

The fundamentals of designing an integrated model of financial risk and operational risk within an Enterprise Risk Management framework: findings of an empirical study

Madhusudan Acharyya¹

Abstract

The objective of this article is to identify and explore the fundamental issues necessary to design an integrated model of financial risk (hereinafter referred as “FR”) and OR (hereinafter referred as OR”) within the framework of Enterprise Risk Management (hereinafter referred as “ERM”) for the insurance² industry. The objective was achieved by conducting an exploratory study on four major European insurers in connection with their ERM practice. The result suggests that quantification of OR is itself complex and the aim to integrate OR with FR for diversification purpose is theoretically problematic given their nature in the insurance business. However, a balance between the quantitative and qualitative approaches towards the management OR could best serve the purpose.

Keywords: Enterprise Risk Management, Strategic Risk Management; Operational Risk Management; Financial Risk Management; Risk Culture; Regulations; Interdisciplinary.

1. Introduction

Following the initiative of the banking sector in managing OR within the Base II framework, there appears an increasing focus on this topic in the insurance industry. A recent study on ERM³ (Acharyya, 2006a) suggests that the existing knowledge is still inadequate to conceptualize the true spectrum of “OR” in the insurance industry. Traditionally, the OR is well understood in the insurance business, in particular, those related to the underwriting and claims functions. However, it is evident that the insurance industry recognizes the definition of OR as suggested by Basel II in practice. However, the Basel II definition of OR was designed to meet a specific purpose (i.e., charging capital) within a limited scope. Another study (Acharyya, 2006b) discovered a wide range of area where a typical insurance company is vulnerable for operational errors within an ERM framework. However, there are much built-in mechanisms in the insurance business (e.g., policy cancellation clause, excess clause, etc.) which protect insurers from many known OR (e.g., undetected fraud while writing the policy). This criticizes the methodology and effectiveness of the modern initiatives of insurers’ in modeling OR within the scope of Basel II.

¹ Lecturer for Risk Management at the Business School of Bournemouth University, UK. He can be contacted at macharyya@bournemouth.ac.uk

² Insurance includes reinsurance

³ ERM is defined as the management of all risks within a holistic framework whatever sources and nature of risk.

The article is structure as follows. First, the literature in relevant to OR with particular reference to ERM was reviewed. It summarizes the literature in three headings - the nature of OR; the challenges of measuring and modeling OR; and the relation of OR with ERM. Second, the methodology employed to investigate the data was described. Third, the original data were analyzed and the results/findings were noted. Fourth, findings were discussed and policy implication issues were derived. Finally, the contribution of the paper was pointed out and a brief conclusion was drawn.

2. Literature

The literature defines OR in a number of ways (Foot, 2002; Chorafas, 2004). Historically, OR in the insurance industry were defined as all risks other than the FR and insurance risk (FSA, 2003). The role of internal auditing in managing OR was traditionally influential and essentially limited to the reactive approach of internal control for financial reporting and compliance of regulations. It was found that the introduction of Basel II definition of OR in the banking industry suggesting OR as “the risk of direct or indirect loss resulting from inadequate or failed internal processes, people and systems or from external events.” However, the definition includes legal risk (the risk of loss resulting from failure to comply with laws as well as prudent ethical standards and contractual obligations) but excludes strategic and reputational risks. This essentially derived the current practice of OR in the banking industry.

The baking concept recently influenced the insurance industry, in particular, Solvency II within EU. It is evident that the current development of practices of OR management is mostly remains within the regulatory capital requirements. However, deregulation and competition in the marketplace are also vital issues (Brink, 2001). Following the regulatory concerns on OR the actuarial community concentrates on the non-traditional view of developing methodology of managing OR in practice within the ERM (risk-capital) framework (CAS, 2003; Tripp, 2004; Dexter, 2006) in the insurance industry. In addition, COSO initiated the practice of OR within the ERM (risk-control) framework (COSO, 2003). However, the initiatives of these two professional bodies (i.e., those of actuaries and accountants) in conceptualizing OR are similar but there approaches towards managing OR are different and essentially motivated by their core professional ethics and training. On the other side, the academic response towards understanding and conceptualizing OR is virtually very limited. In fact, OR was never been considered as a researchable topic by academics. Some previous works, for example, (Mehr, 1974) addressed OR within the broader concept of business risk. Most recently, academics, for instance, (Power, 2005) showed interest on OR following the interest of the practitioner community. However, no original research was completed by academics on OR. Indeed, the key source of data to research on OR is the works of practitioner community. Moreover, as the literature suggests, the techniques of managing OR within the framework of ERM differ even within the practitioner community. After in-depth review of the works

of both practitioner and academic community a summary of the literature for OR is noted for the purpose of this article.

