# RE: Actuarial Pension Modelling

**From:** "Veinot, Cindy (TBS)" <"/o=govon/ou=exchange administrative group (fydibohf23spdlt)/cn=recipients/cn=veinot, cindy (tbs)d57">
**To:** "Petsche, Nadine (TBS)" <nadine.petsche@ontario.ca>
**Date:** Tue, 29 Nov 2016 15:01:47 -0500

I think there are three different issues;

1) What we talked about at the meeting last week re: negotiating with OTF – for that, I was looking for cost information re: the stochastic model (in the event the FMP was amended)
2) Work for the Panel – not sure what they will want yet if anything
3) Work for OPCD re: valuation for Public Accounts – which will be influenced by the recommendations of the panel.

Cindy

---

**From:** Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
**Sent:** November-29-16 2:06 PM
**To:** Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
**Subject:** Actuarial Pension Modelling

Cindy,
Alex Killoch has requested clarification of the nature of support that we and/or the Panel may require of OTPP's actuary (Mercers). In a discussion earlier today, he wondered if we were expecting the actuary to update the scenario analysis initially done in 2014 which provided estimates of the % of time that the plan would be in each of the funding zones. I didn't think that is what was being envisioned. Rather, I suggested that we/Panel might want to engage Mercers to assist with running different scenarios for purposes of the asset ceiling test?
Please advise.
Thanks.
Nadine