



GROUPE CONSULTATIF ACTUARIEL EUROPEEN
EUROPEAN ACTUARIAL CONSULTATIVE GROUP

SECRETARIAT, NAPIER HOUSE, 4 WORCESTER STREET
OXFORD OX1 2AW, UK

TELEPHONE: (+44) 1865 268 218 FAX: (+44) 1865 268 244

E-MAIL: groupe@gcactuaries.org

WEB: www.gcactuaries.org

29 September 2008

Christina Trickett
Professional Oversight Board
5th floor Aldwych House
71-91 Aldwych
London WC2B 4HN

Dear Christina

Response to Discussion Paper: Monitoring and Scrutiny of Actuarial Work

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this discussion paper.

Naturally the method used for monitoring actuarial work is very much a local issue, as it is important that the process fits with the local regulatory and supervisory environment. For this reason it is difficult for the Groupe Consultatif to have a view on the best strategy to be used in the UK.

We would however like to make a couple of comments

In looking at how the monitoring works, in particular regarding oversight by the profession itself, one needs to bear in mind the fact that some actuaries are working in the UK without being members of the Institute or Faculty of Actuaries. As part of the Groupe's Mutual Recognition Agreement, we actively encourage our individual members who are working a significant amount of time in another territory to join the local association. However we do not (and have been advised that we cannot) insist that they do so. Within the Groupe Consultatif we have put effort into ensuring a consistent code of conduct in all of our member associations, and so one can expect actuaries from our member associations to live up to similar ethical standards: however the Institute and Faculty of Actuaries will not have the power to oversee actuaries that are not members of their own associations.

It appears that a favoured solution is to increase the use of peer reviews. Whilst in a number of Anglo-Saxon countries there has been an increased use of peer reviews, this trend has not emerged in other European countries. A key issue is often the availability of actuarial resource, and thus the need to use actuaries efficiently. If more use is to be made of peer reviews we would recommend that thought is put into how this can be done with a minimum of duplication of effort.

If you would like to discuss any of these comments further, we are happy to do so

Yours sincerely

Malcolm Campbell
Chairman, Freedoms and Professionalism Committee