The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the future

IFRS v Solvency II GIRO Workshop, 8 October 2009

Agenda

- Introduction
- The working party
- The paper
- Discussion

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the fut

Introduction

- Background to issues
- Why a working party?



The working party

- Terms of reference
- Current membership
- Meetings held



Help to understand an accountant's perspective on the principles of accounting as applied to GI firms

- Existing UK GAAP, SORP and IFRS Phase I (IFRS 4);
 Proposed IFRS (Phase II)

Compare and contrast to evolving FSA and Solvency II requirements Challenge and appraise proposed IFRS and SII in terms of the following:

Policyholder protection

· Effectiveness of financial reporting for the purposes of shareholders Managing the business, including links with ERM

Influence external thinking through identifying other opportunities to communicate our ideas to
 The actuarial profession / GIRO / External bodies

The Actuarial Pro

The Actuarial Profess

Working party - Current membership

- Profession:
 - Martin White
 - David Sanders
 - Sarwar Grami
 - Shailesh Malde
 - Shreyas Shah
 - John Charles
 - Paul Cook
 - David Simmons (FSA)

Others:

- Paul Klumpes (Chair)
- Andres Reibel (ICL)
- Wendy Hawes (Shadow)

The Actuarial Profession

Working party - Meetings held

1. October 24

- November 11
 December 4
- December 4
 January 15
- January 15
 February 5
- 6. March 18
- 7. April 23
- 8. May 14
- 9. June 11
- 10. July 15 & 28



The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the fu

What we put in our paper

- 1. Introduction
- 2. General insurance valuation principles
- 3. Alternative perspectives on Solvency II
- 4. Alternative perspectives on IFRS phase 2
- 5. The IASB's proposals for IFRS phase 2
- 6. Unresolved issues in insurance accounting
- 7. Conclusion



1. Introduction

- How to reflect risk in published financial statements
 Consistency with non-insurance transactions
- IFRS phase 1 w.e.f. 1.1.2005
- IFRS phase 2: fair value
- Multiple purposes of accounts
 - Stewardship
 - Performance / Efficiency,
 - Conservative valuation

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the futur

2. General insurance valuation principles

- SAP and GAAP (economic profit basis)
- SAR and GAAR (BCONDING Profile Dasis)
 Earned premiums
 Incurred dosses
 Different treatment of acquisition expenses
 Consistency with non-insurance transactions
 IFRS: ASM = [EP (LP + APVL') (E/WP)EP D] T + IG'
 ED correct premiums IFRS: ∆SM = [EP – (LP + ∆PVL') – (E/WP)EP – D] – T + IG'
 EP = earned premiums
 LP = paid losses
 PVL' = present value unpaid earned claims
 E/WP = underwriting expense ratio
 D = policyholder dividends
 T = income taxes
 IG' = investment income + realized and unrealized capital gains

- 3. Alternative perspectives on Solvency II 4. Alternative perspectives on IFRS 2
- Policyholder protection •
- Shareholders' perspective
- Management perspective

The Actuarial Profession making financial server of the

The Actuarial Profess

Policyholder protection - Solvency II vs IFRS

| | Solvency II | | IFRS | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|-----|
| Objective | Policyholder protection - prudence | +ve | Shareholder reporting - realistic | -ve |
| Capital Req. | Stronger than past regime | +ve | NA | -ve |
| Risk mgmt. | massive focus; ORSA | +ve | NA | -ve |

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the future

Policyholder protection – Solvency II vs IFRS

| | Solvency II | | IFRS | |
|-----------------------|---|-----|-------------------------------|-----|
| Quality of Capital | Quality-based tiers 1-3: basic & ancillary | +ve | No distinction | -ve |
| Compar- ability | Applicable to all insurance entities | +ve | Only publicly quoted entities | -ve |
| Valuation | Fair value (= exit value); Marked to market (where possible) | +ve | Fair Value (= exit value) | +ve |

Policyholder protection – Solvency II vs IFRS

| | Risk free rate (CP 40) | +ve | | |
|--------------|--|-----|---|-----|
| | or Replicating ortfolios | +ve | Asset-based rates not prohibited (?) | -ve |
| Margin ex | Cost of Capital model; extensive guidance <i>CP 42</i>) | +ve | Market view of risk; comparability issues | +/- |
| Equalist. al | SCR component; not allowed in tech provision | +ve | Not allowed in tech prov; (doesn't require but also no prohibition on using other means e.g. ret. profits, RBC) | -ve |

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the future

The Actuarial Professi maidoo financial sense o

Policyholder protection – Solvency II vs IFRS

| | Solvency II | | IFRS | |
|------------|---|-----|---|-----|
| Goodwill | Valued at 'nil' (CP35) | +ve | Recognised in business acquisition | -ve |
| Intangible | Valued at 'nil' if can't be fair-valued <i>else</i> <i>IAS38 (CP35)</i> | +ve | IAS38: reliable cost measurement; probable future benefits | |
| Property | Investment: IAS 40 (FV only) | -ve | Investment: IAS40 (cost or FV) | -ve |
| | Occupied: revaluation (IAS16): 3-yr external | | Occupied: IAS16 Comparability issues | |

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the fu



Policyholder protection – Solvency II vs IFRS

| | Solvency II | | IFRS | |
|-------------------------|---|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|
| Own credit rating | Ignored | +ve | Recognised | -ve |
| Profit on sale | discount > risk margin; (UEP vs pre-claims liability) | -ve | Net gain, subj. to market evidence | -ve |

Shareholders' perspective

- Volatility of reporting
- The impact of the Underwriting/Reserving cycles
- Range of best estimates
- Reporting framework and disclosures
- Measurement issues
- Stewardship

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the fut

The Actuarial Profess

Managing the business

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the futur

5. IASB Proposal for IFRS Phase II

- Issues Paper 1999 & DSOP by IASB Steering . Committee
 - Diversity in global insurance accounting practice .
 - None in line with what the Committee envisaged
 - Assumed IAS39 to be replaced by full FV basis Problem: no liquid active secondary market for insurance liabilities

 - Deferral and matching approach ruled out Defeural and matching approach ruled out Deductive methodology also not feasible MV(liabilities) = MV(Assets) Surplus, but surplus is hard to measure consistently, particularly as regards potential impact of options and guarantees

| 6. | Unresolved Issues in Insurance |
|----|--------------------------------|
| | Accounting |

- IASB DP 2007 .
 - Insurance contracts = Financial instruments?
 - Fair Value appropriate for insurance liabilities?
 - Volatility?
 - How to apply Fair Value?
 - Fair Value of Intangibles?
 - Individual contracts or Group of contracts?
 - FV should be at group level
 - Credit risk: entry value or exit value?
 - Entry value if no valid market info available?

The Actuarial Professio

The Actuarial Profe

7. Conclusion

- Can split out fair value balance sheet to show component sources of credit, market and business risk
- Risk disclosures can overcome mismatch between economic and accounting performance measurement of these fair value components
- .
- components IFRS4 disclosures: amounts in financial statements and the amount, timing and uncertainty of future cash flow Can go further and identify areas of risk allocation, e.g. operational risk and information about internal risk models, that are not generally covered by a fair value reporting system Rayman (2006) proposed new conceptual dual valuation framework that can address the various multiple roles served by general insurance actuaries in both valuation and accountability contexts

The Actuarial Profession

Discussion

