ACTUARIAL ASSOCIATION OF EUROPE
ASSOCIATION ACTUARIELLE EUROPÉENNE

1 PLACE DU SAMEDI
B-1000 BRUSSELS, BELGIUM
(+32) 2 201 60 21
INFO@ACTUARY.EU
WWW.ACTUARY.EU

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PROFESSIONALISM COMMITTEE

HELD IN UTRECHT, THE NETHERLANDS

ON FRIDAY 21 SEPTEMBER 2018

The participants list is attached as **Annex 0.1** at the end of these minutes.

1. **OPENING OF MEETING AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**
David Martin, the Chairperson, opened the meeting and thanked the Dutch association for their hospitality. David welcome all to the meeting and asked for a short personal introduction of each delegate and observer.
No matters of confidential nature were raised.

2. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR PERSON AND NOMINATION OF NEXT CHAIRPERSON**
The chairperson welcomed Birgit Kaiser as confirmed vice-chairperson and presented Christophe Heck as the next chairperson of the Professionalism Committee (ProfC), subject to approval of the General Assembly scheduled for the afternoon of 21 September 2018.

3. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

3.1 The notes of the meeting held in Lisbon on 13 April were approved.

3.2 On the matter of additional agenda points, Thomas Béhar mentioned that he will include further comments on the number of actuaries at item 7 and Esko Kivisaari mentioned that he will briefly talk about the white paper at item 9.

4. **ACTUARIAL STANDARDS**

4.1 The ProfC confirmed the installation of the Actuarial Standards Subcommittee (ASSC) and as a consequence disbanded the Standards Project Team (SPT). It was also agreed that the current members of the SPT will continue as members for the ASSC. Due process was taken into account and the Board will be asked for approval of the composition of the ASSC.

4.2 The ProfC confirmed the revised ToR, which will be presented for approval to the General Assembly in the afternoon of 21 September 2018.

4.3 **Report of the ASSC**
Hillevi Mannonen outlined the work of the ASSC and discussed the Workplan as attached to the agenda as annex 4.3b. The objective of the ASSC is to prepare model actuarial standards (ESAPs) only when these are deemed necessary and to be efficient and effective in doing so and in reviewing existing ESAPs.
The workplan refers to the review of existing ESAPs, which includes the review of ESAP1 (referred to in the workplan as ESAP6/ESAP1A).
David mentioned the IAA decision to merge ISAP1 and ISAP1A, which will be presented for approval at the upcoming IAA Council meeting in Mexico (November 2018).
In the discussion that followed various views and comments were shared:

