THE ETHICAL ACTUARY

A 30-year investigation into governance, risk, and ethics —
and why actuarial judgement now shapes humanity's future.

We help organizations meet global sustainability goals - without sacrificing ethics, transparency, or human dignity

1 NO POVERTY	2 ZERO HUNGER	3 GOOD HEALTH AND WELL-BEING	4 QUALITY EDUCATION	5 GENDER EQUALITY
6 CLEAN WATER AND SANITATION	7 AFFORDABLE AND CLEAN ENERGY	8 DECENT WORK AND ECONOMIC GROWTH	9 INDUSTRY, INNOVATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE	10 REDUCED INEQUALITIES
11 SUSTAINABLE CITIES AND COMMUNITIES		THE GLOBAL GOALS For Sustainable Development		12 RESPONSIBLE CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION
13 CLIMATE ACTION	14 LIFE BELOW WATER	15 LIFE ON LAND	16 PEACE AND JUSTICE STRONG INSTITUTIONS	17 PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE GOALS

A Message to Actuaries, Risk Leaders, and Stewards of the System

This paper is structured to be read modularly. Core principles establish the ethical and actuarial framework, while applied sections and appendices provide concrete policy and system-level examples. Readers may engage sequentially or reference sections independently depending on context.

For much of the last century, actuarial judgement operated within defined boundaries: pricing risk, assessing probability, and advising institutions within known social and economic frameworks. That world no longer exists.

Today, actuarial models increasingly sit upstream of policy, automation, and governance itself. Risk assessments influence capital allocation, access to services, regulatory compliance, and long-term societal outcomes — often at scale, and often without a clear line of professional accountability.

This shift does not make actuaries less relevant. It makes their ethical judgement more consequential than ever.

The question is no longer whether global frameworks, sustainability targets, and automated decision systems will shape the future — they already do. The real question is whether actuarial professionals remain conscious stewards of that influence, or become passive operators inside systems whose outcomes they no longer fully control.

This paper exists to make that distinction visible — and to offer a path forward grounded in ethics, responsibility, and professional integrity.

The Ethical Actuary is an independent research and advisory initiative focused on the intersection of actuarial judgement, governance, risk modeling, and ethical accountability in complex systems.

Our work examines how probabilistic models, compliance frameworks, and sustainability metrics increasingly shape access to capital, public services, regulatory outcomes, and long-term societal trajectories. As decision-making authority shifts from individuals to systems, the role of professional judgement becomes both more consequential and more obscured.

We operate at the boundary between technical rigor and ethical responsibility — translating actuarial logic into transparent decision pathways that can be understood, interrogated, and governed by humans, not merely automated processes.

This report reflects a long-form investigation into how actuarial tools are currently used, where accountability is diluted, and how ethical stewardship can be structurally re-embedded into risk-based decision systems. All pages are hyperlinked for easier viewing.

Readers seeking concrete international policy examples and real-world algorithmic pricing scenarios are directed to Appendix A and Appendix B.

Table of Contents

FULL ACCESS TO THE BLUEPRINT WHEN YOU BECOME A MEMBER

Ethical Actuarial Judgement: Principles and Boundaries

The Role of Judgement in an Automated Age

Actuarial judgement has always operated at the intersection of mathematics, uncertainty, and human consequence. While models quantify risk, judgement determines how those models are constructed, which assumptions are selected, and where responsibility ultimately resides.

As actuarial influence expands into automated systems, sustainability frameworks, and policy-linked decision-making, the need to clearly articulate ethical boundaries becomes not optional —but foundational.

Modern actuarial work increasingly informs systems that operate at scale and with limited transparency. In such environments, ethical judgement is not confined to outcomes alone, but embedded in upstream decisions: data selection, proxy variables, model constraints, and tolerance for uncertainty.

When judgement is deferred entirely to automated processes, responsibility does not disappear —it becomes obscured. Ethical actuarial practice therefore requires clarity around where human accountability begins and where it must not be surrendered.

Model Design as an Ethical Act

Every actuarial model reflects a series of human choices: which risks are included, which are excluded, how uncertainty is treated, and whose interests are prioritized. These decisions shape not only predictions, but real-world consequences affecting access to capital, insurance, services, and opportunity.

Ethical boundaries demand that actuaries remain conscious of how model design choices may amplify bias, normalize harm, or create false objectivity. Transparency around assumptions and limitations is not a technical preference — it is a professional obligation.

Delegation, Accountability, and Professional Limits

As actuarial outputs are increasingly integrated into policy frameworks, regulatory mechanisms, and automated decision systems, the question of accountability becomes more complex. Delegating decision authority to systems does not absolve professionals of responsibility for their downstream impacts.