- Nature: OR risk is context driven and heavily depends on the management style, culture, and arrangement in place. Consequently, prioritization within organizations' risk landscape is a real issue rather than measuring OR preciously.
- Scope of Measuring and Modeling OR: The current initiative of measuring OR is limited to assign a numerical value of the quality of control and governance issues in relation to capital assessment for solvency purposes. However, this initiative will broaden the OR attached to entire business including the capability of decision making at the senior management level. However, the key challenge is to achieve a right balance between quantification of OR and mitigation of the causes of OR. Nevertheless, the success of quantification technique depends on the adequacy, accuracy, consistency, and validity of data.
- OR & ERM: Risk is conceptualized differently both at the practitioner as well as the academic community within the scope of professional ethics and training (Wang, 2006). Consequently, the definition and understanding of ERM varies extensively. In addition, the perception of risk differs across different levels of management hierarchy. It is suggested that when the perception of the people moves from bottom to top then risk gradually shift from silo to holistic issue. Consequently, risk needs to be managed holistically (Chicken, 1998) because of its heterogeneous nature. ERM encompasses all types of risk, where OR is an element.

3. Methodology

The study utilizes the findings of author's original work (Acharyya, 2006a) which has achieved a PhD award. The data which were used for this article is selected from the original database (collected during 2004-06). The sources of data were interviews with the members of staff of four major European insurance companies (hereinafter referred as "Case") followed by a questionnaire survey. However, the database was updated with particular reference of this article by re-interviewing some key respondents of the Cases. The data were analyzed by comparing and contrasting the views of respondents. The findings of the literature were also referred, where necessary, to resolve the conflicting arguments.

3.1. Analysis of Data

The issues revealed from the analysis of data are structured into seven headings. They are –

- Evolution of OR
- Importance of OR
- Understanding of OR
- Overlapping Character of OR
- Challenge in Identifying OR
- Challenges in Quantifying OR
- Influence of Regulations on OR

They are discussed below in turn.

3.1.1. Evolution of OR

The study revealed that the source of insurers' OR management is particularly the area of Business Continuity Management. One respondent, who headed the Group Risk Management team of a major insurer, suggests "...that [Business Continuity Management] was almost the sole focus of our current activities for OR management".

3.1.2. Importance of OR


It is argued by the respondents that the current effort on OR is a top management agenda. One respondent, who works in the investment department, argues "we are not dealing much on OR, which I think should be integrated at the higher level". However, there are several reasons why OR was not a prominent issue in the insurance sector. Moreover, OR in insurance is not an issue as like it is in bank, partly because insurance companies historically maintain conservative remuneration policies for risk taking. Moreover, the asset allocation is completely different in insurance from banks. One respondent states "I think that because of these reasons OR is much less for insurance companies". Another respondent, who is an expert on FR argues, "it is true that insurance industry is underdeveloped in practicing risk management tools to manage OR but one should consider that the banking industry is exposed to a huge of systemic risk because of a dynamic payment system but it is different in the insurance industry." The study finds that this may be one of the reasons why regulations in the insurance industry for OR is not strong in the banking industry.

It was established that there may be two reasons that an organization exposed to risk – "bad luck" and "bad housekeeping". The former is purely external and organizations may have little control over it. However, in order to develop a sound foundation for doing business through managing other types of risks, the significance of managing OR comes into play. An insurer can only add value for its stakeholders if the household is in order. One respondent argues, "Operational risk is all about how to run our household".

The arguments made by the respondents were also supported by the questionnaire survey conducted in 2005 for the purpose of author's PhD project

(Acharyya, 2006a). The survey concludes measurement and modeling of OR risk as the key technical challenge of implementing ERM. Graph 1 illustrates the results.