- Kristoffer Bork asked if we should look at continuing to have a specific European ESAP1. David mentioned that at the time ESAP1 was developed the AAE strategy was different from the current strategy which now assumes that matters of a truly international nature will be dealt with by the IAA whereas those relating only to European matters will be dealt with by the AAE. He confirmed that there now is a choice for the AAE: adapt the current ESAP1 to reflect the new ISAP1 (+1A) or simply refer to the new ISAP1 (and as a consequence abolish ESAP1). It was noted there are references to ESAP1 in other ESAPs
- Gábor Hanák stated his preference to abolish ESAP1 and refer to ISAP1.
  Gábor stressed that the AAE can influence any future changes in ISAP1.
- Esko Kivisaari referred to Chris Daykin's initial idea of having a complete European set of standards.
  He also mentioned that the implementation phase or ISAP1 revisions should be taken into account in the final decision, which may be an additional hurdle.
  He believed that if the AAE referred to ISAP1 rather than ESAP1 when ISAP1 changes in the future, it would be necessary to review all AAE references to ISAP1(in ESAPs and elsewhere) every time.
- Regarding the implementation issue David explained that the AAE could refer to ISAP1 for which previous versions will be clearly indicated and so reference can be easily be made to an earlier version.
- Thomas Béhar mentioned that he is in favour of not abolishing any ESAP and expressed his concern of going backwards and the signal that we give which is contrary to developing and issuing standards. He stressed that there is no damage done if we do nothing and leave the current ESAP1 as it is (and refer to an earlier version of ISAP1).
- David raised the possibility of consulting the FMAs on whether they foresee any damage by abolishing ESAP1. In response Birgit Kaiser mentioned that some FMAs have implemented ESAP1 already. Birgit was against issuing a consultation since there is not much difference between ESAP1 and ISAP1 and mentioned that it also has consequences for ESAP2 and ESAP3. Birgit confirmed that she is in favour of leaving ESAP1 as it is so that we can keep all references in place.
- Gábor Hanák mentioned that ISAP1 has fundamentally changed and is in favour of asking the FMAs in a clever way for their opinion, which could be seen as an indicative vote, not a binding vote.
- Malcolm Campbell observed that the main difference between ESAP1 and the original ISAP1 is the fact that the Glossary is included in each standard for ESAPs whereas ISAPs have a separate Glossary. He agreed that this also has consequences for ESAP2 and ESAP3.
- Kristoffer reflected that the AAE should not have separate European standards if we have global standards to refer to. He also expressed his concern about keeping outdated standards in place. He also shared his view that there is no need for a consultation, since the MAs are all represented in the ProfC and as such can decide on this issue during the meeting.
- Gábor noted that any removal or other decision on ESAP1 would have to be approved by the GA.
- Hillevi explained that the ToR state that regular reviews of existing ESAPs are included in the work of the ASSC. ESAP1 is due for review shortly.
- It was agreed that the ASSC will prepare a paper/recommendation on these matters taking into account the IAA Council decisions on this issue. The

recommendation will be ready in the spring meeting for further discussion, so that it can be presented to the GA in October 2019.

4.4 **Due Process for the development of ESAPs**

4.4.1 The proposal for the Due Process was approved by the ProfC. This document will be presented for approval at the General Assembly in the afternoon of 21 September 2018.

4.4.2 **Due Process for the development of EANs**

David explained that the document attached as annex 4.4.2 needs to be updated. He asked for volunteers to review and asked for feedback on which group should do this task. On this issue Christophe Heck referred to the workplan in which he proposed installing a new TF/SubC to take on this task. He also mentioned that this group could review the EANs being developed (by IC, PC) in addition to the Due Process document review. Christophe agreed to return to this issue at item 12.1 and discuss then the composition of the TF/SubC.

4.5 Note – the numbering on the agenda, in error, did not include an item 4.5.

4.6 **EAN related IORPII:**

David referred to the Proposal to draft an EAN related to IORPII attached as annex 4.6.1 as discussed by the ProfC in Lisbon. It had been updated following comments made there, in particular from Gabor Hanak. The ProfC agreed the proposal document.

Cathal Fleming explained that the EAN as attached as annex 4.6.2 had been mainly updated on wording:

- Page 6 changes: the 2nd paragraph was simplified, the technical content was reviewed and the topics were better listed.
- Sections were combined which made it easier to read. Feedback was expected arising from comments at the Pensions Committee (PC) meeting on the previous day. Cathal reported that these would result in only minor changes.

In the discussion that followed the following remarks were made:

- Gábor expressed his concerns and said more specifically that the updates improved the EAN, but the substance has not changed. He suggested that the ProfC ask the PC if they wished to change their minds and now wish to develop a standard instead of an EAN. In his opinion the title of EAN is misleading relative to the substance of the document.
  Cathal explained that the TF would like to wait for legislation which is expected early 2019, so that it can be fully taken into account of in the EAN.
  David confirmed that the PC had previously made the decision not to draft a model standard and confirmed their wish for an EAN instead.
- David mentioned the style guide, which made specific mention of EANs (see item 4.9).
- Yvonne asked whether the PC expected that practitioners will use this document. Cathal mentioned that the EAN is being developed for countries where there is no local standard and that it could be considered as a checklist.
- Yvonne believed that there is no reason why we should not consider developing an ESAP a few years from now. This idea was seconded by Esko and Kristoffer.
- Thomas mentioned that this is not considered as a checklist for France. France would implement this EAN as a standard, as would Portugal.
- David mentioned that all are free to use the EAN in whichever way would be locally appropriate.
- Yvonne further said that she did not like part of the Scope (she felt it reads more like ‘application’ which in her opinion should not be in an EAN). She asked to have this removed from the EAN.

