### Local Government Pension Scheme (Scotland)
#### Employer Data Collection Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>SPPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Created</td>
<td>12 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision Date</td>
<td>2 June 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Assets (£000) for five or fewer, closed amended from 6993 to 36993
Contents

Purpose 3
Background 3
Executive Summary 3
Objectives and Scope 4
Methodology and Data 5
Metrics - LGPS Scotland 6
Annex A 18
Annex B 21
Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Scottish Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Advisory Board in their consideration of issues including the impact of cessation valuations on LGPS funds and contributing employers (Scheme Advisory Board 2015 Work Plan item 7).

Background

2. On 30 October 2015, Scotland’s Deputy First Minister, John Swinney MSP, asked the Scottish Local Government Pension Scheme Advisory Board to carry out detailed research into the ‘cessations issue’ in Scotland around which further policy guidance may subsequently be considered. This became 2015 Work Plan item number 7 and further background is available in Annex A.

3. The Scheme Advisory Board (SAB) agreed that the baseline information reported upon in this paper should inform their further consideration of, and recommendations concerning, the issues raised by the Deputy First Minister’s commission. The SAB also agreed that the report would provide important context ahead of the drafting of Scheme Advisory Board guidance to LGPS (Scotland) Scheme Managers on the treatment of cessation liabilities.

This report presents a summary of information provided to the Scottish Public Pensions Agency (SPPA) by the 11 Scottish LGPS scheme managers on the categorisation of fund liabilities held by various employers participating in the Scheme.

Executive Summary

Key metrics from the data provided

4. Based on data received:
   - 80% of all employers with at least one active member in the LGPS (Scotland) are admission bodies;
   - just over half (53%) of all admission bodies have no guarantor;
   - around half (46%) of admission bodies with no guarantor are reported to have five or fewer active members; and approximately 40% of admission bodies with no guarantor and with five or fewer active members are closed to new members;
   - of the admission bodies with no guarantor, 18% (41 bodies) are at risk of becoming an exiting employer (based on a benchmark of bodies that are closed
to new members and have five or fewer active members, as applied in one Pension Fund’s Funding Strategy Statement). The data therefore indicates that the majority of the risk related to bodies without a guarantor lies at some point in the future.

- as at 31 March 2014, the reported **deficit** between assets (£36,993,000) and liabilities (£37,919,000) associated with admission bodies with no guarantor and five or fewer active members that are closed to new members was around £1 million (£-926,000), measured on an ongoing basis. It should be noted, however, that exit payments are typically calculated on a cessation (gilts) basis, which would give a significantly greater value (see 5 below, for illustration).

5. Two of the eleven funds provided data on both an ongoing and a cessation basis. Based on this dataset:

- 83% of all employers with at least one active member in the two funds are admission bodies;
- of all admission bodies, 49% have no guarantor, with 52% of these having five or fewer active members;
- 23% of admission bodies with no guarantor and five or fewer active members are closed to new members.
- as at 31 March 2014, the reported **surplus** between assets (£9,346,000) and liabilities (£9,213,000) associated with admission bodies with no guarantor and five or fewer active members that are closed to new members was around £131,000, measured on an ongoing basis. Valued on a cessation basis, this surplus becomes a deficit of £-3,518,000.

6. While data on both an ongoing and a cessation basis are available for only two of the eleven funds, it is illustrative of the impact of valuation basis, with a surplus of £131,000 becoming a deficit of £-3,518,000.

7. The above figures are based on the data provided, and represent a snapshot in time. It is recognised that the value of pension funds is not static.

**Objectives and Scope**

8. Prior to this exercise, there was no clear picture of the scale of employers facing a cessation valuation across the LGPS. In recognition of the importance of knowledge of the relative financial health of the LGPS funds, it was agreed that greater clarity was needed on the scale of this issue.

9. Further work to identify best practice in the sector will inform the SAB’s recommendations to the Deputy First Minister and subsequent cessation guidance to scheme managers.
Methodology and Data

10. On behalf of the LGPS (Scotland) SAB, the SPPA sent out requests to each of the 11 scheme managers requesting information about: the number of admitted bodies; whether or not they have a guarantor in place; who that guarantor is; their assessment of the likelihood of funding problems in the near future; and how much the current net assets/liabilities are for each employer.