Graph 1: Key Operational Challenges of ERM



From Graph 1 it can be noted that amongst the 52 respondents of four major European insurers 37 (i.e., 71%) identified the measurement of OR (both Non-Insurance and Insurance related) followed by the modeling as major challenges while implementing ERM within their organizations. Whereas, the measurement of FR was listed on the bottom of the list and around 50% respondents viewed it as a key challenge in implementing ERM.

3.1.3. Understanding of OR

The study found that although some system related risks (e.g., IT risk) comes under OR but a big chunk of OR falls within the area of legal risk in terms of non-compliance of regulations. Consequently, one respondent, who is responsible for capital allocation, argues “OR is mostly an internal auditor’s issue”. Another respondent, who is responsible to monitor the underwriting functions of foreign subsidiaries, hold similar views and suggests, “To monitor and balance and to reduce the OR of our global insurance operations we work with our internal auditing team”. A further comment came from a respondent suggesting, “The responsibility of safety from fire, IT back-up, etc. [which are OR] are increasingly coming under the agenda of our Group Internal Auditing”. It is suggested the absence of proper incentive within the regulatory criteria discourages some insurers to invest more in the management of OR. One respondent argues, “Within the current regulatory framework, I don’t see any incentive that encourages companies to improve their OR control”. Consequently, some companies prefer to leave the management of OR to the people like the internal auditors, who are believed as specialists to manage people, systems and fraud, etc. However, some respondents do differentiate the modern thinking of OR from day-to-day operational errors. One respondent, who held the position of the Chief Risk Officer of a major insurer, argues, “I think that identification and management of OR is an important issue for us because we may have large

losses just for not controlling our ERM process correctly". The same respondent also finds competitive advantage while managing OR as a part of ERM in addition to the compliance of regulatory capital requirements. S/he argues, "it is a challenge for us to reasonably estimate the amount of capital for our exposure to OR – although I'm very sceptical personally about the accuracy of the estimate". However, insurers find it very difficult to detect which risk belong to the category of OR and where do they exist and, in particular, prioritising significant OR in terms of frequency and severity at any specific period of time-frame.

Moreover, there appears a clear distinction between the nature of OR in various functions of insurance companies. For instance, the OR attached to the insurance functions (e.g., processing of claims, selling of products, pricing risks, etc.) are different by nature from that of investment functions (e.g., choosing derivatives for hedging purposes, maintaining the limits, etc.). However, their management, irrespective of nature, is based on a common risk-management framework (i.e., assessment, measurement, controlling, and monitoring). Nevertheless, the challenge, as one respondent, who plays a consulting role in the industry, says, "It is really important to combine and put them in the common framework despite the feelings of insurance and investment professionals towards OR". Consequently, a common standard is necessary across the organisation.

3.1.4. Overlapping Character of OR

Regarding the question of overlapping character of OR with FR, which suggests that the root cause of all FR includes the elements of OR, a range of contradictory views were noted. The concern of such overlapping (or doubling effect) provides significant challenge for the measurement of OR on stand-alone basis. One respondent suggests, "I think there is no solution – it is my fear – I think what you have to do is trying to reduce OR as much as possible." The analysis suggests that practically (even theoretically) it is impossible to reduce OR to zero. This is because insurers only get a very few large OR, which are also very difficult to quantify. Moreover, one respondent states, "A lot of ORs are unobserved".

The study noted a consensus among the respondents suggesting that the definition of OR needs to be broaden as it is regarded as one of the biggest risk in the financial services industry. For instant, one respondent, who is an ERM consultant, suggests, "OR needs to be defined in a broader perspective including how the users manage models, how the organisation manages the managers' integrity, etc."

There also remain uneven understanding about FR and OR. Some respondents believe that in most cases they are same and others believe that they are totally different. Another group believes that they overlap. For instant, a respondent

state, "...it is often very difficult to separate OR from FRin my view most OR that interest us are financial risks ... the insurance risks are financial risks too".

It is noted that the respondents often contradicts OR with Strategic Risk (hereinafter referred as "SR"). For instance, one respondent states "if the interest rate moves inversely with our payment policies of guaranteed life insurance products then we will face severe OR". Although the decision of the management on whether and how to change the equity exposure seems a SR but some respondents believe it as OR. A respondent, who leads the capital allocation team, argues. "No, it is an OR but to me both OR and SR are same".

