



List of topics and summary – EAN on ESAP3 and ORSA

AAE Committee meetings in Sofia

11-12.4.2019 – Lauri Saraste

THE DOCUMENT

- **supplements ESAP 3 on the ORSA process**
- **provides further explanation of the ideas introduced in ESAP 3**
 - where it was inappropriate to include in the ESAP the level of detail which is contained in this EAN.
 - Explanations and examples are provided with the hope of elucidating generalised topics or complex ideas.
- **This EAN is envisaged as a “living document”**
 - will reflect developing good practice and address actuaries’ doubts and questions as they relate to the requirements set out in ESAP 3
 - more widely in actuaries’ responsibilities in supporting the ORSA within their company and their profession.
 - Therefore updated versions of this EAN can be expected.

THE DOCUMENT

- **The following sections may be read *en face* with the ESAP 3.**
 - Section 2 below of this EAN clarifies definitions from the ESAP 3.
 - Section 3 and its subsections correspond directly to the sections of the ESAP 3 with the same indices.
 - Section 4 provides detailed examples and explanations, which are relevant to the ORSA and the ESAP 3, but not directly attributable to specific sections of the ESAP 3.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Preface

- 1.1 Due process on this EAN
- 1.2 This EAN on the ORSA and ESAP 3
- 1.3 List of abbreviations used

2 Supplementary notes to ESAP 3 definitions

- 2.1 Additional material relating to "Risks", "Uncertainties" and "Exposures"
- 2.2 Additional material relating to an "ORSA-triggering event"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3 Supplementary notes to ESAP 3 text 8

3.1 ESAP 3, Section 3.1 “Design of the ORSA process”

3.1.1 ESAP 3, Section 3.1.1 “Establishing a structured approach to uncertainty”

3.1.2 ESAP 3, Section 3.1.2 “Deviation from Solvency II balance sheet approach and methodology”

3.1.3 ESAP 3, Section 3.1.3 “The ORSA consideration period”

3.1.4 ESAP 3, Section 3.1.4 “Inconsistency with the undertaking’s risk management approach”

3.2 ESAP 3, Section 3.2 “Performance of the ORSA process”

3.2.1 ESAP 3, Section 3.2.1 “Quantitative risk assessment and financial projections”

3.2.2 ESAP 3, Section 3.2.2 “Qualitative risk assessment”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4 Other relevant subjects relating to ORSA work

4.1 Differences in methodology

- 4.1.1 A business projection model and multiple bases
- 4.1.2 Own Solvency Needs
- 4.1.3 Risk measure
- 4.1.4 Risk measurement time frame
- 4.1.5 Projection basis: what is Best Estimate and why?
- 4.1.6 Risk capital versus policyholders' protective risk capital
- 4.1.7 Fungibility of capital
- 4.1.8 Risk-neutral Economic Scenario Generator (ESG) implementation
- 4.1.9 Economic best estimate liability

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4.2 Differences in modelling

- 4.2.1 Nature of stresses
- 4.2.2 Dependencies, correlations, interactions and cause-and-effect relationships
- 4.2.3 Loss absorbing capacity of deferred taxes
- 4.2.4 Loss absorbing capacity of technical provisions
- 4.2.5 Defaults, downgrades, credit spreads, and market values

4.3 Differences in assumptions

- 4.3.1 Contract boundaries
- 4.3.2 "Risk neutral" versus "real world"
- 4.3.3 Future new business
- 4.3.4 Discount curves
- 4.3.5 Sovereign credit risk

4.4 Risk Maps and the ORSA

TF response to findings from different committees and any open issues

Prof. committee and ASSC review

- The language, which at some parts could be found complicated especially for non-native-English speakers --TF response: some additional examples and simplifying has been done but there still remains concepts, words which require quite much depth and experience of such matters. Also a list of abbreviations has been added. Also if simplifying the text a lot then some of the subsections should be deleted because of the nature of the issues covered there
- Terms and definitions, which were not consistently or clearly explained --TF response: corrected, now same abbreviations used. Also changes are made to harmonize the wordings. Still there remains different way to say same things, a long document with several writers.

