

## Insurance and Reinsurance Stakeholder Group meeting

27 June 2012

**Venue: EIOPA, 14th floor, Westhafenplatz 1, 60327 Frankfurt am Main**

### Conclusions and Action Points

List of participants:

IRSG: Michaela Koller (IRSG Chair), Oliver Bäte, Thomas Béhar, Mads Mølgaard Braüner, Paul Carty, Seamus Creedon, Guenter Droese, Hugh Francis, Francis Frizon, Lars Gatschke, Pilar González De Frutos, Helmut Gründl, Raffaella Infelisi, Rob Jones, Asmo Kalpala, Marcin Kawiński, Damien Lagau, Pierpaolo Marano, Alexander Sadovski, Chris Verhaegen and Daniela Weber-Rey.

EIOPA: Gabriel Bernardino (EIOPA Chair), Carlos Montalvo (EIOPA Executive Director), Peter Braumueller (EIOPA Management Board), Daniela Rode (Director of Regulations), Justin Wray (Head of Policy Unit), Aitor Azcoaga, Giulia Conforti, Sandra Hack, Dora Iltcheva, Kai Kosik, Juan Lumbreras, Yvonne Schmerfeld, Pamela Schuermans, Pierre-Jean Vouette, Timothy Walters, Manuela Zweimueller.

EIOPA Working Groups: Paolo Cadoni, Chair of EIOPA Internal Models Expert Group (IntMod) and David Revelin, Vice-Chair of EIOPA Internal Governance, Supervisory Review and Reporting Committee (IGSRR).

European Commission: Ulf Linder, Insurance and Pensions Deputy Director – DG Internal Market and Services.

10.30	Welcoming by Mrs Michaela Koller, IRSG Chair	Type
1.	Approval of the draft agenda	Decision
<p><b>Remarks:</b> IRSG Chair welcomes members to the eighth statutory meeting of the Stakeholder Group and introduces Pierpaolo Marano, the new IRSG academic representative, who in turn made a brief introduction of himself to the audience.</p> <p><i>Professor Marano is an Associate Professor of Law to the School of Banking, Finance and Insurance of the Catholic University of Milan. Professor Marano also holds a Ph.D. in banking law and regulation from the University of Siena. He currently sits on the executive board of the International Association for Insurance Law-Europe. Professor Marano teaches Comparative Insurance Regulation in the Insurance Law LL.M. program at the University of Connecticut – School of law, Insurance law center, where he is scholar in residence.</i></p> <p>The Chair also informed that Kay Blair, IRSG Vice-Chair, is unfortunately not able to join the meeting due to an important private commitment.</p> <p><b>Conclusions and action points:</b> Draft Agenda is approved.</p>		
2.	<b>Approval of the 24.05.2012 meeting conclusions and action points</b>	Decision
<p><b>Remarks:</b> Due to the vicinity of the last IRSG meeting in May and the current heavy workload at EIOPA, it was not possible to submit the draft minutes ahead of the meeting.</p> <p><b>Conclusions and action points:</b> The minutes will be sent to IRSG in a written procedure.</p>		