3.1.5. Identification of OR

Risk identification was found a key challenge for the management of OR. The study revealed that some insurers identify typically through the Total Risk Profile (TRP) exercise, which is a key part of developing the ERM framework. The Chief Risk Officer of a major insurer states, "We do that [TRP] systematically and this gets everybody thinking about risk, which helps us to identify OR".

3.1.6. Challenges in Quantifying OR

The respondents mentioned various challenges in quantifying OR. For instance, inconsistency among the OR events provides a key challenge in developing a reliable database for measurement purpose. Such inconsistency challenges the reliability of the amount of capital derived by statistical models. One respondent argues, "there is a quantification problem – once you have detect an OR and you implement things – but it does not happen again - there will be another one – much severe than the previous". This argument realistically challenges the accuracy of any figure derived by quantification methods. In this sense the value of OR management should not only be judged in terms of the accuracy and technical efficiency of the models but the strength of check and balance in place to detect the gaps within the operating system is paramount important. One respondent states, "I'm hoping that the situation will definitely change in future due to the sophistication of technology but this fundamental problem will still exist". Another respondent argues, "I think quantifying or measuring OR is helpful; but it is always about knowing it. It is more a question of ranges and setting priorities and not being too precise".

However, there appear two approaches of quantifying OR capital – one is a top-down analogy approach, which is very much like a standardized approach in Basel II and the other is more bottom up communication approach in terms of individual risk, process and control, which is very much like the AMA (Advanced Measurement Approach) in Basel II. However, both of them have weakness, for example, the top down approach doesn't reflect the control environment and the bottom up approach requires a lot of data, which is not currently available in the industry. However, one respondent, who is a financial consultant, suggests, "I think the next generation of OR measurement will live with an average of these two approaches".

Regarding the methodology for quantification, a respondent, who is the head of OR modelling team of a major insurer, says, “we usually use a ‘black & white’ model to identify and quantify OR (e.g., new product risk, new regime risk, etc.) and actually it is quite difficult to quantify them because we don’t have enough experience on them”. In addition, the scenario process doesn’t expressively say what will happen rather it can only guess what could happen leaving a lot of room for expert judgements and intuitions. Another respondent, who headed the risk engineering department of a major insurer, suggests “...although we are currently working towards quantification and measurement of OR but I personally think that the concept of OR in the insurance industry is fully misunderstood and in my view we have a totally wrong approach to OR and OR quantification”. In contrast, the respondent, who is professionally a risk modeller, argues, “I’m surprised to see the misconception of some people on the reliability of the quantification methodologies that in place for OR”. According to this respondent, quantification of OR is possible and this is gradually getting recognition in the insurance industry. However, it is true that quantification of OR is difficult and it is a question whether it is worth to give more emphasis on the quantification side while the ERM model of an insurer is concerned. One respondent, who headed the Group Risk Management of a large insurer states, “Our Group Risk Model includes insurance risk, market risk and credit risk and largely excludes OR and SR”. The same respondent further states, “It is not meaningful to quantify all risks, however, special cases may be OR where we can say that part of OR is actually included into the model because certain parts of the model are based on calibrated historical loss data, which contains operational losses”.

3.1.7. The Influence of Regulations

It was revealed that the regulators (e.g., FSA in the UK) put quite high priority on governance – the way that the decisions are made, making sure that the directors know that they are accountable for the risks that their organizations are exposed to. The Directors’ (who oversee the whole business) responsibility of managing risk is then cascade down throughout the organization making everybody responsible for the risk of the organization. One respondent, who is a renowned risk management academic, argues, “...I mean the Company Secretary, who is implementing the governance issues is also managing OR of his/her organization”.

Although OR is a growing agenda for regulators but some insurance companies do not find it much important because, as one respondent, who is capable for capital allocation at the corporate office, states, “Yes, it is true that we run OR but again there isn’t enough knowledge and information out there – we don’t want to waste our time and money right now - at the moment our biggest challenge is to get the measurable risks understood”.

4. Findings and Discussions

The above analysis suggests a number of findings. They are discussed below.