Cathal accepted that the document can be improved and asked the ProfC for further suggestions.

- Malcolm mentioned the issue of litigation processes in different countries. IAA's IANs wording (no use of 'should', 'must') mainly comes from concerns in the US regarding potential litigation.
  If there is a problem in Europe it is most likely to come from the UK. He stressed that the AAE is not a standard setter and should not be considered as such. He mentioned that a style guide would be of help.
- Ann Muldoon believed that - from a UK point of view - if it is an EAN by its definition it could not be adopted as a standard. In her view it reads like an ESAP model standard.
- While some expressed the view that the format was too like a standard to be regarded as an EAN, others felt it was in an acceptable format for an EAN.
- In conclusion it was agreed that an EAN subgroup (to be formed – see item 12.1) will look at the due process and work with the PC to proceed forward.

4.7 **EAN on ESAP3**:

Esko mentioned that this was discussed in the IC on 20 September 2018. The IC agreed that there is still work to be done. It was agreed that the new TF (as suggested by Christophe) could assist in the process.

Gábor expressed his appreciation of the work done preparing this draft EAN and commented on the difference between the two draft EANs (IORP and ESAP3). He suggested rewriting the first paragraph on page 4 chapter 2 starting with 'In this section …. '. He particularly commented to general agreement that the part of the text which implies that ESAP3 needs clarification.

Gábor also commented on the style and recommended making clear references instead of bullet points.

4.8 **Possible new topics for ESAPs**:

David mentioned that in Lisbon discussions were held whether GDPR and ESG could be potential topics for ESAPs. It was agreed in Lisbon not to pursue these as ESAP topics at the moment.

In the discussion that followed Gábor noted that the TF Roles of Actuaries (TF RoA) is working on professional judgment/expert judgment which could potentially be a subject for an EAN or ESAP on the governance of professional judgement. This matter is subject to further discussions in TF RoA.

Gábor also mentioned that this topic was raised by him in the IAA ASC but will not be further pursued there.

4.9 **Draft Style Guide**

David referred to the draft style guide as issued at annex 4.9. It was agreed that this is a useful document.

The comments included:

- The reference to "Officers" should read "AAE Board"
- 14a: drafting committee should be drafting team or TF according to the new ProfC workplan

It was agreed that updating the document is needed. It may be delegated to the new EAN subcommittee.

4.10 **Monitoring Adoption of ESAPs**

Birgit explained that she had updated for possible AAE use the questionnaire developed for the IAA. It now had been updated to include references to ESAPs and EANs.

Two questions were raised:

- Is this questionnaire a good tool to assess adoption of ESAPs?
  All agreed and also agreed that the survey could/should be sent to delegates of the ProfC to guarantee higher response rate than sending it to associations' secretariats.
- Should we combine this with the IAA survey (ie including questions on ESAPs in the IAA survey)?
- Either the IAA or AAE could issue a combined survey and receive responses. There was agreement to this, but the following must be considered:
  - The IAA will need to be consulted as either
    a) the IAA will receive AAE related responses or
    b) the AAE will receive IAA related responses. Birgit commented that she would be happy to receive the AAE responses directly.
  - If a), we need to persuade the IAA to include questions on ESAPs (to be ignored by countries not using ESAPs)?
  - Thomas commented that we have a commitment not to duplicate work of IAA and stressed that we should not ask our FMAs views on ISAPs - only on ESAPs.
    The final decision is for the Board taking into account the MoU with IAA.
  - Esko agreed to liaise with the IAA President on the content of the MoU with IAA.
    We must not break the protocol. So there may be 2 surveys (IAA and AAE separate). If we can find a way around, there will be only one survey (IAA and AAE combined).

