



ASSOCIATION OF CONSULTING ACTUARIES

Association of Consulting Actuaries Limited · First Floor (129) · 40 Gracechurch Street · London · EC3V 0BT
Tel: +44 (0)20 3102 6761 · Email: acahelp@aca.org.uk · Web: www.aca.org.uk

30 May 2022

The Director of Actuarial Policy
Financial Reporting Council
8th Floor
125 London Wall
London
EC2Y 5AS

Dear Sirs

Proposed revision to AS TM1: Statutory Money Purchase Illustrations (SMPIs) – consultation

I am writing on behalf of the Association of Consulting Actuaries in response to the above consultation.

In relation to this consultation, many of our members advise both employers and trustees on their DC arrangements.

We support the general principle of amending AS TM1 to provide greater consistency for recipients of SMPIs where individuals have several different pension policies, particularly in the context of information to be provided on pension dashboards. However, we have concerns about some of the proposals, which we set out in the answers to the questions, including the proposals on accumulation rates, the form of benefits at retirement, and annuity rates at retirement.

The proposals on accumulation rates are radical, and we think that they can create problems of understanding for individuals and significant additional work for fund managers in many cases. The proposals can also create anomalies when, for example, bond funds prices are volatile. On balance, recognising that the SMPI will be indicative only, we would prefer an asset-class based approach, which is the approach most schemes adopt currently. We give further comments on this in the response to the questions.

We note that most individuals do not take annuities at retirement, and further thought should therefore be given to the form of benefits to illustrate to better match what individuals would typically do when they take benefits. We appreciate that this would take some time, and that the annuity approach may need to be maintained for a period.

Given the Government's proposal that all DC projections for the Dashboard are covered by AS TM1, we believe AS TM1 should refer to and give guidance on any additional projections for the Dashboard not currently referred to in AS TM1, such as projections based on the accrued fund (See question 13). However, this should reflect the final Dashboard Regulations on this matter.

Association of Consulting Actuaries Limited
Registered Office: 10 St James Road · Wokingham · RG40 4RT
Registered in England No. 10184138
Registered under the Data Protection Act ZA114526

Our responses to your specific questions are set out in the appendix to this letter.

We hope that you find the contents of this letter of assistance. We would be happy to discuss them further if that is helpful. In that event, please contact me on 01372 733763 or at peter.williams@aon.com or Spencer Bowman on 020 7170 2729 or at spencer.bowman@willistowerswatson.com.

Yours faithfully

Peter Williams

Chairman, Pension Schemes Committee

On behalf of the Association of Consulting Actuaries Limited

1. How supportive are you of the approach to prescribe the accumulation rate and form of annuitisation more precisely, in order to improve consistency across projections from different providers? In particular, do you have any concerns arising from the loss of independence and judgement allowed to providers to set these terms?

We support consistency across projections from different providers, and we agree with the FRC that specifying accumulation rate assumptions will assist this.

We also agree that specifying the form of annuitisation will assist consistency. We suspect that most SMPs are carried out currently assuming no cash, index-linked and 50% spouse's pension. Given this, there is an argument that this approach should be adopted. However, we suggest that the approach to be settled on should be realistic in terms of what individuals do in practice, so we accept that if the annuitisation approach is retained it would be reasonable to change to level pensions and single life. However, further thought should be given to reflecting that individuals frequently opt for drawdown and take cash and do not opt for annuities initially on retirement. We provide further comments on this below.

2. What are your views on the proposed effective date of 1 October 2023?

We support 1 October 2023, assuming that the final version of the revised AS TM1 is in place by 1 October 2022 as planned.

3. What are your views on the proposed volatility-based approach for determining the accumulation rate?

While this is an interesting proposal, and appears to address certain disadvantages of alternative approaches, we think there are significant problems with it, based on the information provided for the consultation.

