Presentation Title 1

	7
Compliance Berjam	
Compliance Review	
GIRO / CAS Convention 2001	-
Paul Duffy - Bill McConnell - John Ryan	
Thursday 4 October 2001	
	7
Compliance Review	
■ The Actuarial Profession's approach to compliance	
review	
■ The Lloyd's perspective	
How can peer review help improve the quality of the product	
■ What is the proposed process?	
■ Who should be able to undertake peer review	
■ What are the responsibilities of a peer reviewer	
■ Should a peer reviewer be from an independent firm	
■ The Irish perspective	
CICLEENT Physical Pool on the Company of the Compan	
	-
	_
How Peer Review assist the Process	
■ A Second pair of eyes.	
■ Greater consistency of Standards	
■ Encourages documentation of the process	
■ Subjective Judgement becomes more objective	
■ Broader Range of Experience	
■ Helps identify what you don't know	
Q:CLIENTVRywn.PP:200 ftp:0409ah.ppt	

Consultant's Name 05 November 2001

Presentation Title 2

The Actuarial Profession's approach to compliance review
■ All Statutory Opinions will require Peer Review
- 7 in statutory opinions will require 1 set it eview
■ Lloyd's Opinions & Friendly Societies will require Peel Review
■ Overseas Opinions will not initially require Peer Review unless there is an overseas requirement
■ The individual Practice Boards are managing the process subject to review by the Professional Affairs Board
-
Lloyd's View
■ In general Lloyd's agrees with principle
■ Any proposals must be fair & practical
- Treatment of similar organisations
 -Must not discourage managing agents employing in- house actuaries
-Should not involve large increase in costs
-Fit in with existing timetable
■ Actuaries lining own pockets
Review of peer reviewer
■ Current position on reviews
■ In-house peer review
■ Auditors actuaries / peer review
The Proposed Process
<u>'</u>
■ For Consultancies & Audit firms there will be an overall review of their processes.
■ This will likely be carried out by Lloyd's
■ It will be necessary to ensure that this is a distinct process to the Audit Process
It is suggested that this should be carried out by someone in an independent organization for In-House Actuaries.
It is not anticipated that this will be a major addition to
It is not anticipated that this will be a major addition to

Consultant's Name 05 November 2001

■ The process is subject to consultation

Presentation Title 3

Who
■ Should the Peer Reviewer be from an independent firm?
■ Is the answer different for a large consultancy to inhouse actuaries?
■ What should be the relationship with the auditor & audit support actuaries?
■ The peer reviewer must hold a Practice Certificate
C) CLEST Rynal 2001 y Gettin put
What are the responsibilities of the Peer Reviewer
■ Not to express an independent view of the reserves
■ Must be comfortable with material assumptions & methodology or at least it gives similar results
■ Not responsible for checking the arithmetic
■ Should check results for reasonableness
■ Applies to the results as a whole & not the individual parts
■ Should review the documentation process

■ What else?

Consultant's Name 05 November 2001