3.	<b>Updates: Solvency II and International developments</b>	Discussion
<p><b>Update on Solvency II</b></p> <p><b>Remarks:</b> European Commission representative, Ulf Linder, updated IRSG members as to state of play on the Solvency II framework. Details were provided as to developments on L1, L2 and L3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>L1 - OMD II:</u> Triologue discussions at political and technical level started in April and are still on going. Main focus on two issues: long term guarantees and the nature of legal acts (Delegated Acts (DA) or Guidelines (GL)/Technical Standards (TS)). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On <b>legal acts</b> – main issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Legal consequences if DA or TS/GL (right of initiative by COM)</li> <li>○ European Parliament (EP) disagrees with the differences made</li> <li>○ EP wants technical knowledge from EIOPA, as technical body</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Triologue agreement reached: delegated act 'package' will be narrowed, some Delegated Acts (DA) will become Regulatory Technical Standards (RTS), with possibility to review. Commission is now working on the split to be made (final list). Some Implementing Technical Standards (ITS) will thus become RTS which are under the responsibility of Commission. For the sake of efficiency, all RTS will be qualified as DA for the first time approval process.</p> <li>On <b>Long term guarantees</b> – two main issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scope of matching premium: specificities of countries in addition to ES and UK need to be taken into account. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ EP (restrictive approach) thinks that some matching adjustments are so important that they should be stated in the Directive (L1).</li> <li>○ Totally different views between EP and COM on how to implement these matching adjustments.</li> <li>○ Council made alternative approach, which is being discussed today.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Transitionals for existing life contracts: very important issue for Germany to which France objects.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• <u>Timeline:</u> New compromise is being discussed today between Council and COM, if these two reach agreement it will be sent to EP tomorrow. If Council and COM cannot agree on 3<sup>rd</sup> July, the next triologue will only take place in the second half of September. <p>EP will most likely not vote on OMD II before October. L2 text will be substantially revised; a new L2 text may be available mid-September, to be published around November-December. L3 Delegated Act will be published around November.</p> <p><u>The floor was opened for reactions by IRSG members:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process: some issues have moved from L3 to L2 (or ITS to RTS). What does it mean for EIOPA and IRSG (and Subgroups) that some ITS will become DA? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Remarks by EIOPA Executive Director: he explained that there no longer exists a co-decision procedure which led to a certain unbalance of powers between EP and COM. Politically sensible issues may be transferred to L2. As a consequence, the EP perceives a certain limitation in their role. This has implications for EIOPA on a consistency and legal level: for RTS EIOPA is obliged to consult, whilst for ITS not. EIOPA may need to consider additional ways to consult with IRSG on certain topics, depending on the nature of the legal acts. However, EIOPA is committed to ensure a proper consultation with IRSG.</li> <li>○ Response by COM representative: EIOPA is kindly asked to continue the work in drafting the technical standards. COM will later designate ITS and RTS. The latter are supposed to be adopted by COM as DA. This split of powers is according to the new Treaty. However, a sunrise clause may enable a later review.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </li></ul>		

- Member states option: where is the harmonization? How is the artificial volatility in the LTG being addressed?
  - Latest Counter Cyclical Premium (CCP) discussion inserted a national different adjustment, which is not appreciated by COM. EIOPA should be responsible for the calculation; Compromise reached: MS options should be very limited.
  - In a market consistent system there will always be more volatility, it is important to remove the artificial one.
- Will there be a quantitative Impact Assessment?
  - Response by COM Representative: it is not realistic to have one now as this would affect the timeline significantly, however a two years review clause might be an option. Equalisation need should be checked during Impact Assessment.
- Calibration today is not adapted to the current economic environment, how do we treat that?
  - Response by COM Representative: These are addressed in Level 2. Some might still change; this is still under discussion. The growth agenda stresses the importance of insurers long term investments. However, there is a limit for adaptations: when it is no longer safe and sound for policy holders.
- EIOPA will need around 8 months after OMD II will be adopted to finalise technical standards and guidelines. Undertakings should have all measures implemented only a couple of months after OMDII coming into force. How will the delay affect?
  - Response by EIOPA Executive Director: 8 months are needed to ensure a sound process. There is a legal component: EIOPA cannot go out with Technical Standards/Guidelines before OMDII and DA. In addition a legal and consistency checking is needed. Then the consultation with IRSG. Main implications:
    - 1) Reputational risk for EIOPA if it would not publish a sound "package" for consultation within the timeline.
    - 2) Operational risk for companies (and Solvency II in general) if many requirements have to be implemented by industry in such short time. The current crisis shows that a risk based solvency framework is needed.
    - 3) There would only be limited transitional periods and only when combined with disclosure requirements. Response cannot be "back to SI".
- Will there be a stress testing initiative?
  - Response by EIOPA Executive Director: EIOPA's intention is to conduct one in 2012, depending on the agreement on OMDII/LTG package. If possible, EIOPA will make a toolkit for national competent authorities.  
  
On equivalence: MEP Skinner's proposal did not find agreement. He suggested to unilaterally declare equivalence following EIOPA's assessment. EIOPA strictly declines such approach.
- Several IRSG members recommended a phased-in approach of SII as well as long transition periods, e.g. for life business. One IRSG members referred to recent analysis of the ESRB with regard to the potential run-off risk in some life insurers.

### **Conclusions and action points:**

The Chair thanked EIOPA ED and COM for the clear insight in the current process.

Wrap-up: today's meeting of the Council will be decisive for the LTG package of measures, which might include the MS options. Timeline of 18 months for implementation is very optimistic. On 5 July EP will vote on quick fix directive.