4.1. Regulations is a key driving force of modern OR management

The history suggests that a lot of sophistication happened in the area of FR but a less concentration was given to OR (D'Arcy, 2001; Nielson, 2005) However, due to some corporate scandals during 1990s, major financial firms, in particular, banks realized their lack of expertise in managing OR. Nevertheless, the regulatory initiatives added further momentum. The financial community expended their view on OR with the tools and expertise they developed and utilized for the management of FR. The underwriting and claims functions are believed as the key sources of OR in the insurance industry. The OR from insurance functions (e.g., underwriting, claims and reinsurance) was traditionally managed by policy wordings and changing operating techniques. However, the approach and application of techniques, those are originally developed for FR remains limited to the measurement of capital for the solvency purpose. Indeed, this is relatively new in the insurance industry. Inevitably, such banking approach of measuring OR, which itself is limited by many constraints, is clearly challenging in the insurance industry. However, ERM could provide solutions in taking a balanced view of all risk that an insurer faces.

4.2. A proper definition of OR is necessary

In the contradiction of defining OR, for instance, fraud, litigation, underwriting and inclusion of their affects in pricing, are usual in the insurance industry. They are traditionally managed by internal auditing and controls, revising operations, outsourcing, etc. These techniques are well established in the insurance industry. However, identification of OR are exceptional but significant for the business is a difficult task because they are hidden and have not yet triggered considerable losses. The study suggests that they probably need management by non-traditional means⁴. Nevertheless, the key question is “why should insurance companies consider non-traditional means of managing OR?” Is not the traditional means enough? Is it just because of the worry of a group of stakeholders who had observed bad experience in Banking?

4.3. Quantification of OR is Problematic

A difference of opinion on the quantification of OR is obvious. The quantitative community believes that it is essential to quantify risk in terms of numbers to develop effective risk management tools. However, they understood that there are some significant risks those are not quantifiable using the tools and techniques in place for financial risks. Conversely, the qualitative community

⁴ It is important to note that the modern approach towards the management of OR focuses only on potential large losses, which may bring down the organisation.

opposes the concept of the quantitative of the people that suggests, “if not quantifiable then it is not manageable”. Although they believe that the exploration of the concept of promoting the cultural change through ensuring more awareness and transparency broadening the depth of knowledge but does not always provide solutions under limitations where corporations realistically operate.

Although it is comparatively easy to put a numerical value of the consequences (i.e., loss) subject to constraints (e.g., time) the same approach can't be justified for root causes which triggers events that leads the financial loss. In fact, it is subjective and the probability of occurring hypothetical events depends on emotion. Moreover, the size and nature of operational losses are inconsistent and extensively differs over the time where the historical data are of little help. In essence, whatever quantification techniques and approach (e.g., Extreme Value Theory; Bayesian Network; Stress Testing; Scenario Analysis; Dynamic Financial Analysis, etc.) are used, the data fed into the models are the views of persons and the accuracy of the results depend significantly on the level of modelers' judgment and experience. Indeed, the ethical behaviour is an integral part of operational risk management, which can be achieved by promoting a culture of risk awareness across the organisation. However, lack of trust among the parties is a key issue (Schiro, 2005). Indeed, integrity and accountability of the associated parties and acting more transparently are essential to built relationships with different stakeholders, which may create opportunities for dialogue and involvement of participation (Goodijk, 2003).

4.4. OR Management needs Multidisciplinary Approach

It is important to distinguish between the top-down and bottom-approaches of risk management. It was found that the top-down approach is more relevant to the corporate governance issues, where the senior management including the board of directors is legally responsible for all risks of the organization. The relevant regulations (i.e., Combined Codes in the UK) are direct hit at the policy makers within the organizations in order to ensure that there are risk management procedure in place to address all risk whatever the sources and nature. However, the bottom-up approach to risk management is more likely a finance related issue covering market, credit and liquidity risk, etc. Incidentally, OR, as the findings suggest, is everything else but also inherent to both types of risk (i.e., strategic and financial) to some extent. The interesting point, which the study concludes, is that OR is a concern for both groups of professionals having expertise in either discipline (i.e., strategic and financial). They apply their expert knowledge to conceptualize OR within their ethics and capacity but maintains a gap from each other as they are not familiar enough about each others profession. However, there is evidence that the gap is gradually shrinking and ERM is establishing a multidisciplinary subject with the development of OR management.

