GRAEME GROUP

THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

Cross-Border Actuarial Contracting

Actuarial modeling work is increasingly delivered by people who are not in the same country as the client, the consultancy that contracted them, or the regulator whose rules the model serves. This trend is best classified less as labor arbitrage and more as a distinct contracting structure. The arrangements that support it are unusual, and their failure points are frequently misjudged.

Published
Graeme Group

Type
Article

Focus
Actuarial Resourcing & Contracting Structure

Introduction

Actuarial modeling work is increasingly delivered by people who are not in the same country as the client, the consultancy that contracted them, or the regulator whose rules the model serves. This trend is best classified less as labor arbitrage and more as a distinct contracting structure. The arrangements that support it are unusual, and their failure points are frequently misjudged.

This article describes a pattern we observe repeatedly across the market. It is intentionally general; no specific engagement, client, or counterparty is described.

Why Actuarial Delivery Went Cross-Border

Three pressures pushed in the same direction. Modeling platforms consolidated, so the skill required became platform-specific rather than purely actuarial, and platform-specific skill is scarce everywhere, which weakens the case for hiring only where you happen to be. Regulatory change arrived in waves that are intense and finite: a reporting standard implementation or a valuation-basis migration needs a large team for eighteen months and a small one afterwards. Modeling work is also location-independent in a way that client-facing advisory work is not.

The result is that the actuarial modeling market for large programs is now global on the supply side while remaining local on the demand side. Reserving rules, regulators, and audit expectations remain national; only the delivery workforce is global.

The Four-Corner Structure

The structure that emerges typically has four distinct corners, and it is rare for any two of them to sit in the same jurisdiction:

The delivery pool. Modelers with deep platform expertise, often concentrated in Central and Eastern Europe or South Asia, where actuarial and quantitative training is strong and platform experience has accumulated through consultancy work.

The contracting intermediary. A specialist firm that holds the contractor relationships, carries the employment and payment infrastructure, and is accountable for delivery quality.

The prime contractor. Very often a member firm of a professional services network, which holds the relationship with the end client and carries the engagement risk.

The end client. An insurer, in whose jurisdiction the regulatory obligations sit.

In practice, the prime contractor may sit in a third country that contributes no delivery resources at all, acting as a contracting and relationship hub rather than a labor source. Scope may be set somewhere else again, in whichever office of the network owns the client. It is entirely ordinary for a program to be governed by the law of one country, staffed from a second and third, scoped in a fourth, and regulated in a fifth.

The Role of the Contracting Hub

The hub can be mistaken for a simple intermediary. Its function is to absorb the mismatch between how the delivery pool can be engaged and how the end client needs to buy.

End clients and prime contractors need a single accountable counterparty, on their own paper, with insurance, indemnities, defined deliverables and a name to call when something is wrong. Delivery pools consist of individuals and small firms across multiple countries with different employment law, tax treatment, payment rails and currency exposure. Those two requirements cannot be reconciled by contract alone. Somebody has to stand in the middle and take both sets of obligations onto their own balance sheet.

These structures survive margin pressure because the margin is not a placement fee; it prices the currency risk, the payment timing mismatch, the employment and classification exposure across several jurisdictions, and the replacement obligation when a resource leaves mid-program.

Where the Risk Concentrates

In our experience, the risk concentrates in four places, and only one of them is the risk clients most commonly raise.

Unseen flow-down terms. Subcontracting agreements routinely bind the subcontractor to the confidentiality and compliance terms of a prime contract it has never been shown. That is an obligation of unknown scope. It should be negotiated at signature, either by attaching the relevant terms or capping the flow-down to the terms disclosed, and almost never is.

Pay-when-paid. Where the intermediary is only paid once the prime contractor is paid by the end client, the intermediary is financing the entire chain and carrying credit risk on a party it has no contractual relationship with. The term is reasonable to accept knowingly and costly to discover after signature.

Client non-solicitation. Clauses restricting the intermediary from serving end clients encountered through the engagement are standard and generally fair. They become difficult when the end client makes a direct approach afterwards, which happens more often than the drafting anticipates, and the restriction typically survives termination by a year or more. These clauses should be reviewed closely before signature.

Governing law that nobody priced. A contract governed by the law of the hub jurisdiction, with arbitration seated there, is easy to agree and expensive to enforce from elsewhere. If the commercial value does not justify litigating in that forum, the dispute clause offers little practical protection.

Delivery quality is rarely the problem. In well-run structures the modelers are experienced, platform-certified, and often embedded in the client's own systems and directories. The failure modes are contractual and financial, not technical.

Practical Guidance

Read the flow-down clause first. If you are bound to terms you have not seen, ask for them. A refusal to provide them is itself a signal.

Price the payment chain, not just the rate. Pay-when-paid plus long payment terms plus currency exposure can exceed the gross margin on a placement.

Establish where the resources are located. Contracting geography and delivery geography are routinely conflated, including by the parties themselves. It matters for tax, for data residency, and for what you can honestly represent to a client.

Treat the non-solicit as a live commercial term. Know its duration, its survival period and its territorial reach before the end client calls.

Insist on a named replacement obligation. The end client's primary concern is an unfilled seat mid-program. An intermediary that can evidence a replacement bench provides more value than a lower-cost alternative.

Conclusion

Cross-border actuarial delivery is now normal for large modeling programs, and the structures supporting it are more sophisticated than the phrase "offshore resourcing" suggests. The technical risk is largely solved. The contractual risk is not, and it concentrates in clauses that are easy to sign and expensive to unwind, flow-down obligations of unknown scope, payment terms that push credit risk down the chain, and restrictions that outlive the engagement.

The parties that manage these structures well treat them as what they are: financing and risk-allocation arrangements rather than routine staffing agreements.

Discuss Your Needs

Tell us what you are validating, building, or staffing.
Contact Graeme Group · info@graemegroup.org