Ethical judgement requires clear limits on delegation. Actuaries must be prepared to challenge system outputs, escalate concerns, and refuse participation where models are used beyond their intended scope or without adequate governance.

Climate Risk Case Study: Decision Pathways

Where Judgement Must Remain Human

Certain dimensions of risk cannot be resolved through quantification alone. Long-term societal impact, intergenerational equity, moral hazard, and systemic fragility require human discernment informed by experience, ethics, and professional courage.

Maintaining ethical boundaries means recognizing where models inform decisions — and where they must not decide. The enduring role of the actuary is not to eliminate uncertainty, but to steward judgement responsibly in its presence.

Decision Pathways Under Climate Uncertainty

Climate risk introduces forms of uncertainty that challenge traditional actuarial assumptions: non-linear impacts, deep uncertainty, model divergence, and irreversible outcomes. Scenario selection, time horizons, discount rates, and assumptions about adaptation are not neutral technical choices — they materially shape policy, capital allocation, and societal exposure to harm.

In this context, actuarial judgement plays a critical role in defining decision pathways rather than point predictions. Ethical practice requires actuaries to clearly distinguish between exploratory scenarios, stress pathways, and decision-relevant thresholds, and to communicate where confidence ends and value-based judgement begins.

Responsible decision pathways acknowledge uncertainty without collapsing into false precision. They surface trade-offs transparently, highlight asymmetries of risk distribution, and resist the use of actuarial outputs as deterministic justification for policy decisions that carry long-term societal consequences.

Applied Domains of Ethical Actuarial Practice

This section translates ethical actuarial principles into real-world domains where judgement, accountability, and decision pathways materially affect human outcomes. These domains illustrate how actuarial influence operates beyond technical modeling — shaping access, resilience, distributional equity, and long-term societal risk.

Each domain highlights where actuarial judgement intersects with uncertainty, governance, and ethical responsibility. Rather than prescribing uniform answers, these sections clarify decision boundaries, professional obligations, and the conditions under which human judgement must remain active.

The Ethical Actuary Toolbox

AESOP is private platform dedicated to actuaries, mathematicians, and other practitioners in the actuarial field practice. This platform is for anyone who implements actuarial judgement that extends beyond technical modeling and into areas of material human consequence.

Each domain demonstrates how assumptions, thresholds, and decision pathways influence access, resilience, distribution of risk, and long-term societal outcomes.

For a structured orientation to the Ethical Actuary Toolbox and its conceptual foundations, see Appendix C — The Ethical Actuary Toolbox (Orientation).

Ethical Actuarial Tool / Framework	What the Tool Does	Decision Impact & Accountability
Decision Boundary Mapping	Defines where actuarial models inform decisions versus where human judgement must intervene. Explicitly identifies thresholds beyond which quantitative outputs should not be treated as determinative.	Prevents inappropriate delegation of moral or societal decisions to automated systems and clarifies where professional responsibility remains with the actuary.
Uncertainty Classification & Disclosure	Distinguishes between quantifiable risk, deep uncertainty, and irreducible unknowns. Requires transparent communication of confidence limits, assumptions, and model fragility.	Reduces false precision, supports informed governance decisions, and protects against the misuse of actuarial outputs as unjustified certainty.
AI-Enabled Ethical Decision Support Systems	Provides pre-structured AI agents and ethical inquiry frameworks that can be adapted to specific actuarial contexts. These tools systematically test assumptions, surface unintended consequences, explore alternative decision pathways, and document ethical reasoning for internal review and external scrutiny.	Enables consistent, defensible ethical practice at scale while preserving professional judgement. Reduces reliance on ad-hoc intuition, supports institutional learning, and ensures accountability remains human, explicit, and auditable.

Practical Boundaries in Implementation

From Models to Decisions

Actuarial models increasingly inform decisions made at scale, often within systems that are opaque to those affected by their outcomes. In such environments, ethical judgement is not confined to final outputs alone, but is embedded throughout upstream decisions — including data selection, proxy construction, model constraints, and the treatment of uncertainty.

When judgement is deferred entirely to automated or quantitative processes, professional responsibility does not disappear; it becomes obscured. Ethical actuarial practice therefore requires explicit recognition of where human accountability begins, where it must remain active, and where it cannot be surrendered to systems or outputs, regardless of their technical sophistication.

Where Tools Support — and Where They Stop

Every actuarial tool reflects a series of human choices: which risks are included, which are excluded, how uncertainty is represented, and whose interests are prioritised. These decisions shape not only predictions, but real-world consequences affecting access to capital, insurance, services, and opportunity.

Ethical boundaries require actuaries to remain conscious of how model design choices may amplify bias, normalise harm, or create false impressions of objectivity. Transparency around assumptions, limitations, and intended use is not merely a technical preference — it is a professional obligation that defines where tools may inform judgement and where they must not replace it.