In addition to the current initiative of financial and management professionals to measure and model OR, the expert knowledge and experience of engineering judgments in terms of probabilistic risk analysis (Pate-Cornell, 1996; Bedford, 2001) may be utilized into this effort. For example, fuzzy logic (reasoning) is adopted to deal with incomplete and inconsistent risk information for engineering and military studies which can be utilized in insurance (Cruz, 2000; Cho, 2002; Sánchez, 2003; Shah, 2003; An, 2006). Moreover, modeling and managing of human errors and reliability as adopted in space science⁵ relevant to system theories is a potential area of multidisciplinary work for insurers' initiative on OR (Cox, 1998; Turner, 1998).

5. Policy Implication Issues

Management of OR is not a new issue in the insurance industry. In fact, insurers are historically aware of fraud, failure in systems, writing good or bad business, etc., and, in practice, they always have risk managers to look after OR. Moreover, some OR is insurable. Consequently, management of OR is developed in the insurance industry more than what is seen in the banking industry. However, the new development, which has been arisen from Basel II, is the calculation of capital necessary to protect the OR that an insurer is exposed to. The implication of Basel II approach in the insurance industry, in particular in Solvency II, encountered many complexities and criticism. Nevertheless, the key conflicting issues are – the nature of OR in the insurance industry are not similar to that of the banking industry; and the methodology which is applied to calculate OR is full of constraints and therefore does not reflect the true level of OR that an insurance company is exposed to. Moreover, the initiative of correlating OR with FR is further complex. The study noted several arguments, such as, the problems of quantifying OR; the inconsistency of among OR suggesting OR are itself uncorrelated; OR are internal to the organization. They all suggest that unlike FR the exposure of an organization to OR can be mitigated to a certain level (but not to zero); and there exists non-linearity between OR and FR in terms of nature and methodology. In summary, the arguments suggest that the work for calculating capital for OR is a non-sensible job, where the true impact of OR is itself fuzzy. In addition, it is not the regulatory requirement for the insurance industry to measure the OR numerically. The initiatives of insurance regulators (e.g., FSA) and several rating agencies (e.g., S&P) towards OR actually focus more on the quality of the arrangement in place, which seems more from the crisis management perspective. Consequently, it is sensible that insurers have the opportunity to reduce OR to a satisfactory level through good risk management. Analyzing the data and reviewing the findings the study concludes that insurers have two choices in managing OR – first, holding capital for OR, and, second, reducing the level of OR by proper management. In reality, the role of quantification is important but essentially falls in between of these choices. This suggests that insurers should not depend solely on either choice.

⁵ Several interesting papers are listed on http://human-factors.arc.nasa.gov/awards_pubs/publications.php

Another issue is defining and understanding OR. It came out from the discussion that the OR, FR and SR are fundamentally different although they apparently overlap. The key issue is conceptualizing risk, where the cause and the effect (or consequence) of risk are two different issue. Another argument is in terms of “bad luck” and “bad housekeeping”, which are believed as the sources of risk. The former is a result of external event and most relevant to financial risk and the organization may not have any control over its causation. However, the latter is totally internal for the organization and they may reduce the financial consequence of “bad luck”. It is true that the consequences of all risks, whatever the types, are measured in financial terms. However, this does not necessarily mean that all risks are FR. They are in fact either “OR” or “SR”. Moreover, risks are hierarchical, which suggests that people in the different organizational level perceived risk differently and their awareness and responsibilities towards managing risks are also different. Moreover, OR and “operational error” are two different issues. Theoretically, formulation of corporate strategy and its execution are not only two different issues but they involve two different levels of people in the organizational hierarchy. However, both of them are exposed to risk. For instance, whether the organization will bid for a hostile takeover and executing the takeover (which involves resources) are two different issues. Following the findings of the study, it is sensible to call the former as “SR” and the latter as “OR”. However, the study suggests that the latter has comparatively small affect rather than the former. The evidence suggests that the concern and focus of the regulators is to the former making liable the top management of the organization. Consequently, the study suggests a big question to both organizations and regulators where they will use the term “SR” or “OR” to continue the work, which is currently falls under the title of “OR”. In this sense it is possible to reduce the “OR” (which is the result of “operational error”) by managing “SR”. However, the converse is not always true. Essentially, it is understood from the study that the lack of clarity of definitions causes all the problems in the issue of the management of OR.