\*\*\*

### **Update on International developments**

**Remarks:** EIOPA Management Board representative, Peter Braumüller, updated members on global developments in the areas of Financial Stability and Systemic relevance. Among the main points raised are the following:

- **ComFrame:** The project of Common Framework for the supervision of **I**nternationally **A**ctive **I**nsurance **G**roups has now come towards the end of its second year of development phase. The 2012 ComFrame consultation document is expected to be issued next week for a two months' comments period. The framework includes now a definition on IAISGs, but further work remains to be done until end 2013, in particular in the areas on solvency and valuation. IAIS will shortly discuss the approach for 2013, including how field testing should be done and when implementation will start.
- **G-SII Project:** The FSB agreed with the IAIS to issue its Assessment Methodology for the Identification of global systemically important insurers (G-SIIs) for public consultation until 31.07.2012. This methodology, similar to BCBS for G-SIBs, but with significant differences. It contains five categories & specific weightings – size (5-10% each), global activity, (30-40%) interconnectedness, (40-50%) non-traditional insurance and non-insurance activities and substitutability (% of weighting). The objective is to prevent arbitrage between banks and insurance, while avoid penalising traditional insurance. FSB has developed substantial insurance knowledge up to now. A new document on policy measures for G-SIIs can be expected in September/October 2012 for consultation thus also providing for practitioner input.
- **ICPs:** After adoption of the new set of Insurance Core Principles in October last year, IAIS has done further work on ICP 9 – Supervisory review and reporting. The new ICP will be issued shortly for consultation.
- **Implementation and assessment:** This also belongs to the IAIS's core activities. They will conduct self-assessments and peer reviews on the ICPs within a time horizon of 5 years, in collaboration with the IMF and the World Bank.
- **Contact with consumers:** IAIS is following the EIOPA example as concerns stakeholders, by trying to broaden its relationship with consumers' representatives and academia.

The floor was opened for reactions by IRSG members:

- On identification: Is there an EIOPA role in the determination of G-SIIs?
  - Response: IAIS has a consultation role in the determination of the list, but FSB finally decides on the designation of the GSII in conjunction with the NSAs. EIOPA is for the first time involved in both technical and decision level within IAIS, ensuring a European element.
- On supervisory measures: FSB is very banking focused; can EIOPA engage on recovery+resolution?
  - Response: EIOPA is involved in the development of supervisory measures with regards to G-SIIs.

4.	<b>Presentation on IRSG Subgroups work</b>	Discussion
----	--	------------

**Remarks:** Update by IRSG Subgroup leaders on current work, followed by feedback from IRSG members.

#### **a) Anti-Discrimination - Marcin Kawiński**

Mr. Kawiński reported to IRSG with a presentation on Discrimination vs. diversification in insurance: gender, age and disability. Consumer Protection subgroup Chair suggested to add consumer concerns such as potential increase in premium with this decision.

**Conclusion/Action points:**

- The next step for the subgroup will be to present the draft report on Anti-discrimination at next IRSG meeting on 18 October.

**b) Governance – Seamus Creedon**

Mr. Creedon acknowledged the effort from the Subgroup members to elaborate the feedback to EIOPA. Among the issue he raised:

- Definitions of critical functions raised by Prof. Sadovski will be added to the subgroup comments
- More clarity is needed in the legal status of Guidelines and explanation of best practices
- Operational independence of Board members only in the explanatory text, maybe need to include on GL: would like to have feedback from EIOPA
- Fit and proper requirement of the actuarial function: needs to be discussed to ensure EU wide harmonization of requirements
- Definition of AMSB, different between EU member states: needs to be discussed

Other IRSG members added the following remarks:

- Terminology and structure: different between banks and insurance, consistency to be reflected; GL should concentrate on content, 100 pages of guidelines (incl. explanatory text) may be excessive.
- Definitions of AMSB important as transposition may be different between member states
- How to apply independence on practical level? It should be clear that all executive board members have the same responsibility and sufficient level of competence and qualification.
- To differentiate between independence and competence, the latter is more important.
- At beginning of the crisis, the governance issue was analysed in the banking sector
- Conflict of interest between shareholders and board i.e. regarding distribution benefits

Gabriel Bernardino thanked the Subgroup for the relevant feedback and responded on the following aspects:

- Governance touches upon many areas, given the high level requirements that interact with other national and corporate law/policies; nonetheless, EIOPA needs to be pragmatic.
- Unfortunate that governance definitions are different between banking and insurance; is not EIOPA's intention to harmonize them, we are dependent on the Solvency II Directive and future Delegated Acts.
- Structuring: EIOPA IGSR is happy to reconsider the structure to bring the most to industry.
- Comply and explain: only applies to GL; explanatory text (ET) is considered to reflect best practices.
- Some discussions are already on-going for a long time; it is important to move forward on the agreed issues in the Directive and DAs, such as that the audit function needs to be independent.

