

Notes of a meeting of the AAE Board and Committee Chairs
8 March 2023 | 13:05 – 15:30 CEST

Participants:

Lutz Wilhelmy	LW	Chairperson
Giampaolo Crenca	GC	Vice-chairperson
Mária Kamenárová	MKam	Immediate Past Chairperson
Philippe Demol	PD	Board member
Inga Helmane	IH	Board member
Matthias Pillaudin	MP	Board member (left at 14:00, rejoined at 14:45)
Kartina Thomson	KT	Board member (joined until 14:00)
Frank Schiller	FS	Board member
Jette Lunding Sandqvist	JLS	Board member
Malcolm Kemp	MKe	Chairperson RMC
Christophe Heck	CH	Chairperson ProfC (joined until 14:55)
Lauri Saraste	LS	Chairperson IC
Tatiana Bitunska	TB	Chairperson PC
Henning Wergen	HW	Chairperson EC (joined until 14.15)
Siegbert Baldauf	SB	SII Project Manager
Monique Schuilenburg	MSch	Operations Manager
Annette Aragones	AA	Operations Assistant

1.	Opening of the meeting approval of agenda. Lutz informed the Board that he is recovering from Covid and that he asked Giampaolo to lead the meeting. The agenda was adopted.
2.	Minutes of the Board meeting of 8 February 2023 The minutes of the Board meeting of 8 February 2023 were approved with the addition to rephrase at 5.2: 'Tatiana left it open, but we must take into account that she might not be able to continue with the second term as a Chair of PC, but she will continue to support all activities of PC.'
3.	Urgent Committee issues What is the issue: To receive an update on committee and board WG issues <u>that require the Board's immediate attention.</u> 1. Professionalism Christophe mentioned that there are no major topics to report. ProfC is working on the survey on the Proper part and on finding volunteers for the new TF on Member engagement.

	<p>2. Risk Management</p> <p>Malcolm reported that there is not much to report. A paper on inflation risk is in preparation and will probably be presented in Bratislava. There are many working on several topics, but nothing in the stage that it can be shared.</p> <p>3. Insurance</p> <p>a. To approve the ToR (1) and the workplan (2) of the Economics & Finance Cross-Functional Working Group (new transverse (L)IR WG)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Lauri explained the ToR, as well as that the same people and chairperson will be used. The idea would be on the governance to first report to the Insurance Committee, acknowledging that it will serve the needs of RMC and PC. The ToR were extensively discussed within the 3 committees. ii. Giampaolo added that he agreed that this set up is the best, but we need to monitor developments. iii. Malcolm added that this may be a slightly different way of doing things in terms of governance. Sam is enthusiastic and it would be great to keep him and the members on board. iv. Mária asked how this will work in terms of scope/alignment. The accountability and who will be responsible for what. Should we make the project more lean and focused? v. Frank asked: we had an investment committee until 5 years ago and there were not enough topics to address. Adding to Mária's questions. vi. Frank asked: on liquidity risk management, I wonder if this should this not be in RMC. vii. Mária said: these seem to be all risk management topics. viii. Lauri responded that we have experts in the Interest Rate WG, when we talk about and deal with these topics it is good to have experts working under this umbrella on it. Look at the way we communicate. He is in support of this idea that would benefit all committees. ix. Matthias: concerning Liquidity the WG should focus on the lapse risk instead of contracts. Maybe it is the question behind it. x. Tatiana: in response to Frank. In the period of the IFR committee, there were not enough experts in this area and therefore they could not fulfil their tasks. Fully support this type of WG with experts and interest in this area. Their work could fit best the interest of the 3 committees. This working structure was established with the support of the experts and to build on this. The 3 committees will be clients of the work of this WG. xi. Malcolm said that if it would help to report to RMC then we can discuss with Sam. Although Sam has an strong insurance back ground. xii. Mária: this would be financial risk management, important for insurance, but would support a WG of RMC. There seemed to be differences in the content in the ToR and supporting slides. xiii. Lutz added that the ToR are very wide, and the supporting slides provide concrete details. Approach it pragmatically. It is important
--	--