11. SPPA has collated all of the information provided by the scheme managers (drawn from data provided to the 2014 LGPS (Scotland) funding valuations) as part of this exercise. Data collected for each employer includes: type of body; type of guarantor (Scottish Government, local authority, other, no guarantor); number of active members; open / closed membership status; related assets at 31/03/2014; related liabilities at 31/03/2014; related surplus / deficit at 31/03/2014; and any comments. Unless otherwise stated, assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit are reported in this report on an ongoing basis.

12. Two of the 11 scheme managers also provided data on a cessation basis. This dataset was analysed separately from the main dataset, using the same approach as set out in the Metrics section of this report.

13. All 11 scheme managers listed below have provided all of the information requested. The associated pension fund names are provided in parentheses.

- Glasgow City Council (Strathclyde Pension Fund)
- City of Edinburgh Council (Lothian Pension Fund)
- Aberdeen City Council (North East Scotland Pension Fund)
- Dundee City Council (Tayside Superannuation Fund)
- Scottish Borders Council (Scottish Borders Pension Fund)
- Dumfries and Galloway Council (Dumfries and Galloway Pension Fund)
- Falkirk Council (Falkirk Council Pension Fund)
- Fife Council (Fife Council Pension Fund)
- The Highland Council (Highland Council Pension Fund)
- Orkney Islands Council (Orkney Islands Pension Fund)
- Shetland Islands Council (Shetland Islands Pension Fund)

14. Individual data on assets and liabilities for some employers were not provided, as they are grouped with other employers for valuation purposes. There are instances where only the body type, guarantor status, number of active members, and open / closed status were provided for certain employers. The assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit amounts for these employers were included in the figures for another employer within the grouping.

15. In some cases, a group consists of different categories of employer, e.g., a group of three colleges where one is an admission body and the remaining two are scheduled bodies. In this example, individual surplus / deficit amounts were
provided for each of the three colleges, but the combined assets and liabilities were provided for the group. Any resulting impact on the figures when comparing admission body assets and liabilities with scheduled body assets and liabilities was not estimated as part of this analysis.

16. Data provided represents only one snapshot in time. Both the demographics and the funding position will have changed since 31 March 2014. For example, some employers have become exiting employers, while others have joined the scheme. Similarly, financial data (value of assets, liabilities, and surplus/deficit) will vary over time.

**Metrics - LGPS Scotland**

17. Based on the data submitted (as at 31 March 2014), there are 530 employers in the LGPS(S) with at least one active member. Of these, 422 are admission bodies, representing 80% of all employers in the dataset. The admission body category includes both Transferee Admission Bodies (TABs) and Community Admission Bodies (CABs) because not all scheme managers distinguished between the two when they provided data. The remaining 108 are scheduled bodies, including local authorities. Figure 1 shows the proportion of admission bodies to scheduled bodies.

![Figure 1: Proportion of admission bodies to scheduled bodies in the LGPS(S) as of 31 March 2014.](image)

18. While admission bodies make up 80% of employers within the LGPS(S), they have 17% of the 218,669 active members. In comparison, scheduled bodies have 83% of the active members. Local authorities have 74% of all active members (including councillor members, where reported separately) in the Scheme. The
data thus indicates that the majority of active members are employed by the local authorities.

19. Scheduled bodies are deemed to have the Scottish Government as guarantor. While there may not be a formal guarantee document, it is understood that they are underwritten by the Scottish Government. From 1 February 2013, all new admission bodies are required to provide some form of security, such as an indemnity or a bond, or to have a guarantor. In many scheme managers, pre-2013 admission bodies have been encouraged to seek alignment with another scheme employer or a guarantor. Based on the data, all admission bodies in one of the 11 pension funds now has a guarantor.