TF response to findings from different committees and any open issues

Prof. committee and ASSC review

- Some wording to exclude “should” or similar kind of quite strong language. **TF response: corrected**
- The EANs are educational documents. Although this draft EAN is linked to ESAP 3 its intent is not to interpret ESAP 3 but only give additional background or aspects to the actuary to consider when applying ESAP 3. This need to be considered when finalizing the draft. **TF response: A considerable amount of time has been used especially in section 3, which tries to provide the support for actuaries complying with ESAP 3 articles. The TF finds no clear issues in relation to ESAP3 anymore**

TF response to findings from different committees and any open issues

Prof. committee and ASSC review

- As a common format for EANs did not exist at the time of the drafting the format of the EAN need to be checked afterwards as well as some other requirements of the style guide. **TF response: OK**
- A lot of specific comments to improve the text / error findings. TF response: basically everything corrected now. Some specific ones; ‘p. 39 Footnote 23 does not seem to refer to an ACPR document’ needs to be checked. There was also a question whether ‘there needs to be an indirect link to ESAP 3 sections in EAN section 4’? **The TF response is that no links needed in section 4 because these topics are not covered in ESAP 3.**

TF response to findings from different committees and any open issues

RMC's comments

- The detailed and prescriptive nature of the paper and how aligns with regulatory expectations that the ORSA is to be the firm's own assessment. **TF response: some clarifications made but the paper remains to be prescriptive. This EAN aims only to support the work so the 'firms own assessment' remark seems not to be an issue.**
- “should's” or equivalent ways of saying things might need to be changed **TF response: other words used, no should's or similar expressions for actuaries responsibilities**

TF response to findings from different committees and any open issues

RMC's comments

- In 2.1, the interpretation of the terms “risks” and “uncertainties” (and “exposures”) doesn’t seem to fully align with the standard ways in which these terms are used in the risk management community (or in academia). **TF response: clarifications made**
- In 2.2, an out-of-cycle ORSA might be needed if the risks (i.e. risk profile) faced by the firm change by a large enough amount to render the current ORSA invalid. **TF response: will be added**

TF response to findings from different committees and any open issues

RMC's comments

- In 2.2 Some of the examples given under “Structured thresholds to identify ORSA-triggering events” seem quite narrow, e.g. equities -20% or credit spreads +/- 50 bps, relative to what might be expected to happen reasonably often, so one would have expected that the in-cycle ORSA would have already allowed for what might be needed in some of these circumstances. **TF response: Some improvement has been made to widen the perspective**
- The complexity around different way to talk about ‘best estimate. **TF response: This has been clarified**

TF response to findings from different committees and any open issues

RMC's comments

- In some areas the paper introduces terminology which may not be universally understood, particularly if there is a possibility of the paper being referenced for non-actuaries. **TF response: some additional examples and simplifying has been done but there still remains concepts, words which require quite much depth and experience of such matters. Also a list of abbreviations has been added**
- In 4.2.3, the abbreviation ALACDT is not common, instead the concept is referred to as LACDT? **TF response: corrected, only LACDT now is being used.**

TF response to findings from different committees and any open issues

RMC's comments

- Is there enough on how to address materiality? For example, in 4.3.5, one would presumably only want to explore different angles for sovereign risk if they were expected to result in materially different answers / conclusions. **TF response: No changes by now**
- Is there enough on what happens if the work is being principally done by non-actuaries, e.g. a CRO who is not an actuary, or on how any of the material covered interacts with the AMSB being ultimately responsible for the ORSA? E.g. page 14 says “there will be incomplete knowledge with the actuary’s understanding of a given system”, but isn’t the more important issue the level of knowledge of the broader team involved? **TF response: No changes, the team angle is covered but not the AMSB.**
- Is there anything in ISAP 6 (or 5) that is relevant? **TF response: This has not been checked / prioritization of work**

TF response to findings from different committees and any open issues

IC's comments

- A deep read through on sections 1 to 3 done and several needs for corrections pointed out. **TF response: More or less all suggestions taken on board**

Thank You!

Actuarial House

1 Place du Samedi

1000 Brussels

Belgium

www.actuary.eu

Follow us on twitter: @InfoAAE