The FRC has indicated that it has a number of objectives for the approach, which we agree are reasonable, although balancing them is difficult. As you outline in paragraph 3.4, these are:

- *Realistic*
- *Take some account of additional returns that can be expected from higher-risk funds*
- *Consistent across funds*
- *Understandable*
- *Do not place an undue burden on providers*
- *Avoid unintended incentives*

We recognise that the FRC has carried out a great deal of research on the proposed volatilities approach, some of which has been shared. On balance, we do not find the volatilities approach set out easy to understand, and we suspect this will be even more the case for individuals particularly when funds change bands and they see material changes in projections – which will likely be much more noticeable in the dashboard world with many individuals comparing estimated retirement income figures from one year to the next. The backward-looking calculation can also present difficulties. For example, taking a property fund where the percentage in cash can vary, this might have had 25% cash in the past but now have only 5%. It will be some time before the impact of this

lower cash holding will fully feed through into the volatility calculation and future expected return. Bond funds also represent particular issues - for example, when bond funds are volatile, this could lead to higher returns than would be considered appropriate. The volatilities approach would also put a significantly greater burden on providers offering large numbers of funds than the asset-class based approach. In respect of non-standard funds, we note that the FRC has tried to address some specific issues – although we are not convinced unquoted assets should assume a nil real return. Given these various issues, the volatilities approach would need to have significant advantages in other areas to offset its disadvantages, and we are not currently convinced it does.

On balance, we would prefer the asset-class based approach. We note the points in 3.18 to 3.20 highlighting issues with this approach. The abiding principle here is that perfection will never be possible or desirable – being overly precise implies a level of accuracy to members that can be misleading and may make members feel they are “prediction”.

This might lead to the following categories, which is how the majority of schemes currently set their assumptions:

- *Cash*
- *Gilts*
- *Corporate bonds*
- *Equities*
- *Property**
- *Multi-Asset funds**

** Funds where the underlying allocation or style may vary (e.g. property with different percentages to cash and Multi-asset funds):*

- *The FRC could adopt an approach aligned to the benchmark objective of the fund as a representation of the exposure it seeks to deliver long term (e.g. a property fund with a property benchmark should be classed as property even if it has 15% in cash... as the cash may be temporary and ultimately the fund’s goal is to deliver a property like return)*
- *For funds with very broad underlying assets e.g. DGFs, most schemes currently use an assumption slightly below equities as a broad brush assumption for this type of fund rather than doing a “look through” assumption. While there are many different DGF styles and types, they generally aim for cash + 3 -5% p.a. again (like property) the long-term objective can be used as a guide for the assumption.*

The FRC identifies having to make regular updates to deal with “new and emerging” asset classes. We think this is equally likely to be an issue for the volatilities approach. Innovation in this area is coming from increased use of and developments in shariah funds and ESG funds, and the lack of historical statistics on these funds will cause issues for the volatilities approach albeit the consultation identifies approaches to this problem.

4. Based on an assumed CPI of 2.5% do you find the accumulation rates proposed for the various volatility indicators to be reasonable and suitably prudent?

We agree that the proposed resulting accumulation rates would currently be in the reasonable range for assumptions at August 2021 for the main asset classes.

5. What are your views on the proposed approach to reflect derisking when calculating the accumulation rate assumptions?

We support this proposal, and believe that most schemes already adopt this approach. If administration is incapable of allowing for this, then we think best endeavours should be allowed.

6. What are you (*sic*) views on the proposals that the recalculation of volatility indicator should be annually as at 31 December with a 0.5% corridor?

If this approach is adopted, we think this is reasonable to provide consistency year to year and only see occasional changes to the allocation to bands. Changes will cause communication issues, both in terms of changing assumptions for the volatility bands and for when funds go up or down a volatilities band, particularly in the latter case as there would likely be a significant impact on the projection for the individual without any change in fund.

7. What are your views on the proposed approach for with-profits fund projections?

We have little experience of dc benefits with with-profit funds, but the proposal seems reasonable to us in the overall context of the proposal.

8. Do you have experience of unquoted assets held in pension portfolios and what are your views of the proposed approach for unquoted assets? In particular do you regard a zero real rate of growth to be acceptable and if not please provide suggested alternatives with evidence to support your views?

We have little experience of the use of unquoted assets in occupational dc funds.

There are similar issues with illiquid assets, which are typically quoted less frequently. These funds may appear to be less volatile than daily quoted assets simply due to the longer periods between valuations, whereas in reality they could well be investments in riskier assets.

9. What are your views on the proposed approach to determine the accumulation rate assumption across multiple pooled funds?