The following comments were expressed by IRSG members:

- Self-assessment of the undertaking regarding governance is very important and one first step for good risk management.

- AMSB definition is welcome, as this could have avoided problems during the crisis.
- Remuneration and audit are important topics and committees should be required (comparable to current banking practices).

Gabriel commented that EIOPA needs to see more in detail into the remuneration issue in relation with shareholder value. He welcomed contributions by IRSG on the „property rights“ (intrusions into corporate/company law) and the qualification requirements.

**Conclusion/Action points:**

- IRSG members are invited to provide feedback to the Subgroup on Governance, which plans to have a meeting or conference call including EIOPA to map out the activity required to prepare the draft opinion.

**c) Long Term Guarantees (LTG) Hugh Francis**

Mr. Francis stressed the need to have a better understanding of LTG across Europe. The tasks of the Subgroup are now included in the Mandate.

**Conclusion/Action points:**

- The next steps for the subgroup will be to have an interim discussion on 18 October.

**d) Consumer Protection - Lars Gatschke**

- **On IMD:** Lars Gatschke informed IRSG that the Subgroup will focus on the review of the Insurance Mediation Directive (IMDII) to be published by the Commission on 3 July (link to the Consumer Package [texts](#)).
- **On ADR:** Francis Frizon presented the recent texts adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Union regarding a proposal Directive on alternative dispute resolution for consumers disputes and a proposal Regulation on on-line dispute resolution (<http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st10/st10622.en12.pdf>). He stressed that due to the impact on financial services a clear opinion expressed by the IRSG, at least on the fundamentals, would be of importance. He also enquired EIOPA on its actions in this field.

Gabriel Bernardino commented that EIOPA is taking a leading role in this area with the Guidelines on Complaints Handling (see link to EIOPA Guidelines: <https://eiopa.europa.eu/publications/eiopa-guidelines/index.html>). ADR will be embedded in IMDII. Ulf Linder added that the Commission will ensure a standard wording for cross-border contacts across UCITS, MIFID, etc.

**Conclusion/Action points:**

- The Subgroup will present the progress on IMDII at the next meeting on 18 October.
- The next step for the Consumer Protection subgroup will be to have a written procedure on ADR.

**e) New: Informal request to Subgroup on Reporting:**

Pierre-Jean Vouette, EIOPA expert, introduced the current work on the „Reporting Tool for Undertakings requirements (TfU)“, and highlighted that:

- The project deliverable will be a freely available tool allowing concerned undertakings to generate the valid XBRL instance expected by NSAs from the content prepared to comply with the Solvency II Quantitative Reporting requirements.
- Feedback is sought from IRSG to improve the set of functionalities to be implemented before the call for tender for a contractor is launched in late July.
- Gabriel Bernardino added that the tool is an important element for implementation and that it is aimed at smaller companies.

**Conclusion/Action points:**

- It was agreed that IRSG Subgroup on Reporting would provide comments to the paper. IRSG members interested in this topic are invited to send comments as well.

5.

**Discussion on Solvency II – Finite Reinsurance and SPVs**

Discussion

**Remarks:** David Revelin, Vice Chair of the IGSRR, presented the topics on Finite Reinsurance and Special Purpose Vehicles. In summary he outlined that:

- The use of SPVs for insurance risk transfer is usually very limited.
- It is a tool which has been used in the past by some insurers in a way that has led to a misleading view of their financial position because the risk transfer was not effective in practice
- Objective of the requirements is to have transparency as to the effectiveness of the risk transfer
- The guidelines do not include a specific definition of a finite re contract but rather criteria for their identification
- It is important that the management of the insurer understands the effects of these arrangements
- For SPV it was stated that these are independent legal entities which aim to transfer risk. In terms of the standards and guidelines on SPV it was stated that:
  - These only cover insurance SPV;
  - They concern both authorization and ongoing requirements including being fully funded as well as governance and reporting requirements
  - They concern SPVs authorised in the EU (not the undertaking transferring risk to the SPV)
- It is easier for an undertaking to take into account risk mitigation technique in SCR if authorised in the EU.

