

FICOM Pension Stakeholder Engagement Forum

Session 3: Target Benefit Plans Reporting & Disclosure Requirements

Greg Heise, FSA, FCIA, FCA
Partner

March 7, 2017

400-601 West Broadway
Vancouver BC V5Z 4C2

Toll-free: (888) 800-1450
georgeandbell.com



Agenda

- Reporting & Disclosure Requirements – Greg Heise
 - Communications issues: Members and Trustees
 - Actuarial valuation reporting/related
 - Stress testing
 - Commuted values
 - Solvency
- Design & Funding – Tom Ault
- Single Employer Target Benefit Plans – Ed Lee
- Forum Discussion

Communications

- Communications are likely the most important aspect of any plan implementation or conversion
- Communicating the “pension deal”
- Negative perception in other parts of Canada
- Training needed
- Methods
 - Mandatory notices
 - Plan summary
 - Newsletters, membership meetings
 - Annual statements
- Experiences

Actuarial Valuation - Stress Testing

- PBSR S60:
 - select (and explain) factors that pose a material risk to ability to meet funding requirements
 - reflect (and explain) for selected factors any material changes if a situation contemplated a risk factor changed in a reasonably foreseeable way without any of the other situations changing
- Without having benefit of seeing how each actuary is approaching
 - Consider benefits/funding policy
 - Constructing tests accordingly
 - Incorporate sensitivity testing required under actuarial standards
- Don't waste the opportunity this brings beyond just being a disclosure item

Actuarial Valuation - Stress Testing

- Sample tests showing effect on funded status and/or minimum required contributions
- Not applicable for every plan:
 - Discount rate sensitivity (actuarial standards)
 - Future investment returns differing from expected
 - Salary increases significantly higher than expected
 - Changes in hours worked
 - Changes in negotiated contribution rates
 - Changes in demographic assumptions (e.g. mortality)

Actuarial Valuation - CVs

- PBSR S9(2):
 - ... actuarial present value of benefits ... under a target benefit provision must be determined in accordance with the actuarial assumptions used in the current actuarial valuation report to determine the going concern liabilities value of the plan.
- Important for preparers/users of report to understand
- Practical difficulties:
 - Conversion (timing)
 - Administrators – access to scales/assumptions
 - Retirement age assumption where one age not used
 - Not in accordance with actuarial practice – additional disclosure
- Best practice: set out all assumptions used in writing to both regulator and administrator

Actuarial Valuation - Solvency

- No effect on funding or disclosure to members
- Still required under legislation and actuarial standards
 - But is it meaningful?
 - Views between plans, actuaries, and regulator currently differ
- Why?
 - How do you determine solvency liabilities for retired members?
 - Is it the value of an annuity or the commuted value?
 - In the TBP world, these amounts vary wildly
 - Annuity could be worth 25% to 45% more depending on plan's going concern valuation assumptions
- For your consideration:
 - PBSA S105 requires that a retiree be offered a commuted value upon wind-up

Actuarial Valuation - Solvency

- PBSR S134: If a retiree wishes to transfer their entitlement from the plan, Superintendent consent is required and the assets of the plan are not sufficient to pay all benefits
- PBSR S135 entitled “**Allocation and distribution of assets if assets insufficient**”
- PBSR S135(12): “Assets of the target benefit component must be allocated” ... “so that each person entitled to a benefit” ... is allocated the product of:
 - (i) the commuted value of that benefit, and
 - (ii) the target benefit funded ratio, as set out in the termination report
- Required benefits upon wind-up are unclear where assets are sufficient; clarification should be strongly considered

Actuarial Valuation - Solvency

- As a result, possible conclusions for solvency liabilities are:
 1. CIA annuity purchase guidance is moot
 - “Solvency” liability = \sum commuted values
 - Solvency ratio will be “similar” to going concern funded ratio
 2. CIA annuity purchase guidance applies to retirees
 - “Solvency” liability = \sum annuity liabilities for retirees + \sum commuted values for others
 - Solvency ratio will be lower than going concern funded ratio
 3. A hybrid of 1 and 2 given that the Regulation clearly uses commuted values for underfunded plans
- Most importantly, what *should* the answer be? For your consideration:
 - If Plan has a target benefit funded ratio of 110% at wind-up, does it make sense that the retirees get the entire 10%?

Key Takeaways

- Rebirth of the Pension Advisory Group
- Our industry should focus greater attention on communicating and reinforcing the “pension deal”
- Consider benefits/funding policy when designing stress tests and don’t let them be “just another disclosure requirement”
- Commuted values: not in accordance with CIA standards and “poetic license” needs to be invoked when determining them in accordance with legislation
- Solvency valuation: meaningful if imminent wind-up, otherwise not
 - What are the benefits upon wind-up?
 - Clarification of legislation needed; plan documents should be reviewed
 - Good news? Not an issue of immediate importance unless plan is winding up in near future



georgeandbell.com