It was agreed that the content of the draft survey will be checked by the ASSC. Any comments/details on the wording should be sent to Birgit.

5. **CODE OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (CoPC)**

5.1 The Webinar on the CoPC was organised for 9 October 2018. Yvonne referred to the flyer attached as annex 5.1. This had been updated to contain clearer wording (available on the website). Yvonne further explained that part of the programme includes detailed explanation on implementation.
It was confirmed that actuaries in full member associations can register.

5.2 *To remind member associations of the transition period and the need to comply by the effective date and to discuss any problems foreseen at this stage.*
No problems were foreseen at this stage.

6. **PROFESSIONALISM ISSUES**

6.1 **Mutual Recognition Agreement (MRA)**

6.1.1 *Update on the revision of the MRA documents (incl. the Heubeck letter)*
Yvonne discussed the report in the papers and mentioned that changes to the directive are listed in the annex. The next step for the task force is to consider the implications.
The MRA WG will have several conference calls scheduled for the next months.
Comments from the ProfC are welcome and can be sent to Yvonne. Yvonne listed the countries mentioned on the European Commission website whose actuaries are regulated.
Mária Kamenárová mentioned that the regulation of the profession disappeared in the Slovakian legislation after the adoption of the Solvency II directive.
Christophe mentioned that the MRA could be considered vulnerable (following a discussion in the meeting of Education Committee on Thursday). Yvonne recognised that this issue could be a result of the assessment by a home association in view of the various degrees of membership and this has different meanings in the various countries.

Christophe mentioned that the UK currently has a legal case relating to a challenge on the MRA, which was confirmed by Emma Gilpin. Further details could not be discussed pending the outcome of the legal case.

6.1.2 *Feedback on specific issues relating to individual recognition and to discuss the next steps.*
Information was posted on the website to deal with questions from member associations related to the MRA. This topic will not be included in future agendas of the ProfC.

6.2 **Continuing Professional Development**
To review the question of requiring member associations to make CPD compulsory in the light of any developments in member associations and at the IAA.
Christophe Heck presented the document (attached as **Annex 6.2**) as developed with Henning Wergen, incoming chairperson of the Education Committee, which requires validation by the AAE Board. Comments included:

- Mariá Kamenárová asked what the objective was here.
  Christophe confirmed that the objective is to obtain a 'fit and proper' overview, to move forward as a European association taking into account the different views of FMAs and to be able to present this to EIOPA and other European stakeholders.
- Jan Kars asked what our opinion is on the <u>importance</u> of CPD and where we stand on <u>mandatory</u> CPD. This is not included in the document.
  David accepted that this is clearly an area that has not been progressed for a while, partly due to waiting for IAA developments.
- Luis Saez de Jauregui agreed with the comment raised by Jan Kars.

It was agreed to create a Task Force to further develop this area and to follow the next steps as outlined in the document.

7. **ROLES OF ACTUARIES / ACTUARIAL FUNCTION**
Karel Goossens – chair of the TF Roles of Actuaries – gave an update on the developments in the TF. There are 4 work streams: Artificial Intelligence, Legal Recognition, Professional Judgement and Data Science.
The following comments were made about the <u>Survey on Legal Recognition</u>:

- A draft had been prepared by the TF (see annex 7.b to the agenda). José Mendinhos suggested including the opinions of MAs (e.g. Is the situation satisfactory? What would you like to have improved (legal issues, status, regulations, etc.)).
- A further request had come from the Board to add some questions to the survey (how many members and composition/categories of membership and the respective requirements are there within the MAs?). This had been discussed in the TF on 20 September 2018.
  The TF preferred NOT to include these questions but to recommend to the Board issuing a separate survey.
  Thomas explained that the question had arisen from the Number of FQA shown in AAE documents.
- José referred to a discussion in the TF and expressed the concerns of MAs that fees may increase following questions on the number of MAs. He referred to the IAA survey on this topic which was experienced as intrusive.
- Since no consensus was reached, it was agreed that Esko will further discuss this with Karel to come to a final decision.
- The Board reviews all surveys issued and will take any sensitivities into account. Esko mentioned that it was important that we establish what the role of the AAE is and what the role of the IAA is in this matter. He suggested the TF need to

consider why this is a European issue and not an international one which should be handled by the IAA. Karel will follow up with the TF.