A number of questions were raised by participants to which the IGSRR Vice Chair responded:

- Is Finite Re tool used effectively and extensively across EU countries and how does it differ with traditional reinsurance?
  - Response: Finite Re is a tool not wide spread in the EU. Supervisors, in a number of countries, for instance France and Germany had taken supervisory action in mid 2000s to address particular concerns. It is challenging to define exactly the border between finite and traditional reinsurance. Specific data on Finite Re are not widely available.
- If captives fulfil the definition of SPV in the guideline, would they be allowed to use a simplified approach for supervisory approval?
  - Response: He doubts that SPVs and non-insurance captives are legally the same; as a result captives would have to be regulated as such and not as SPVs. However, he would have to look into the specific details separately.
- In a number of instances in the US it was discovered that finite reinsurance structures were abused so as to 'smoothen' an insurer's balance sheet in a way that was a clear abuse of accounting laws.
  - Comment: the impact on the insurance market was rather small, however it was used in specific areas where industry might otherwise struggle to find insurance coverage, for instance trade risk or cyber risk. This use of finite reinsurance can also help the insurance market to develop covering new risks by enabling information to be obtained on these specific risks.

**Conclusion/Action points:**

- On SPVs members expressed their support for the quality of material produced and believe that it is important for this topic to be within the scope of insurance supervision.

6.

**EIOPA Presentation on Solvency II – Internal Models**

Discussion

**Remarks:** Paolo Cadoni, Chair of the Internal Models Committee, introduced the topic of internal models. In particular, he outlined that:

- The standards and guidelines are to support both supervisors and the industry
- They cover a number of different internal model topics corresponding to the Directive (Use test, validation, external models and data etc.)
- EIOPA is also undertaking other activities to ensure consistency in approach to internal model approval, e.g. informal supervisory meeting where experiences are shared (on confidential basis); EIOPA is involved in all supervisory colleges.

A number of concerns/comments were raised by participants to which the IMC Chair responded:

- If the one year period is adequate in cases of long-term liabilities; the one year time horizon is too short for life insurance.
  - Chair response: On the one year time horizon he did not believe that this was an issue - the intention for having internal models is to enable insurers to build the model based around how they run their business, whether this is on a 1, 5, 10 year etc. time horizon. It is not the intention that they have separate economic and regulatory models. But supervisors have a duty to ensure that the same level of policy holder protection is provided according to the 1 year confidence level. Therefore, insurers need to demonstrate that this is met (they are, however, free to have a higher confidence level). The confidence level and time horizon is set in the L1 and therefore is not something that can be changed.
- The issue of significant staff turnover in the national supervisors which resulted that company has had to provide repeated explanations to supervisors on particular topics. There needs to be a process whereby issues can be closed. EIOPA should do more to facilitate the effective running of colleges by drafting standards for how colleges should operate.
  - IMC Chair response: He asks for understanding that it is not an easy issue to address, supervisors are not able to offer the same incentives as some companies and therefore it is necessary to recruit some staff with less experience and train them. He added that if information is received by a supervisor on a particular part of a model and no issues are highlighted at that stage that does not necessarily mean that issues will not be raised at a later stage when that information is placed within a wider context.
  - The EIOPA Executive Director spoke about the role of EIOPA in the colleges as part of the SII package. He stated that although EIOPA has not yet finalised the college guidelines, this does not mean that it is not taking effective action. The Action plan of colleges sets out the tasks that the college should undertake and therefore ensures consistency of approach. At the end of the year EIOPA will publish a report, which will highlight if particular colleges have not carried out particular tasks that they should have.
  - On the point about turnover of staff, it is incumbent on regulators (as regulators charge companies to do) to have appropriate documentation so that the same questions do not have to be asked and knowledge is retained.
- The guidelines vary in tone between the succinct and verifiable and those that are more educational or aspirational (the latter is useful but may not be relevant for the guidelines).
  - IMC Chair response: we previously used the phrase guideline and recommendations,



but now we simply use the term guidelines. The key point about material in the guideline is that it is subject to the principle of „comply and explain“. In addition to that, EIOPA can issue best practice information – these are not subject to comply and explain.

