# MORTALITY ASSUMPTION METHODOLOGIES IN PENSIONS WORKING PARTY

**Terms of Reference**

**Purpose:**

To identify and investigate public interest issues relating to mortality assumption setting methodologies in relation to defined benefit pension schemes. To include traditional (“postcode”) and more innovative techniques (such as use of Medically Underwritten Mortality Studies (MUMS)).

# Key responsibilities:

1. To identify what key public interest risks, if any, exist in relation to the use of traditional and innovative techniques.
2. To consider and provide recommendations to the Regulation Board as to what appropriate steps, if any, might be taken by the IFoA to (1) support members and (2) mitigate such risks.
3. To consider, in particular:

* 1. The benefits and limitations of traditional approaches such as the postcode model.
  2. The benefits and limitations of more innovative approaches such as MUMS.
  3. The extent to which the use of MUMS techniques in insurance are appropriately transferrable to a pensions context.
  4. Whether or not there are any specific risks associated with the use of traditional and innovative approaches in combination.

1. To make recommendations to the Regulation Board on the appropriateness of producing guidance, educational material etc for the purposes of raising awareness of the issues considered by the working party.
2. To take account of appropriately diverse perspectives and experience on these issues, including from practitioners experienced in the use of different approaches, relevant industry and academic knowledge and expertise, other regulators.

# Membership:

Chair: Andy Rear

Executive Support: Kirsten Mavor

Members: Deborah Cooper, Madhavi Bajekal, Matt Collinson, Matthew Fletcher, Stephen Caine, Steven Baxter, Stuart McDonald