RE: please advise

From: "Petsche, Nadine (TBS)" <nadine.petsche@ontario.ca>
To: "Veinot, Cindy (TBS)" <cindy.veinot@ontario.ca>
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2016 10:38:51 -0400

Also sent to PwC

From: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Sent: September 19, 2016 10:31 AM
To: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Subject: RE: please advise

Perfect – exactly what I was looking for. Can you eliminate the outstanding question at the end of the document re: the Asset Project and send to Deloitte ASAP.

Thanks,

From: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Sent: September-19-16 10:27 AM
To: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Subject: FW: please advise

From: Keates, James (TBS)
Sent: September 19, 2016 10:22 AM
To: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Subject: RE: please advise

Hello Nadine, here is the draft – is this what you are looking for? I am going to start looking at the Asset project question you have asked now.
Jim

Jim Keates, MBA, CPA, CA
Office of the Provincial Controller Division | Treasury Board Secretariat
2nd Floor Frost South, Toronto
james.keates@ontario.ca | 416 327-2721

From: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2016 8:00 PM
To: Jim Keates; Keates, James (TBS)
Cc: Provis, Ian (TBS)
Subject: RE: please advise
Importance: High

Hi Jim.

We have a follow up request on the same subject…

Can you please document the similarities between government partnership criteria and JSPP definition in 3250. Specifically, we need an analysis of how a JSPP fits into the government

partnership section. Please include reference to the analysis you've already provided (re: no scope exclusion which would have been contemplated when 3250 was updated). Can you also see if you can find out what if any research was done in connection with the newly issued Assets section as it doesn't reference shared control and it would be interesting to find out why given the proportional consolidation model in the gov't partnership section.
Thanks in advance.
N
P.S. Please let me know how soon you can complete this item as it is quite urgent.

From: Jim Keates [mailto:jimkeates@hotmail.com]
Sent: September-17-16 11:03 AM
To: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Cc: Provis, Ian (TBS)
Subject: Re: please advise

Nadine, thanks for the clarification.
3060 was issued in 1999 and 3250 was issued in 2001. Both standards were issued before the introduction of Basis for Conclusion documents.
Both standards use similar wording in the definitions of a government partnership in 3060.06 and of a Joint Defined Benefit Plan in the glossary to 3250 showing the development of 3250 considered 3060.
At the time of approval of 3250, the Board would have had the option to make a consequential amendment to 3060 to scope out JDPP if they felt the more specific standard (3250) conflicted with the general standard (3060). They did not which would suggest the Board felt both the general and specific standards were applicable for JDPP.
Because 3060 is a general standard for all types of government partnerships, it would not be typical to try and mention all the types of government partnerships covered by the standard such as JDPP. A list of types of government partnerships would always be incomplete and changing. The standard is meant to be more principle based.
I hope this provides some assistance.
Jim

From: Petsche, Nadine (TBS) <Nadine.Petsche@ontario.ca>
Sent: September 17, 2016 7:56:55 AM
To: Jim Keates (jimkeates@hotmail.com)
Cc: Provis, Ian (TBS)
Subject: FW: please advise

Jim,
Thanks for your quick response. To clarify, we're not talking about a situation with the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan where employees jointly manage the plan with the government, but rather a situation of a jointly sponsored pension plan with shared control and risk taking.
We think that the section should rationally apply to JSPPs such as the OTPP, so we're curious as to why the standard doesn't specifically mention jointly sponsored pension plans (as defined in 3250) or alternatively, explicitly exclude them as defined in 3250 in the scope exemption section of the government partnerships standard?

Can you please give this some thought.
Thanks!
N

From: Jim Keates <jimkeates@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2016 10:45 PM
To: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Cc: Provis, Ian (TBS)
Subject: Re: please advise

Hi Nadine, I am not sure I am answering your question but footnote 3 referenced in paragraph 3060.06 (paragraph .06 is defining a government partnership) is indicating that the joint management for example of a pension plan by the government with its employees does not make the pension plan by itself a government partnership.
The employees are not considered to be a partner for purposes of the government partnership definition and a government partnership is an arrangement between two or more partners.
Jim

From: Petsche, Nadine (TBS) <Nadine.Petsche@ontario.ca>
Sent: September 16, 2016 9:25:03 PM
To: Jim Keates (jimkeates@hotmail.com)
Cc: Provis, Ian (TBS)
Subject: please advise

Rush request…

Jim,
Can you please review the attached and advise w.r.t. your interpretation of this guidance on jointly sponsored pension plans. The footnote in reference to 3060.06 (#3) is what is in question. For the OTPP for example, where the OTF situation does not involve employees acting as management of the plan, we're not sure of the applicability of the footnote. Our assumption is that the guidance might be applicable to the situation of joint sponsored defined benefit plans, but would appreciate your thoughts.
Thanks in advance.
Nadine