- The responsibility of members of AMSB to understand the model is expressed in an aspirational way – more practical guidance is necessary in terms of the specific level of knowledge required.
  - IMC Chair response: On the ASMB he stated that the position is already weaker in the Level 2 than desired – he had sought understanding at individual level within the Board, the Commission changed this to a “collective” understanding at board level. He mentioned the Board is not expected to have the same level of understanding as the actuary for instance. However, a sound understanding of the result is needed, in particular in the context with business decisions and risk profile.
- How is the consistency of approach on the internal model approval process by different supervisors being addressed?
  - IMC Chair response: It is important to consider what has been achieved so far. There has been agreement at the Board of Supervisors to an internal model timeline such that supervisors have started a pre-application phase enabling them to receive “informal” applications before they are „officially able“ to receive them –therefore co-ordination is in place to avoid things being done at the last minute.
- As regards to the confidence level of 99.5 %. The understanding was that companies would particularly explore and adopt an internal model if they want a higher credit rating; 99.5% does not equate to AAA. However, this is different from a regulatory requirement.
  - Chair IMC acknowledged this and reiterated that it is for the undertaking to determine the confidence level on which it wanted to run its business.
- Do guidelines that are issued by EIOPA undergo a consistency check? The principles based approach is welcomed, but if they are interpreted differently by supervisory authorities then there will not be convergence. Thus, peer review is critical and should potentially be accelerated.
  - Chair IntMod responded that ultimately it is the guideline itself that must be complied with. The explanatory text only provides additional narrative to enhance understanding.
  - Peer review has two key purposes: check comply and explain; highlight best practices.
  - Efforts already made to ensure consistency – for each college there is one pre-application process (rather than for each college member). In addition, internally EIOPA have also set up a Q&A process so that supervisors can ask questions in more different areas of interpretation and can agree on a common approach.

**Conclusion/Action points:**

IRSG members showed appreciation for the involvement in the cycles of pre-consultation that have helped to improve the drafts. In addition, these actions are to follow:

- It was proposed to set-up an IRSG Subgroup on Internal Models to draft an opinion. The following members volunteered: Tomas Béhar, Seamus Creedon, Rob Jones, Hugh Francis
- EIOPA to launch the written process for other members to joint this Subgroup.
- The Subgroup is expected to prepare a draft mandate and to provide with a draft opinion by end of September (for the IRSG meeting in October).

13.00	Lunch (45 minutes)		
-------	--------------------	--	--

7.	<b>EIOPA Presentation on Solvency II – Valuation</b>	Discussion
<p><b>Remarks:</b> The vice chair of the IGSRR presented the topic of valuation and outlined the standards and guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will result in far greater harmonization (SI based on different statutory accounting bases making comparisons difficult)</li> <li>• Concern the valuation of assets and liabilities other than Technical provisions</li> <li>• Primarily deal with issues where IFRS deviates from the Solvency II market consistent approach. Therefore, in some areas the requirements specify where a particular IFRS option should be taken or alternatively where an IFRS approach is not appropriate.</li> <li>• Address the means of valuing assets and liabilities based on valuation models rather than based on available market data</li> </ul> <p><u>A short discussion was held on the topic:</u></p> <p>Welcomed the extensive pre-consultation and the principles based approach, since it is not possible to anticipate specific changes in IFRS. Clarification was asked on the status of the explanatory text on deferred taxes and the valuation of pension liabilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ EIOPA Chair responded that the guidelines are what is necessary to ensure consistency and have legal status - the explanatory text does not have any legal status. The pensions issue is still under consideration.</li> <li>○ Sandra Hack (EIOPA expert) added that the planning horizon on deferred taxes has intentionally been moved to the explanatory text and is no longer part of the guidelines.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion/Action points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It was proposed to appoint Tomas Béhar and Hugh Francis as joint topic owners, to prepare the draft opinion on Valuation.</li> </ul>		
8.	<b>IRSG organisational item: approval of mandates from the Sub-groups</b>	Discussion & decision
<p><b>Conclusion/Action points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Subgroup on Reporting Mandate was approved by the IRSG</li> <li>➤ Subgroup on Long Term Guarantees Mandate was approved by IRSG</li> <li>➤ EIOPA to upload the mandates on the website</li> </ul>		
<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p><b>Dates for 2013:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Friday, 22 February</li> <li>• Tuesday, 16 April</li> <li>• Monday, 1 July</li> </ul>		
<p>Next meeting is scheduled on 18 October and 28 November (joint OPSG and BoS)</p>		
16.00	Scheduled end of the meeting	