20. The data provided for admission bodies can be organised into nine different categories based on guarantor status (Table 1; Figure 2). Of the 422 admission bodies, 223 have no guarantor, representing 53% of admission bodies. Given that TABs have guarantors, it can be assumed that the admission bodies with no guarantor are CABs. The reverse cannot be assumed; not all admission bodies with a guarantor are TABs, as some CABs do have a guarantor. This is supported by the data, as some scheme managers did distinguish between TABs and CABs.

Table 1: Guarantor status for admission bodies in the LGPS(S) as of 31 March 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guarantor Type</th>
<th>Number of Admission Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government (SG)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority (LA)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority &amp; Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority &amp; Bond</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority for CAY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Guarantor</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>422</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. The admission bodies with no guarantor can be divided into those with five or fewer active members and those with more than five active members. The data shows that of the 223 admission bodies with no guarantor, 102 have five or fewer active members, representing 46% of admission bodies with no guarantor (Figure 3).

22. Data was also provided on the open/closed status of employers. Of the 102 admission bodies with no guarantor and fewer than five active members, 41 are closed to new members (40%), and 60 are open to new members (59%).
open/closed status was not provided for one of the 102 admission bodies with no guarantor (Figure 4).

23. Of the 121 admission bodies with no guarantor and more than five active members, 27 are closed to new members (22%), and 94 are open to new members (78%) (Figure 5).

24. Scheme regulations require that each administering authority prepare, maintain and publish a Funding Strategy Statement. While there is local variation among the 11 scheme managers, each administering authority will have
regard to CIPFA guidance and also the Management and Investment Regulations.

25. Scheme regulations also require that when an employer no longer has an active member contributing to the administering authority, that employer becomes an exiting employer. An exit payment for the employer will then be calculated. The regulations also allow an administering authority to adjust the contributions paid by an employer where, in the administering authority’s opinion, there are circumstances which make it likely that an employer will become an exiting employer.

26. Note that the regulations allow an administering authority to suspend an employer’s liability to pay an exit payment for a period of up to three years starting from the date when that employer would otherwise become an exiting employer, if in the reasonable opinion of the administering authority the employer is likely to have one or more active members contributing to the fund within the period specified in the suspension notice.

27. By way of example, one Pension Fund’s Funding Strategy Statement (March 2015) states the following:

“Overall the Fund adopts a long-term investment strategy, aiming to maximise the investment return within reasonable and considered risk parameters and hence minimise the cost to the employer.

However employers (with the exception of Transferee Admitted Bodies and employers admitted to the Fund following a transfer of members from another Fund employer and the ceding employer has agreed the employer should be treated as a Transferee Admission Body for funding purposes) who are closed to new members and have less than 5 active members, or are expected to leave the Fund within two valuation periods (6 years), will be assumed to be invested in lower-risk investments i.e. index-linked government bonds. This aims to reduce the degree of short-term change in employer contribution rates in the period prior to the employer leaving the Fund and hence manage risks for both the individual employer and for the Fund as a whole.”

28. Applying the above criteria (closed to new members and five or fewer active members) to the data provided by the 11 scheme managers for the current study provides an illustration of the proportion of employers that would be deemed at risk of becoming exiting employers. Scheme regulations require that where for any reason it is not possible to obtain all or part of the exit payment due from the exiting employer, or from an insurer, or any person providing an indemnity, bond or guarantee on behalf of the exiting employer, the exit payment debt will be passed on to and be paid by the aligned body in the case of an exiting TAB, or the remaining employers for any other type of exiting employer.
29. The data indicate that of the admission bodies with no guarantor that are closed to new members and have five or fewer active members, 40% are currently at risk of becoming an exiting employer (41 bodies out of 102). Expanding this to all of the admission bodies with no guarantor, 18% are at risk of becoming an exiting employer (41 bodies closed to new members and with five or fewer active members; 223 admission bodies with no guarantor).

30. The data therefore indicates that the majority of the risk still lies at some point in the future.

31. The assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit for admission bodies with no guarantor can be broken down based on whether the bodies have five or fewer active members and whether they are open or closed to new members (Table 2). The same data is shown graphically in Figure 6. These figures are on an ongoing basis, and represent the amounts that would fall to the aligned body or the remaining employers, as appropriate, if these admission bodies became exiting employers and were unable to pay their exit payment debts. It should be noted that exit payments are typically calculated on a cessation (gilts) basis and are significantly greater than those calculated on an ongoing basis.