Human Oversight as a Design Requirement

As actuarial outputs are increasingly integrated into policy frameworks, regulatory mechanisms, and automated decision systems, accountability becomes more complex — not less. Delegating decision authority to systems does not absolve professionals of responsibility for downstream impacts.

Ethical actuarial judgement requires clear limits on delegation. Actuaries must be prepared to challenge system outputs, escalate concerns, and refuse participation where models are deployed beyond their intended scope or without adequate governance. Human oversight is therefore not an optional safeguard, but a design requirement for ethical practice.

Why This Matters at Scale

At scale, small modelling choices can produce widespread and durable societal effects. As actuarial methods are embedded across institutions, errors, biases, or unjustified certainty can propagate rapidly, often without clear lines of accountability.

Ethical actuarial practice demands foresight into how decisions scale, how responsibility is distributed, and how harm may emerge over time. Maintaining judgement under conditions of automation, institutional pressure, and complexity is essential to preserving professional integrity and public trust in actuarial systems.

Implications for the Actuarial Profession

To illustrate this systemic pattern, the following international policy domains are examined within the Ethical Actuary framework. Together, these examples demonstrate how policy-driven risk redistribution emerges across systems when large-scale regulatory objectives are operationalised without disclosed actuarial or systemic impact assessment:

International Policy Examples *(each found inside blueprint)*

- CBAM – Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism
- National Energy Transition Mandates
- Environmental Compliance & Permitting Frameworks
- Agricultural Emissions Reduction Policies
- Urban Density & Transport Decarbonisation Policies
- Cross-Border Environmental Trade Restrictions
- Water Usage & Resource Allocation Mandates
- Digital Identity & Data Governance Frameworks
- Labour Market Decarbonisation & Transition Policies
- Housing & Building Energy Performance Mandates
- Central Bank Climate Stress Testing Frameworks
- Sustainable Finance & Taxonomy Regulations

Where do you go from here?

Ethical actuarial practice is not a static compliance exercise. As climate-related risk (SDG 13) becomes increasingly embedded in financial, insurance, and regulatory decision-making, the consequences of unchecked assumptions, proxy variables, and automated reasoning become systemic rather than local.

This paper demonstrates that ethical judgement must remain active wherever actuarial models influence real-world outcomes — particularly under conditions of uncertainty, scale, and policy pressure.

The next phase of this work is not theoretical. It requires applied case analysis, stress-testing of decision pathways, and explicit documentation of where professional responsibility must override technical convenience.

The full implications of these dynamics become clear when examined through concrete policy and system-level examples, presented in the appendices and applied scenarios that follow.

AESOP - Platform
From Fables To Fortunes

AESOP is dedicated platform that is everyday evolving set of analytical, ethical, and systems-based instruments designed to help actuaries, analysts, and decision-makers translate abstract risk into concrete judgement.

Historically, actuarial "tools" referred primarily to technical programs and models used within insurance and financial risk domains. Today, actuarial judgement operates across far broader terrain — including environmental policy, sustainability frameworks, algorithmic governance, and the full scope of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The toolbox therefore expands beyond traditional programs to include conceptual, analytical, and ethical instruments necessary for this new decision landscape. The Ethical Actuary training program expands these tools through structured learning, applied case studies, and guided practice designed to support real-world judgement.

What this appendix provides:

- A conceptual orientation to AESOP - the Ethical Actuary Toolbox
- A framework for understanding how actuarial "tools" must evolve beyond traditional programs
- A reference point for applied tools developed in training and practice

What it does not attempt:

- Exhaustive technical specifications
- Jurisdiction-specific implementation guidance
- Prescriptive policy outcomes
- The expanded scope of actuarial judgement increasingly intersects with the full landscape of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), requiring tools that account for systemic, cross-domain risk.

Becoming A Member — From Orientation to Practice

The Ethical Actuary training program expands these tools through structured learning, applied case studies, and guided practice designed to support real-world judgement. Participants engage with evolving ESG and SDG-driven risk landscapes, develop shared language with other actuaries and analysts, and cultivate the questions necessary to interrogate complex systems with clarity and professional integrity.

In a world increasingly shaped by automated systems and policy at scale, the role of conscious, ethical actuarial stewardship — alongside that of mathematicians, quantitative analysts, data scientists, and system designers — has never been more consequential. The decisions made by today's risk and decision professionals will quietly shape the conditions under which future generations live, work, and thrive.

The Ethical Actuary and **Freedom Collective Foundation** exists to support professionals who are committed to strengthening judgement, accountability, and long-term societal wellbeing—for generations to come. To become a member, enquire our membership options on the website or email: Wellness@FreedomCollectiveFoundation.org.