A further issue has arisen on the inclusion of OR in calculating risk appetite of the entire organization. It is important to differentiate “risk appetite” from “risk tolerance”; the latter essentially means “how much risk an organization can afford?” It is purely an internal exercise for the organizations because the organizations have no control on the external event although they may expose severe damage to them. It is important to mention that risk appetite of an organization differs with another organization simply because they have different risk tolerance levels. For instance, an organization can invest £200m to an equity believing that it can tolerate a risk of losing £100m if the market goes down by 50%. This example suggests that organizations knowingly accept a certain level of risk and ultimately if there is a loss for which the organization loses £100m then it is just due to “bad luck” even there was “good housekeeping”. The conclusion is that an organization’s risk appetite plays a significant role in defining risk differently from another organization.

6. Contribution

The objective of this paper was to explore the issues necessary to develop an integrated model of OR and FR. The paper suggested the followings which may influence the actuaries (i) in conceptualizing OR and its relevance with other type of risk; (ii) the potential challenges to measure OR and (iii) and deciding to what extent the OR is quantified and modeled within the framework of ERM seeing its inherent nature. The paper clarifies the definition of OR. Moreover, the relation of OR with other types of risks (e.g., FR, and SR) was clearly established. The problems associated with the quantification of OR were elaborately discussed in view of the comments of the respondents. The future role of regulators in relation to OR was predicted. The study expects that the future generation of regulations for OR will hit the root cause of the faulty decisions at the top management level of the organizations for prescribing actions and penalty for the wrongdoers from the crisis management perspective using principle-based regulations. Alternatively, instead of focusing on financial outputs the regulators will likely to set organizational culture (e.g., the capability of affording risk, the way of handing risk, and the governance system in place) at the heart of assessing organizations' risk management initiatives. Whatsoever, the study finds that transparency is a key concern of regulators in relation to OR. In addition, the study observed an interesting relation between the degree of diversification of businesses and the degree of OR, to which a global insurer is exposed to. The less the organization diversified the lower the OR it holds. However, the disadvantage is that less diversified organizations are exposed to more concentration risk.

7. Conclusion

Indeed, measurement and modeling are two steps towards achieving the ultimate objective of OR management within an ERM framework. However, justification of capital necessary to protect OR should not merely depend on the robustness of the models. The key issue is the inputs, which is robustness (e.g., adequacy, accuracy, consistency, and validity) of data. Clearly, prioritization and categorization of OR is difficult because they involves a big amount of subjective and behavioral issues. Incidentally, no amount of capital is reliable neither for the purpose of neither running the business nor meeting the regulatory constraints (i.e., capital adequacy) if the quality of data is not ensured and an effective corporate governance system in place within the organization. Consequently, the fundamentals of the quantification of OR needs to be supported by a strong qualitative risk management while ensuring the quality of data and the effectiveness of the balance and control in place within the organization. Indeed, this is an area of cognitive psychology and the several approaches adopted by the risk and reliability studies in engineering science (e.g., cautionary principle, safety culture, etc) can be utilized in the attempt of understanding and managing OP risk (e.g., human errors) in insurance business. In reality, there is no one-size-fit-all solution for the management of risks. It is concluded that the future studies should aim to develop methodologies in order to achieve a suitable

balance between qualitative and quantitative approaches towards measuring and managing OR and integrating OR with FR. Nevertheless, the desirable outcome can only be achieved by an interdisciplinary research on ERM, which encompasses all risks. Finally, it is predicted that there will unlikely be any universal or purely theoretical ground of such study rather an industry oriented best-practice could provide economic solutions.

Acknowledgement

The author gratefully acknowledges the contribution of the interview respondents for the information they provided for the study. Their identities remain anonymous for legitimate reasons. The concepts developed in the article are author's own and do not necessarily reflect any specific case.

Bibliography

Acharyya, M. (2006a). Exploring the understanding, motivation, design, challenges and performance of Enterprise Risk Management in the insurance industry: an empirical study on four major European Re/insurers. PhD Dissertation submitted at the School of Management, University of Southampton, United Kingdom.

Acharyya, M., & Johnson, J (2006b). "Investigating the development of Enterprise Risk Management in the Insurance Industry: an empirical study of four major European Insurers." The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance: Issues & Practice (Special Issue): 55-80.