- Luis Saez de Jauregui mentioned that legal information can be found following this link: http://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/regprof/index.cfm
  This database contains information on regulated professions, contact points and competent authorities, as provided by EU Member States, EEA countries and Switzerland.
- Mária will send some comments on the survey via email to Karel.
- Yvonne asked what the purpose of the survey is. Karel responded that it is to understand our position in Europe, to note the differences and to learn lessons. The outcome will help us to formulate what we want.

8. **GLOBAL ERM QUALIFICATION**

Malcolm Campbell gave an update on the CERA qualification. He reported that there had been no new entries since his last report.
Ireland has become an Acceding party: they are not aspiring to be an Award Signatory.
Currently there are 2 applications in process for Award Signatory Status: Belgium (long process), Italy (complicated due to the fact that the legal structure leads to delays, but this is now progressing).
The CERA statutes require a 5 year review of the IAA Syllabus. Following the change of the IAA Syllabus a review will be conducted by CERA.

9. **CONSUMER PROTECTION WORKING GROUP**

9.1 Mária Kamenárová gave a short report related to annex 9.1.

9.2 She mentioned that the original intention was to have an AAE position in PRIIPS regulation. However widening the group to other aspects of consumer protection is beyond the expertise of the current WG so a change in the composition of the WG is required.
The following remarks were made:

- Recognising that currently the focus had been on PRIIPs is there a link with the GDPR TF of the IC? Coordination with them seems appropriate.
- Thomas mentioned that it had been a Board decision to assign the WG to ProfC.
- Esko expressed concern that our objective appeared not to be protection of the consumer but rather protection of actuaries. Esko would like to find a way (other than just advising on the technical issues) for the AAE to show how actuaries can help in improving consumer protection.
- Esko also mentioned the challenge for the AAE of having something useful to say to the new European Parliament and European Commission (next spring). The Board is scheduling the issue of a white paper. Suggestions should be received no later than 26 October 2018. This white paper should include recommendations of what should be included in the new workplan of the Commission. Input from the Consumer Protection WG would be appreciated. Esko will provide slides to be included in the minutes (attached as **Annex 9.2**).
- Esko observed that EIOPA had asked the AAE for simple indicators in the complex consumer protection area which AAE has been reluctant to do.
- It was agreed that the Board, Valéry Jost and Christophe will further discuss the scope of the WG.

10. **ACCREDITATION OF MEMBER ASSOCIATIONS**

David gave an update on arrangements for continuing accreditation of member associations.

With respect to accreditation the AAE relies upon the IAA with respect to code of conduct, disciplinary schemes and standard setting procedures (if any). The IAA Membership Committee looks in detail at these aspects. However, the IAA Education Committee (and in turn the Membership Committee) rely on the AAE Education Committee certification for European FMAs. The new AAE CoPC will be brought up by David in the next IAA meeting in Mexico.
Henning mentioned that with the new AAE syllabus the Education Committee aims to have a regular/automatic check with the IAA on the content of the Syllabus.

11. **AAE AND IAA – ISSUES OF MUTUAL INTEREST**

It was agreed to include the minutes of the IAA Professionalism Committee held in Berlin to the minutes so that the latest information is available to all (**Annex 11**).