	<p>that our volunteers feel supported and the topics they are proposing are important and valid. We should give it a frame, if we come to the conclusion that it is better to report to RMC. It is important that this is a joint effort. The risks materialise in insurance products. He suggested that Tatiana, Lauri and Malcolm take it up with Sam to report to RMC.</p> <p>xiv. Frank agreed with the approach, it is more forming an organisation around the expert volunteers, and we have to provide output. From the projects described these could result in deliveries. The organization is less important as long as Lauri, Tatiana and Malcolm are OK with it. Perhaps rephrase the scope to be a bit clearer, that could potentially extend the group of experts.</p> <p>xv. Mária agreed with Frank and Lutz, and supported and agreed to clarify the scope. How will this influence existing WGs?</p> <p>xvi. Lutz responded that such a group would be an ideal instrument where we can address such questions in a collaborative form, be more precise in the ToR, but we should not be too narrow.</p> <p>xvii. Malcolm: the question is how do we navigate around the focus on risk topics under the current structure.</p> <p>xviii. Lauri – we had a problem of clarity in the LIR WG in the past, and this is the moment to get more focus. We would benefit of having such a group. There is indeed a clear risk management angle.</p> <p>xix. It was agreed that Lauri will have a call with Sam (with Tatiana and Malcolm), after which the revised ToR will be presented to the Board in a next Board meeting.</p> <p>4. Pensions</p> <p>a. To approve the ToR for the IORP II Directive Review TF Tatiana explained that EIOPA launched the consultation on Friday 3 March. The draft version shared earlier was adapted accordingly. The TF has 7 members, chaired by Philip Shier. The ToR were approved.</p> <p>5. Education</p> <p>a. Status update syllabus assessment – process in case of not responding Henning reported that an update from Greece was received. No update received from Cyprus and Turkey. The process leads us to write a letter to the association to establish a contact, see red box on slide 4. Henning, Lutz, Monique to prepare letters.</p> <p>6. Artificial intelligence and data science working group</p> <p>a. update on the data challenge – there is a party that is interested, written confirmation is pending.</p>
--	--