An, M., Lin, W., & Stirling, A. (2006). Fuzzy-Reasoning-Based Approach to Qualitative Railway Risk Assessment. Proceedings of the I MECH E Part F Journal of Rail and Rapid Transit, Professional Engineering Publishing.

Bedford, T., & Cooke, R. (2001). Probabilistic Risk Analysis. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Brink, G. J. (2001). Operational Risk: the new challenge for banks, Palgrave Macmillan.

CAS (2003). Overview of Enterprise Risk Management. The Casualty Actuarial Society Forum, Casualty Actuarial Society: 99-164.

Chicken, J. C., & Posner, T. (1998). The Philosophy of Risk. London, Thomas Telford Publishing.

Cho, H. N., Choi, H. H., & Kim, Y. B. (2002). "A risk assessment methodology for incorporating uncertainties using fuzzy concepts." Reliability Engineering and System Safety **2**: 173–183.

Chorafas, D. N. (2004). "Operational Risk Control Business Opportunity and Challenges for the Insurance Industry." The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance Issues & Practice **29**(1): 87-101(15).

COSO (2003). Enterprise Risk Management Framework, The Committee of Sponsoring Organization of the Treadway Commission: 152.

Cox, S., & Tait, R. (1998). Safety, Reliability and Risk Management - An Integrated Approach Elsevier

Cruz, M., & Carroll, J. (2000). Fuzzy Logic. Operational Risk Special Report: 16-19.

- D'Arcy, S. D. (2001). "Enterprise Risk Management." Journal of Risk Management of Korea **12**(1): 207-228.
- Dexter, N., Ford, C., Jakhria, P., Kelliher, P., McCall, D., Mills, C., Probyn, A., Raddall, P., & Ryan, J. (2006). "Quantifying Operational Risk in Life Insurance Companies." Accessed on <http://www.actuaries.org.uk>
- Foot, M. (2002). "Operational risk management for financial institutions." Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance **10**(4): 313–316.
- FSA (2003). Building a framework for operational risk management: the FSA's observations. Accessed on www.fsa.gov.uk
- Goodijk, R. (2003). "Partnership at corporate level: The meaning of the stakeholder model." Journal of Change Management **3**(3): 225 - 241.
- Mehr, R. I., & Hedges, B. A. (1974). Risk Management: Concepts and Applications, McGraw-Hill Education.
- Nielson, N. L., Kleffner, A. E., & Lee, R. B. (2005). "The Evolution of the Role of Risk Communication in Effective Risk Management" Risk Management & Insurance Review **8**(2): 279-289.
- Pate-Cornell, M. E., & Murphy, D.M. (1996). "Human and management factors in probabilistic risk analysis: the SAM approach and observations from recent applications." Reliability Engineering and System Safety **53**(2): 115-126.
- Power, M. (2005). "The invention of operational risk." Review of International Political Economy **12**(4): 577 - 599.
- Sánchez, J. A., & Gómez, A. T. (2003). "Applications of Fuzzy Regression in Actuarial Analysis." The Journal of Risk and Insurance **70**(4): 665-700.
- Schiro, J. J. (2005). Better Regulation for European Insurers to Fulfill Their Role in Society: What's needed on the regulatory front for European insurers to meet worldwide competition successfully? Speech to the Comite European des Assurances (CEA). Paris. Accessed on www.zurich.com
- Shah, S. (2003). Measuring Operational Risk using Fuzzy Logic modeling. IRMI Expert Commentary. Accessed on www.irmi.com/Expert/Articles
- Tripp, M. H., Bradley, H. L., Devitt, R., Orros, G. C., Overton, G. L., Pryor, L. M., and Shaw, R. A., Ed. (2004). "Quantifying operational risk in general insurance companies." British Actuarial Journal **10**(5): 919-1012.

Turner, R. F. (1998). Risk Aspects of a Mission to a Comet. Proceedings of the I MECH E Part G Journal of Aerospace Engineering, Professional Engineering Publishing.

Wang, S., & Faber, R. (2006). Enterprise Risk Management for Property-Casualty Insurance Companies. Enterprise Risk Management Institute. Accessed on www.ermii.org/Research