Table 2: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit for admission bodies with no guarantor. Data is subdivided on the basis of number of active members (five or fewer, or more than five) and whether the body is open or closed to new members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assets (£000)</th>
<th>Liabilities (£000)</th>
<th>Surplus / Deficit (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>five or fewer, open</td>
<td>38011</td>
<td>37130</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five or fewer, closed</td>
<td>36993</td>
<td>37919</td>
<td>-926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five or fewer, unknown</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than five, open</td>
<td>1365783</td>
<td>1433452</td>
<td>-69205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 5, closed</td>
<td>356044</td>
<td>350366</td>
<td>5677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit for admission bodies with no guarantor. Data is subdivided on the basis of number of active members (five or fewer, or more than five) and whether the body is open or closed to new members.

32. For this subset of data (admission bodies with no guarantor), the largest figures are associated with employers that have more than five active members and are open to new members. The second highest figures are those for employers that have more than five active members and are closed to new members.

33. The surplus/deficit associated with the ‘at risk’ group (closed to new members, and five or fewer active members) is a deficit of £926,000.

34. The assets, liabilities, and surplus/deficit data for the Scheme as a whole can be subdivided based on guarantor status (Table 3; Figure 7). Of the 108 scheduled bodies, 33 of these represent local authorities. Data was not submitted for one of the 32 local authorities, and separate data was provided for councillors for two scheme managers, resulting in a total of 33.

Table 3: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit data for the Scheme as a whole based on employer type and guarantor status. Note that all scheduled bodies are deemed to have a guarantor (Scottish Government).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body Type &amp; Guarantor Status</th>
<th>Combined Assets (£000)</th>
<th>Combined Liabilities (£000)</th>
<th>Combined Surplus (Deficit) (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>618994</td>
<td>637375</td>
<td>-18381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>863079</td>
<td>852999</td>
<td>10080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>256098</td>
<td>260427</td>
<td>-4330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority &amp; Councillor</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit data for the Scheme as a whole based on body type and guarantor status.

35. The proportions shown in the above assets, liabilities, and surplus/deficit data are more clearly shown when graphed individually (Figures 8, 9, and 10).
Figure 8: Assets data for the Scheme as a whole based on body type and guarantor status.

Figure 9: Liabilities data for the Scheme as a whole based on body type and guarantor status.
The above table and figures show that the total surplus / deficit for admission bodies with no guarantor is a deficit of £63,005,000.

In comparison, the total surplus / deficit for admission bodies with a local authority guarantor is a surplus of £9,971,000. This is likely a reflection of the majority of these bodies being TABs, which typically have a different funding strategy relative to other types of employers within a fund.

The total surplus / deficit for local authority scheduled bodies is a deficit of £1,666,729,000. As noted earlier, local authorities account for 74% of all active members in the Scheme.

Two of the 11 scheme managers provided data on both an ongoing and a cessation basis. The same approach to data analysis was applied to this second dataset. Of the 223 employers, 186 are admission bodies (83%), and of these 186 admission bodies, 91 do not have a guarantor (49%). A total of 47 of the 91 admission bodies with no guarantor have five or fewer active members (52%), and 11 of these 47 are closed to new members (23%). The percentage of admission bodies with no guarantor that are closed to new members and have five or fewer active members is 12% (11 out of 91). These 11 represent the employers deemed at risk of becoming exiting employers. See Annex B for associated tables and figures.

Table 4 and Figure 11 show the impact of valuation basis on assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit, using all admission bodies with no guarantor as an example.
Table 4: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit data for admission bodies with no guarantor in two of the 11 pension funds. Data is presented on both an ongoing and a cessation basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation basis</th>
<th>Assets (£000)</th>
<th>Liabilities (£000)</th>
<th>Surplus / Deficit (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>769836</td>
<td>783407</td>
<td>-13573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessation</td>
<td>769836</td>
<td>1091387</td>
<td>-321551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit data for admission bodies with no guarantor in two of the 11 pension funds. Data is presented on both an ongoing and a cessation basis.