4.	<p>Update on important business topics</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update from Advisory panel. Communication on the Swedish Presidency is ongoing. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Meetings with stakeholders Folder in Teams: 01 Meetings with stakeholders b. To discuss and prepare for upcoming meetings: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. 13 March – DG FISMA Didier Millerot – material to be finalised on 9 March. ii. 27 March – Insurance Europe – prep call scheduled for 17 March. c. Follow-up EIOPA meeting Follow up meetings will be arranged separately for the topics marked in green in the attachment. With the next meeting with EIOPA scheduled on 3 July in Frankfurt, the aim is to make progress on the green topics before this meeting, and if possible also on the yellow topics, but that depends on mutual availability. Lauri mentioned the Consumer Trends report and suggested to also pick up on that topic. 2. Update from the Communications Panel <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. To discuss the proposal on ‘Communications Expert’ Inga shared the slides and emphasised that it is the intention to not only have a discussion but also a decision today (see last slide). ii. Giampaolo added that this presentation is the result of intense discussions. iii. Lauri mentioned that he is in support of the communication angle. He asked about the identified needs, what we do might be really technical, it might require special skills in terms of (actuarial) background. iv. Inga responded that any lobbying is out of scope for this person. We would communicate with stakeholders, language is already covered in the communication strategy. We have the checklist where we included how a specific will be communicated. We are looking not at just one specific topic, but more the wider communication as such. Our priority list is already quite long and in terms of communication this requires the right approach. From statistical data we analyze how our messages are read. Unfortunately we see that we wanted these message to be read on higher level and where the expert would help us. v. Mária – communication is something we should support. Congratulations to CommP, we are in a good place now, a lot of work has been done. We have to understand that Giampaolo and Inga will leave CommP soon. From this point of view we have to think of continuity and how to support it. From this point we acknowledge the need of capacity. Preference to option B or C. But the expectations are the biggest concern. vi. Lutz suggested to try it with option C. Neither option B and C entail a long term commitment. We would do some tests, and if we are happy with the service level. If we are not happy we can reconsider.
----	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vii. Giampaolo – the main reason is to raise the level of quality and quantity of communication. Option C would be his preferred option. His experience in a local level is good, but we are looking for European level. viii. Matthias proposed to come back to CommP to consider the options in terms of budget available. (In the meantime, Matthias confirmed that there is budget allocated for strategic initiatives and as such to go forward). ix. A conditional decision was agreed for option C, subject to financial feasibility. After the meeting Matthias confirmed that the budget is available. <p>3. Consultations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. to assign reviewers to outstanding consultations Philippe and Frank volunteered to review the IORP consultation.
5.	<p>Priorities and strategic topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jette was assigned as sponsor to various topics after discussions with Lutz. 2. Feedback from sponsors with committee chairs on what should be delivered, how to communicate, and when to deliver the deliverables – will be discussed in a separate meeting on 27-28 March 2023. The idea is have transparency.
6.	<p>Presidents' Meeting 16 February 2023</p> <p>Giampaolo shared that the participation was good, not just attendance but also in terms of commitment. The breakout sessions contained lively discussions. The Presidents Corner was also interesting and of added value, well lead by Inga.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow-up actions Effective Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Matthias shared the slides and mentioned the strong support for effective support. He mentioned the polls conducted during the meeting of which the results will provide input for the profile. On the budget side, more clarification would be needed. b. For the next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. proposal for job description ready before summertime (Matthias, Monique, HR expert?) ii. For the budget implications – to be presented to the Board in June in Zurich in order to prepare for the GA in October where we will discuss the annual fee for 2025. The next steps were approved.

6.	<p>2. Follow-up actions European Brand (Mária)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mária explained the feedback of the Presidents, noting that in group 1 there was positive feedback, but in group 2 there was some more critical feedback. The Presidents wanted to go for voluntary basis as some associations already have a title. Understood from the Presidents meeting is that we can go ahead but we should do a test phase. What would be the acceptance on a voluntary basis and to measure the impact. We should listen to their concerns, be ready to explain and to reach a common understanding. How to manage the governance is also a question. b. Giampaolo shared that he supports the idea. c. Matthias asked about the goal to have this brand. d. Mária responded that by having a logo it should be clear that this is a protective brand. FQAs can only use it if their MA adopts this brand. This is not a legal role. We would give a certificate that they are meeting the MRA requirements. There is no political appetite for this title. What we can do is to promote the brand. e. Mária shared that some associations do not have appetite to use the official branding, and remains voluntary, and therefore cannot be made mandatory. This would create 2 groups, those who are accredited, and those who are not. f. Philippe Demol: If the local association decides not to use the brand, and I use the brand anyway – what happens? g. Maria: it would be the duty of the local association as the ethical code of conduct remains, you could not use what you are not entitled to. h. Lutz: the AAE has no relation to any individual member and can therefore not interfere. It must be dealt with on a local level. i. Matthias: in order to achieve the first goal, we have to be mandatory to provide a singular message to the external world. j. Philippe agreed, for all actuaries to be on the same level. k. Mária: Currently, we propose non-mandatory, as we do not have the support today. l. Lutz: we've heard both sides of the argument, and we should go back to those associations struggling with the mandatory option and discuss how to overcome this. m. Lutz asked if it is feasible to get feedback from the associations that shared concerns before the Bratislava meeting. n. Maria proposed to create a task Force (see attachment), under the responsibility of the ProfC and for a period of 2 years. o. It was agreed to create a task force, the ToR were approved.
----	--