Assuming the overall proposal is adopted, we are comfortable with this specific proposal.

10. What are your views on the proposed prescribed form of annuitisation and treatment of lump sum at retirement? In particular, does the recommendation to illustrate a level pension without attaching spouse annuity cause you any concerns in relation to gender equality or anticipated behavioural impacts?

Longer term, since most people opt for cash and drawdown rather than an annuity, cash and drawdown would seem to be the appropriate approach to model in these statements. This becomes even more important as the prescribed information is used for the dashboard where there will be less opportunity for trustees to add content and information to the prescribed figures. Clearly a move to a drawdown projection approach would need further consideration and a consultation on the details. We would encourage this to be taken forward as soon as possible.

In the meantime, while we continue to use an annuity-based approach, a non-increasing annuity is probably the best option, as it is likely to be closer to the level of drawdown income achievable than an annuity with increases. Having said that, illustrating a level pension versus an index-linked pension would currently more than double the illustrated amount, and this may encourage people not to think adequately about the impact of inflation on their income. If a level pension is used for

illustrations as proposed, then very careful communications would be required to explain to members why their projected income in retirement has more than doubled (all other things being equal) compared with an index-linked pension. We are less concerned about not showing a joint life pension, provided it is made very clear that the annuities illustrated would cease completely on the member's death.

11. What are your views on the proposed approach to determine the discount rate assumption when used to determine the annuity rates for illustration dates which are a) more than two years from retirement date and b) less than two years from retirement date?

- a) The fixed interest gilt yield is more appropriate when considering level annuities, and we support dropping the alternative based on real yields and adding a margin, an option available currently when illustrating level pensions.*
- b) It is unclear what is being proposed for those within two years of retirement. C3.4 indicates the illustration should be no better than using the 'provider's own annuity rate and must be consistent with those annuity rates available in the market place....'. First, for occupational dc schemes trustees do not have their own annuity rates. Second, it would represent a very significant administrative burden to use a different approach for annuities for those members within two years of retirement than for those members over two years from retirement. As the consultation notes individual market rates depend on many factors in most cases and general market annuity rates would only be indicative. In our experience schemes generally currently provide SMPIs within two years of retirement on the current basis, despite not being required to under the legislation. The revised AS TM1 should allow this approach to continue – it is particularly disproportionate to require schemes to assess possible annuity rates with more accuracy, given in practice the majority of members do not purchase an annuity.*

12. What are your views on the proposed new mortality basis for determining the annuity rates where the illustration date is more than 2 years from the retirement date?

This seems reasonable. Of course, actual annuities would reflect a host of individual factors, such as impaired lives and postcode, which make relating the SMPI pension to what would actually result if a pension is secured on retirement no more than indicative.

13. Do you have any other comments on our proposals?

AS TM1 does not refer to some of the requirements of the Dashboard Regulations proposed currently, which are to be covered by AS TM1 under those Regulations. For example, there is a proposal in the Dashboard Regulations to provide an illustration based on the current fund without investment returns and future contributions – the 'annualised accrued value' referred to in schedule 3 of the draft Pensions Dashboards Regulations 2022. If this is retained, or a variation of it, in the final Regulations, then AS TM1 should provide guidance on it. It is important AS TM1 covers all the guidance requirements of the Disclosure Regulations as amended by the Dashboard Regulations once finalised.

14. Do you agree with our impact assessment? Please give reasons for your response.

We suspect there will be increased costs, particularly for fund managers, deriving the volatilities under the volatilities approach. The proposals on annuity rates for those within two years of retirement could also represent significant additional costs. There could also be significant transitional costs related to calculations and communications explaining the changes to individuals, particularly where this leads to large changes in the projections compared with previous projections.

Disclaimer

This document is intended to provide general information and guidance only. It does not constitute legal or business advice and should not be relied upon as such. Responding to or acting upon information or guidance in this document does not constitute or imply any client /advisor relationship between the Association of Consulting Actuaries and/or the Association of Consulting Actuaries Limited and any party, nor does the Association accept any liability to any person or organisation relating to the use of such information or guidance.

Produced by the Association of Consulting Actuaries Limited

May 2022