41. The assets remain the same, while the liabilities increase with the shift from an ongoing basis to a cessation (gilts) basis. This results in a greater deficit.

42. The figures for admission bodies with no guarantor, based on number of active members and open/closed status, are presented in Table 5 and Figure 12.

Table 5: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit data for admission bodies with no guarantor, based on number of active members and open/closed status. Data is presented on both an ongoing and a cessation basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation basis &amp; category of body</th>
<th>Assets (£000)</th>
<th>Liabilities (£000)</th>
<th>Surplus / Deficit (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing basis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or fewer, open</td>
<td>22281</td>
<td>20475</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or fewer, closed</td>
<td>9346</td>
<td>9213</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than five, open  504676  520207  -15531
More than five, closed  233534  233512  22

**Cessation basis**

Five or fewer, open  22281  28158  -5877
Five or fewer, closed  9346  12864  -3518
More than five, open  504676  733456  -228781
More than five, closed  233534  316909  -83375

Figure 12: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit data for admission bodies with no guarantor, based on number of active members and open/closed status. Data is presented on both and ongoing and a cessation basis.

43. The surplus / deficit figure for those admission bodies at risk of becoming exiting employers (five or fewer active members and closed to new members) on an ongoing basis is a surplus of £131,000. This becomes a deficit of £3,518,000 when a cessation basis is used.
Annex A

Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS)  
Exit Payment Valuations

Current Process

The LGPS regulations are flexible enough to allow for an exit payment to be calculated and applied on an ongoing basis and also for that debt to be paid back over time. Recent amendments to the regulations ensure that there are now additional flexibilities provided to scheme managers, within the LGPS regulations, which provide for parties to enter into an arrangement to manage exit payments over a reasonable period agreed by both parties.

Each administering authority is required by the regulations to publish a Funding Strategy Statement which sets out how pension liabilities will be met. Policies included within a funding strategy statement may include an admission policy for employers joining the fund, a bulk transfer policy, and a policy on employers leaving the fund. The administering authorities may also set out an appeals process to allow employers to negotiate an alternative funding strategy with the Pensions Committee if the published funding strategy would have the effect of placing the employer at risk of insolvency.

Risk Management

When an employer with no guarantor is unable to pay their exit payment upon leaving the scheme, the cost of contributions for employers remaining in the scheme may increase as a result of this loss of income. It is considered that employer insolvency does not ensure the necessary financing will be forthcoming from those insolvent employers to meet the liabilities assigned within LGPS funds to that employer.

As a result of increasing pensions contributions, some charitable bodies in the LGPS have already taken a decision that it has become unaffordable to continue to pay pensions contributions for their staff in the LGPS. When the employer ceases enrolling new members and therefore the fund loses this expected income, the administering authority regards that this action will eventually result in the body ceasing to be a scheme employer. Under the scheme regulations, the body thus becomes an exiting employer in relation to the relevant fund.

When a body ceases to be a scheme employer, the administering authority is required under the LGPS Regulations 2014 to instruct the Fund’s Actuary to carry out an actuarial valuation as at the exit date of the liabilities of the fund in respect of benefits in respect of the exiting employer’s current and former employees.
Actuaries will carry this out on a gilts basis, which is a more prudent basis than the ongoing basis used in regular triennial actuarial valuations. The estimated liability is then invested in a safe investment (i.e. government bonds or gilts) guaranteed to pay the full amount when members are due their pension benefits. The resulting Actuary’s report will identify the additional contributions, or exit payment, due to be paid by the employer to meet their obligations.

As set out in their 2015 Funding Strategy documents, one of the pension funds has adopted a cessation basis for any employer who is closed to new members and has five or fewer active members in the scheme. As a result, a number of employers, many of them charities are now faced with a steep rise in employer contributions which may risk their insolvency.

It is noted that some Third Sector organisations have argued that the scheme regulations are being applied disproportionately to a number of relatively small bodies resulting in a situation where some organisations cannot afford to remain in the scheme but also cannot afford to exit the scheme completely.

