	5 +	
		No evidence of a risk register being	Evidence and e-links to demonstrate		
		a) prioritised	a) risks prioritised on a RAG red, amber, green or by a scoring methodology	1	a) Risk Register reviewed by the Gloucestershire Pension Committee every 6 months.
		b) annually reviewed by Pensions Committee	b) completed actions signed off by Pensions Committee after at least annual update,	1	b) As above
		c) annually reviewed by internal audit or external audit	c) annual review by internal audit and external audit	1	c) Reviewed as part of the Annual Governance framework which is led by Internal Audit and feeds into the Annual Governance Statement which is published annually by the County Council.
		d) used to reduce high risks	d) <3 priority/"red" risks	1	d) No residual red risks
		e) available for public scrutiny.	e) public disclosure of a summary version published on fund	1	c) Included within Appendix C of the Annual Report
		Self score -1 point for each one	Self score +1 point for each one		
2	Funding level and contributions	a) Decreasing funding level (calculated on a standardised and consistent basis) and/or in bottom decile of LGPS, over the last three triennial valuations on a standardised like for like basis.	Evidence and e-links to demonstrate	5+	
	(see explanatory notes)	b) No or minimal employer funding risk assessment and monitoring and not reported to Pensions Committee	a) Funding level rising and getting closer to 100% funded (or above) over last three triennial valuations on a standardised like for like basis. Funding %		
		c) Total actual contributions and actual received in last 6 years less than that assumed and certified in last 2 triennial valuations.	91 to >100 =score +5		
		d) Net inward cash flow less than benefit outgoings so need for any unplanned or forced sale of assets.	80-90 =+4		
		Self score -1 for each one	70-79 =+3	3	a) 76.0% funded as at 31st March 2013, calculated on a like for like basis using HM Treasury assumptions by the Fund's actuary and reported to Pension Committee in 2014/15
			60-69 = +2 <59 = +1		
			b) Employer funding risk assessment and monitoring reports to Pension Committee. Net inward cashflow forecasts meeting planned income or significantly exceeding benefot outgoings		
			c) Total actual contributions received in last 6 years equate to (or exceed) that assumed and certified in the last 2 triennial valuations.	1	c) Confirmed - detailled in Annual Report
			d) Net inward cash flow significantly exceeds benefit out-goings	1	d) Net inward cashflow significantly exceeds benefit out goings in both 13/14 and 14/15 as shown in the Statement of Accounts and summarised on page 11 of the Pension Fund Annual Report 2014/15
			Self score a) as above and rest +1 for each one		
3	Deficit recovery	a) No or opaque deficit recovery plan.	Evidence and e-links to demonstrate :	2+	
	(see explanatory notes)	b) Lengthening implied deficit recovery period (for contributions)	a)Transparent deficit recovery plan for tax raising and non-tax raising bodies.	1	a) Shown in Fund Valuation report and report to Pension Committee by Fund Actuary on a Like for Like basis
		c) Implied deficit recovery periods >25 years for last 3 valuations.	b) Implied deficit recovery reducing each triennial valuation.	1	b) Increasing funding levels at each valuation
		Self score -1 point for each	c) Implied deficit recovery period in line <15 years for last 3 valuations		c) confirmed at < 15 years by actuary following 2013 valuation (but not evidenced for earlier valuations)
			Self score +1 point for each one		
4	Investment returns	a) Required future investment return (calculated on standardised and prudently consistent basis) not aligned to the investment strategy target return, so lower likelihood of the fund achieving its funding strategy	Evidence and e-links to demonstrate :	2+	
	(see explanatory notes)	b) Actual investment returns consistently undershoot actuarially required returns	a) Required future fund investment return (calc by actuary) are consistent with and aligned to investment strategy (asset mix expected target returns) so higher likelihood of the fund meeting its funding strategy.	1	a) See Investment Policy and Performance Report on pages 25 to 36 of the 2014/15 Annual Report
		Self score -1 point for each one	b) Actual investment returns consistently exceed actuarially required returns	1	b) Investment returns being higher than expected since 2010 lead to a gain of £75m per actuarial report.
			Self score +1 point for each one		