12. **REVIEW OF COMMITTEE PRIORITIES**

12.1 Christophe introduced and explained his ideas for the committee's priorities, based on his document in the papers.
The following comments were made:

- PROF 3: leave out reference to item 2 under the reference to SO2.
- Malcolm raised the issue of compulsory CPD, and suggested deleting the word 'compulsory'
- PROF 4: Christophe will contact Valéry Jost on Consumer Protection.
- New proposal PROF 7: currently a high level idea. Learn from experience of Virtual Platform at ECA 2019 in Lisbon and develop a proposal.
- Costs Virtual platform: Henning explained that for ECA the existing virtual facilities of DAV will be used which will not affect the AAE directly. Learn from experience to see if a joint cooperation is an option bearing in mind the costs.
  Jan suggested involving the EAA. Henning mentioned that the EAA is supporting the AAE in the ECA2019 arrangements. DAV is currently looking into the expertise needed for this task.
- PROF 1: change 2018 into 2019.
- PROF 4: no. 3 of SO2 relates to GDRP webinar
- PROF 6: include CoPC webinar. Offer professionalism courses.

Christophe explained the new structure and mentioned that a request for volunteers will be issued shortly and Board approval will be sought for the installation of the EAN Subcommittee.
Christophe proposed holding a conference call each month where leaders of work streams are asked to attend with the objective to develop fast and efficiently.
Comments included:

- Gábor questioned the need for an EAN Subcommittee, and suggested consideration of a TF.
- Hillevi agreed to discuss details with Christophe regarding the TFs for ESAP3, ESAP5 and ESAP7/8
- Esko and Kristoffer mentioned that Big Data is an IAA topic, which has a dedicated TF. The AAE should not duplicate this work, but should only comment on European specific areas (if any). Karel will take this into account with regard to the workstream of the TF Roles of Actuaries.

An updated version of the ProfC Engagement Plan is attached as **Annex 12.1**.

12.2 **Revised ToR Professionalism Committee.**

David explained the suggested changes to the ToR. David also mentioned that the Board is currently looking at the ToRs of all committees to have these more harmonized.
With the following update, the document was approved. This will be presented to the GA for approval in the afternoon of 21 September 2018.

- Item 2.vi should read "ASSC" instead of "Standards Subcommittee"

Some remarks were made on whether Consumer Protection should be specifically mentioned. It was agreed that 1.iv of the ToR would cover this.

13. **STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3**

Esko explained the process and results of the work on this topic and mentioned that a presentation will be given at the GA. The presentation is attached as **Annex 13**.

14. **DEFINITION OF AN ACTUARY**

David suggested this topic should not be discussed further due to time constraints and the lack of response from ProfC members on this issue.

15. **MEETING WITH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS AND STAKEHOLDERS**

The overview of meetings held between delegations of the AAE and the respective stakeholders was noted.

16. **FUTURE ANNUAL AND SPRING MEETINGS**

16.1 *Annual Meetings*

2019 – Vienna, Austria – 12 October 2019
2020 – Munich, Germany - *<to be confirmed>* October 2020
2021 – Zürich, Switzerland - *<to be confirmed>* September 2021
Offers to host other Annual meetings from 2022 onwards are welcome and can be submitted to the AAE Secretariat.

16.2 *Spring Meetings*

2019 – Sofia, Bulgaria, 10-12 April 2019 – all committees
2020 – Bratislava, Slovakia, 2-3 April 2020 – all committees
Offers to host other Spring meetings from 2021 onwards are welcome and can be submitted to the AAE Secretariat.

17. **INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

The information provided with the agenda was noted (from SAI, IFoA, DAV).

- The report from Switzerland is included in the minutes as **Annex 17.**

19. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Committee will be held in Sofia, Bulgaria, on Friday 12 April 2019, at the invitation of the Bulgarian Actuarial Society.

20. **ANY OTHER NON - RESERVED BUSINESS**

- José Mendinhos gave a short presentation on ECA2019 and referred to the website www.eca2019.org and the Call for papers.
- Thomas introduced Rafael Marconi, member of the Board of Brazil, and explained his aim to develop relations with Brazil and the AAE.
- Kristoffer mentioned that, as discussed at the recent meeting of the Nominations Panel, the numbers of associations in the different voting categories in AAE are changing. There seems to be a need to recalibrate the voting categories. A way to

do that is a change in statutes which is the responsibility of the ProfC. It was agreed to add this topic to the workstream of the ProfC and to install a small TF/WG to develop a proposal. Those who volunteered at the meeting are Thomas Béhar, Kristoffer Bork, Birgit Kaiser, Christophe Heck and Mária Kamenárová.