Request for Intervention

As a result of letters and meetings with Third Sector bodies, on 21 August, Mr Swinney formally directed the Scheme Advisory Board (SAB) to provide recommendations on this issue as an early priority. Accordingly, the SAB considered this matter at their meeting on 27th August 2015. The Joint Secretaries supporting the SAB liaised with employer representatives and provided the SAB with a paper outlining the concerns of those bodies.

Councillor Cree wrote on behalf of the SAB to Mr Swinney on 3 September suggesting amendments to the regulations to allow the scheme managers greater flexibility when agreeing payment of cessation liabilities. A letter of comfort was provided to scheme managers from Mr Swinney which allowed them to act as if these regulatory changes were already in force. These changes were included in draft amendment regulations which were laid in the Scottish Parliament on 21 December 2015.

This change to the regulations gives scheme managers more discretion on how they approach funding valuations with charitable bodies. Although this change provides some further discretion to scheme managers, the SPPA do not anticipate that this will resolve the issue.

Most of the LGPS funds are working with their employers to avoid precipitating a cessation event if at all possible. This can involve an employer admitting a new member to the scheme to avoid a cessation event. This does not solve the problem but it does give the SAB some time to work out the extent of the problem and to provide advice to Mr Swinney.

In October Mr Swinney wrote to the SAB to say that there was limited knowledge in the SAB and amongst the LGPS community of the scale and impact of cessation
funding issues on affected bodies and the pension scheme. Consequently, he asked the SAB to carry out detailed research into this issue in Scotland.

As a result of the advice from the SAB, the Scottish Government will consider whether there is a need for further policy guidance to be issued.
Annex B

Part 1

Tables and figures not already presented, for all 11 scheme managers, ongoing basis

Table A1: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit for admission bodies with no guarantor. Data is subdivided on the basis of number of active members (five or fewer, or more than five).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assets (£000)</th>
<th>Liabilities (£000)</th>
<th>Surplus / Deficit (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>five or fewer</td>
<td>75385</td>
<td>75430</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 5</td>
<td>1721827</td>
<td>1783818</td>
<td>-63528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A1: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit for admission bodies with no guarantor. Data is subdivided on the basis of number of active members (five or fewer, or more than five).

Part 2

Tables and figures for two of the 11 scheme managers, on both an ongoing and a cessation basis.
Figure A2: Proportion of admission bodies and scheduled bodies in two of the 11 scheme managers as of 31 March 2014.

Table A2: Guarantor status for admission bodies in two of the 11 scheme managers as of 31 March 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guarantor Type</th>
<th>Number of Admission Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government (SG)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority (LA)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority for CAY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Guarantor</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A3: Guarantor status for admission bodies in two of the 11 scheme managers as of 31 March 2014.

Figure A4: Proportion of admission bodies with no guarantor and five or fewer active members by open/closed status in two of the 11 scheme managers as of 31 March 2014.
Figure A5: Proportion of admission bodies with no guarantor and more than five active members by open/closed status in two of the 11 scheme managers as of 31 March 2014.

Table A3: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit for admission bodies with no guarantor in two of the 11 scheme managers as of 31 March 2014. Data is subdivided on the basis of number of active members (five or fewer, or more than five), and presented on both an ongoing and a cessation basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation basis &amp; category of body</th>
<th>Assets (£000)</th>
<th>Liabilities (£000)</th>
<th>Surplus / Deficit (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing basis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or fewer</td>
<td>31627</td>
<td>29689</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five</td>
<td>738209</td>
<td>753718</td>
<td>-15509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cessation basis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or fewer</td>
<td>31627</td>
<td>41022</td>
<td>-9395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five</td>
<td>738209</td>
<td>1050365</td>
<td>-312156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A6: Assets, liabilities, and surplus / deficit for admission bodies with no guarantor in two of the 11 scheme managers as of 31 March 2014. Data is subdivided on the basis of number of active members (five or fewer, or more than five), and presented on both an ongoing and a cessation basis.