7.	<p>Events</p> <p>1. AAE webinars and roundtables Monique shared the slides and raised the option to organise a ‘regular’ webinar on 21 June, now that the Forum has been postponed until 2 November. Philippe and Tatiana mentioned that this could potentially be a slot for the Pensions Committee on the topic of the IORPII Directive Review. On the roundtable the topic of ELD was suggested. Lauri shared that June may be too soon and would like to await also the meeting with Didier Millerot and the follow-up in small circle with EIOPA. But keep the idea for roundtable in autumn.</p> <p>2. EAD 2023 Henning referred to the slides and mentioned that we have a great number of registrations already. We have one confirmed sponsor. The CommChairs shared the Call for Papers of which the deadline ends on 15 March. The outline of the programme was approved and keynote speakers will be contacted.</p> <p>3. Social Security Forum This topic was just briefly discussed, where it was noted that the Forum was postponed until 2 November. Further details to be shared in the next meeting.</p> <p>4. ECA 2024 Kartina shared that another steering committee meeting took place. Everything is on track. We discussed the sponsoring concept and making sure there is alignment of expectations. Currently busy to have physical review of 3 potential venues, by Giampaolo, Henning and Martin early April. To further report to the Board in the April meeting.</p>
8.	<p>Hosts AAE Spring and Annual Meetings 2024 and onwards</p> <p>Issue: To decide on format and hosts Spring and Annual Meetings from 2024.</p> <p>It was agreed to call for tenders for an in-person 2024 spring meeting, allowing presenters to committees to present virtually. Side-meetings, e.g., of working groups, could be offered hybrid.</p>
9.	<p>AAE Office situation</p> <p>Issue: To receive an oral update on the Brussels office situation Philippe Demol informed the Board that more will be known in the next week(s). Several options are at the table and the IA BE Board will share their proposal as soon as it is available.</p>
10.	<p>Report AAE Secretariat</p> <p>Mária shared that her association is progressing on the arrangements for the Spring Meetings to give a warm welcome to all travelling to Bratislava. She will share the various venues (lunch, meeting Board).</p>

11.	Topics for agenda next Board meetings What is the issue: To identify the topics for the agenda of the next Board meeting Next meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extra Board meetings on 27 and 28 March to discuss feedback of sponsors to priority topics.
12.	Any other business No issues were raised.
13.	Backlog topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance process one-pagers/positions/discussion papers

Appendix

	Future meetings / conference calls: 13:05 – 15:30 CE(S)T on the second Wednesday of every month unless shown otherwise
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 27 and 28 March 2023 – 10:00-11:30 (attendance at least at one of these meetings) 19 April 2023 – Bratislava, 14:00-17:00 17 May 2023 Thu 15 June 2023 – Zurich, 09:00-16:00 5 July 2023 13 September 2023 4 October 2023 – Cologne, 14:00-17:00

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS/DECISIONS:

Insurance Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ToR new WG Economics and Finance CF: It was agreed that Lauri will have a call with Sam (with Tatiana and Malcolm), after which the revised ToR will be presented to the Board in a next Board meeting. 	Lauri, Tatiana, Malcolm
Pensions Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ToR IORP II Directive Review were approved 	
Education Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To prepare letters to send to Cyprus and Turkey regarding non-responsiveness on education assessment. 	Henning, Lutz, Monique
EAD 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The outline of the programme was approved. Speakers can be invited. 	CommP
Follow-up EIOPA meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To schedule separate meetings for green topics (see slides). 	Monique
Communications Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A conditional decision was agreed for option C, subject to financial feasibility. 	CommP
Consultations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Philippe and Frank volunteered to review the IORP II Directive Review on behalf of the Board. 	Philippe, Frank

Follow-up actions Effective Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next steps (job description before summer and budget implications before June Board meeting) were approved. 	Matthias, Monique
European Actuary Brand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was agreed to create a task force, the ToR were approved. 	