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Pension Funding Rules In Canada

Pension plan funding rules set by provincial legislation
Different laws for each province
Traditional Pension Funding

Going concern
Actuarial judgement

Solvency
Market value
# Types of Pension Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Ability to reduce accrued benefits</th>
<th>Risk assumption</th>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined benefit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Going concern</td>
<td>No cap</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solvency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target benefit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Going concern</td>
<td>18% cap</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Union or joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solvency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jointly sponsored</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Going concern</td>
<td>No cap</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Joint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Defined benefit**
  - Going concern
  - Solvency

- **Target benefit**
  - Going concern
  - Solvency

- **Jointly sponsored**
  - Going concern
Funding Challenges

1. Plummeting interest rates = skyrocketing solvency liabilities
2. 2008 financial crisis = unsustainable contribution requirements
3. Target benefit plans faced with substantial benefit cuts
4. Flaws of solvency funding became apparent
Problems with TB Solvency Funding

Purpose of solvency funding is to protect members against plan termination

- Likelihood of plan termination is very small
- Contributions are fixed
- Only corrective action is benefit reductions
- Vagaries of solvency funding creates benefit volatility
- Large price to pay for remote risk
Regulatory responses

- Creation of “shared risk plan”
  - Risk is shifted not shared
  - Sophisticated modeling embedded in funding requirements
  - False sense of security
  - Model not copied across country

- Removal of solvency funding
  - Temporarily at first – becoming permanent
  - No change in going concern requirements

- Introduction of Provision for Adverse Deviation (PfAD)
  - Essentially reserve held on balance sheet
  - Levels vary
  - Generally not funded on balance sheet
  - Generally required in cost of benefits
PfAD Details

- Represented as percentage
  - Quantum depends on portion invested in risky assets and discount rate
  - From about 5% to 30%

- Creates volatility in funding if PfAD changes substantially from one valuation to next

- Additive, not inclusive, of unfunded amortization payments
Impact of PfAD

1. Margins stripped out of assumptions
2. May result in lower benefits that are more secure
3. May lead to intergenerational inequities
Observations for future

- Solvency funding needs to be permanently removed
- Reasonable PfAD makes sense
- PfAD should be applied appropriately
Thank you.