

EQUITABLE LIFE

- and -

ERNST & YOUNG

**OPENING SUBMISSIONS ON
BEHALF OF ERNST & YOUNG**

	Page
A. AN OVERVIEW OF THE CLAIM AGAINST E&Y	1
B. AUDIT ISSUES	10
B1. INTRODUCTION	10
B2. THE PROVISIONING CLAIM	14
B2.1 Background to the GAR options	14
B2.2 Technical background	22
B2.2.1 The statutory and regulatory context	22
B2.2.2 Accounting guidelines	27
B2.2.3 The distinction between the Companies Act accounts and the regulatory returns	28
B2.2.4 Actuarial guidance relevant to the GAR provisions	30
B2.2.5 Basic actuarial method	38
B2.3 E&Y's audit work in relation to GARs	41
B2.3.1 Introduction	41
B2.3.2 The 1997 audit	44
B2.3.3 The 1998 audit	53
B2.3.3.1 The prominence of the GAR issue	53

B2.3.3.2	Initial consideration of the GAR issue	55
B2.3.3.3	The Society's discussions with the regulator	58
B2.3.3.4	The Society's proposal for the GAR provision	66
B2.3.3.5	The change to a commercial cost approach	71
B2.3.3.6	Summary in relation to 1998	74
B2.3.4	The 1999 audit	75
B2.3.4.1	Initial consideration of the GAR issue	75
B2.3.4.2	The Court of Appeal decision	77
B2.3.4.3	The 1999 GAR provision	80
B2.4	The commercial cost approach	84
B2.4.1	The method explained	84
B2.4.2	Criticisms of the commercial cost approach	91
B2.4.3	Conclusion on the commercial cost approach	98
B2.5	The approach of Mr Bennison and Mr Creedon	100
B2.5.1	Introduction	100
B2.5.2	The allowance for take-up influenced by the DTBP	101
B2.5.3	Other take-up factors	109
B2.5.4	The provisions calculated by Mr Creedon	111
B2.5.5	The £350 million figure calculated by the Society	111
B2.6	The approach of the claimant's experts	113
B2.6.1	The claimant's assumed take-up rates	113
B2.6.2	The difference between the claimant and E&Y	115
B2.6.3	Problems with the claimant's approach to provisioning	117
B2.7	The claimant's criticisms of Mr Bennison's and Mr Creedon's approach	122
B2.7.1	The core criticism	122

B2.7.2	Subsidiary criticisms	131
B2.7.3	Mr Parmee's distinctive features	136
B2.8	Conclusion on provisioning	140
B2.9	Postscript: the 2000 accounts and the 2001 interim accounts	142
B2.9.1	GAR take up in the 2000 accounts	142
B2.9.2	Consideration of prior year figures	151
B2.10	Mr Bennison's additional disclosure	156
B3.	CONTINGENT LIABILITY DISCLOSURE	160
B3.1	Introduction	160
B3.2	The nature of the contingent liability issue	163
B3.3	Remoteness	168
B3.3.1	The relevant adverse outcome	168
B3.3.2	The position by the conclusion of the 1998 audit	175
B3.3.3	The position by the conclusion of the 1999 audit	183
B3.3.4	A tension in the claimant's position	190
B3.3.5	Conclusion on remoteness	194
B3.4	Further points on contingent liability disclosure	195
B3.5	Conclusion on contingent liability disclosure	199
B4.	A CHANGE TO THE VALUATION BASIS	200
B5.	THE NATURE OF THE AUDIT DUTY AND THE TIMING OF ANY BREACH OF DUTY	204
B5.1	Introduction	204
B5.2	The duty to audit	205
B5.2.1	The duty in statute and guidance	205
B5.2.2	Additional duties	212
B5.2.3	The claimant's pleaded case	216

B5.2.4	The engagement letters and related documents	223
B5.3	The valuation range cases	232
B5.3.1	Introduction	232
B5.3.2	Valuation outside the range as a precondition of liability	234
B5.3.3	Conclusion	237
B5.4	The timing of any breach of duty	237
B5.4.1	Timing in principle	237
B5.4.2	The factual position	241
B5.4.3	Conclusion on timing	246
C.	THE PROPER APPROACH TO FACTUAL CAUSATION	247
C1.	Introduction	247
C2.	The nature of the argument identified	249
C3.	Can negligence be established?	251
C4.	The need for a causal link between breach and loss	251
C5.	The correct hypothesis from BBL	257
C6.	The application of the supposed BBL principle	260