- Esko mentioned the white paper which will be developed and which was already briefly mentioned at item 9.2.
- Christophe thanked David Martin on behalf of the committee for his 11 years in the ProfC of which 6 years were as chairperson.

21. **RESERVED (CONFIDENTIAL) BUSINESS – IF ANY**

There were no issues reported.

Annex 0.1

	First name	Family name	Country	Nominating association	Role
1	Karin	Hirhager	Austria	Aktuarvereinigung Österreichs	Observer
2	Peter	Prieler	Austria	Aktuarvereinigung Österreichs	Delegate
3	Karel	Goossens	Belgium	Institut des Actuaires en Belgique	Delegate
4	Tatiana	Bitunska	Bulgaria	Bulgarian Actuarial Society	Alternate
5	Jan	Svab	Czech Republic	Ceská Spolecnost Aktuáru	Delegate
6	Kristoffer	Bork	Denmark	Den Danske Aktuarforening	Delegate
7	Esko	Kivisaari	Finland	Suomen Aktuaariyhdistys	Delegate
8	Hillevi	Mannonen	Finland	Suomen Aktuaariyhdistys	Observer
9	Thomas	Behar	France	Institut des Actuaires	Delegate
10	Birgit	Kaiser	Germany	Deutsche Aktuarvereinigung	Delegate
11	Michael	Renz	Germany	Deutsche Aktuarvereinigung	Observer
12	Wilhelm	Schneemeier	Germany	Deutsche Aktuarvereinigung	Observer
13	Mike	Poulding	Guernsey	Channel Islands Actuarial Association	Alternate
14	Gabor	Hanak	Hungary	Magyar Aktuárius Társaság	Delegate
15	Baiba	Mocane	Latvia	Latvijas Aktuäru Asociãcija	Alternate
16	Jan	Kars	Netherlands	Het Koninklijk Actuarieel Genootschap	Delegate
17	Ad	Kok	Netherlands	Actuarial Association of Europe	Secretariat
18	Monique	Schuilenburg	Netherlands	Actuarial Association of Europe	Secretariat
19	Ernst	Visser	Netherlands	Het Koninklijk Actuarieel Genootschap	Observer
20	Gunn	Albertsen	Norway	Den Norske Aktuarforening	Delegate
21	José Manuel	Mendinhos	Portugal	Instituto dos Actuarios Portugueses	Delegate
22	Yvonne	Lynch	Rep. of Ireland	Society of Actuaries in Ireland	Delegate
23	Ducky	Jozef	Slovak Republic	Slovenská spolocnost' aktuárov	Observer
24	Maria	Kamenarova	Slovak Republic	Slovenská spolocnost' aktuárov	Delegate
25	Felix	Arias Bergada	Spain	Col.legi d'Actuaris de Catalunya	Observer
26	Xavier	Plana	Spain	Col.legi d'Actuaris de Catalunya	Delegate
27	Luis María	Saez de Jauregui	Spain	Instituto de Actuarios Españoles	Delegate
28	Malcolm	Campbell	Sweden	Svenska Aktuarieföreningen	Delegate
29	Christophe	Heck	Switzerland	Association Suisse des Actuaires	Delegate
30	Craig	Hanna	U.S.A.	American Academy of Actuaries	Observer
32	David	Martin	UK	Institute and Faculty of Actuaries	Chairperson
33	Emma	Gilpin	UK	Institute and Faculty of Actuaries	Observer
34	Ann	Muldoon	UK	Financial Reporting Council	Observer
35	Emma	Potter	UK	Institute and Faculty of Actuaries	Delegate