IAIS Consultations

Print view of your comments on "Risk-based Global Insurance Capital Standard (ICS) version 1.0 Public Consultation Document" - Date: 19.10.2016, Time: 14:52

Organisation	EIOPA Insurance & Reinsurance Stakeholder Group
Jurisdiction	EU
Role	Other
Name	Annette Olesen
Email	a.olesen@nordea.com
Phone	+4521346607
Treat my comments as confidential	No

	Question
	Q1 Section 3 Should the IAIS further define the concept of an insurance-led financial conglomerate to give greater certainty to supervisors and IAIGs as to how the head of an IAIG will be identified in a complex conglomerate structure? If "yes", is the proposed definition a helpful start and if so what further specification is suggested?
Answer	Yes
Answer Comment	Executive Summary – IRSG opinion General comments on the scope of the ICS • The IRSG understands that the development of global capital standards for insurance was triggered by an overarching objective to ensure increased resilience of the global financial system and comparability. The IRSG supports risk-based prudential measures for the (re)insurance industry. • Given the technical nature of the paper the IRSG has focused on providing high-level comments to the design and have not comprehensively covered all questions raised by the IAIS • The ICS should in the view of the IRSG ensure that appropriate and strong risk management is encouraged and is aligned with the economic basis that the business is managed on e.g. * Use of internal models; * Asset and liability management through cash flow matching is not properly reflected in the current formulation of the ICS model. • It is not clear whether the use of partial or full internal models and other variations to the standard method will be covered in ICS2.0. Given these are areas of importance to many IAIGs the need for and validity of including internal models should already be made clear in V1.0. • The limits of a standard formula should be acknowledged and the core role for internal models made clear from the start. It is not realistic that a one size fits all works in every case on a global basis, given the diversity in terms of products, consumers' needs, and other regulations such as tax and financial regulation, which are also, most often, jurisdiction-specific. Even for global businesses, there are many differences in risk profiles that can hardly be captured by a standard method, all the more if the scope of application is restricted to 50 or so IAIGs. • The Valuation basis is a critical aspect of the ICS, it is important that this reflects the insurance business model and does not introduce pro-cyclicality. The use of an appropriate discount rate is essential in this regard. Under Solvency II, in a European context, this area was discussed at length and specific long term measures were introduced to address this. Under the 'MAV approach' this aspect must be given greater focus to provide appropriate solutions consistent with the long term nature of insurance liabilities, asset liability management and the ability to hold investments for the long term. In addition further work should be undertaken to explore the extent to which a bridge to 'GAAP with adjustments' can be found in this area. • The overall scope of the ICS 1.0 consultation is narrow and does not address/ describe the basic principles such as the overall objectives of the ICS, the purpose of the measurement basis, the interaction with existing jurisdictional regimes, the consequences associated with not meeting the ICS requirements. • The IAIS states that the ICS would serve as a "minimum standard" for a group PCR (paragraph 13). It is unclear what is meant by a minimum standard. If the ICS together with the suggested calibration of a VaR with a 99.5% confidence level over a 1 year time horizon is assessed to be the minimum standard for capital requirement, it could suggest that higher capital requirements are needed (ladder of

intervention, see also Insurance Core Principle (ICP) 17.3). The high level of capital requirement and the "one size fits all" will result in substantial deviations between the calculated capital requirement and the risk profile of the IAIG. • It is unclear how the ICS interact with local juristically requirements in particular SII in a European context. • The fact that the ICS would be implemented as a minimum standard would appear to undermine the key potential benefit of a common framework, such as comparability across jurisdictions and harmonisation of capital frameworks.
Timing • The proposed timetable of having a usable and agreed framework ready for adoption in 2019 and fit for implementation from 2020 appears optimistic given the time it has taken to develop similar regulatory frameworks (Solvency II; Basel II and IFRS) • Transitional measures should be considered as part of the implementation. • The IAIS should take the necessary time to carefully test as well as calibrate its proposals and to learn from experience of already existing frameworks designed around the same principles and objectives (Solvency II being one of them)

Interplay with Solvency II • From a European perspective, the development of ICS should be implemented in a proportionate manner taking due account of the fact that Solvency II is a sophisticated risk based framework. Overall the view of the IRSG is that Solvency II should be considered an appropriate implementation of ICS • ICS will be a major project, and the costs related to the project cannot be ignored • The use of internal models as part of ICS must be considered at an early stage. This was a core part of Solvency II allowing a more appropriate reflection of the underlying business models e.g. reinsurance, geographical diversification

Section 2 – Insurance Capital Standards Note, the Public Consultation raise no questions to this chapter • In section 6.1.1 the IAIS described the composition of the 2015 Field test and contributing type of insurers and resulting risk types embedded in the submissions. The IAIS itself concluded that not all types of insurance and risks were represented. It is unclear how the 2016 field test will ensure a more balanced view. It should be noted that for a proper calibration and assessment of appropriate methodology a sufficient representation is needed especially on those areas were regional diversity is high such as health insurance and catastrophe risk. • More fundamentally, it is noted that if the scope of application is restricted to 50 or so IAIGs, a standard method can hardly capture the diversity in risk profiles among these (re)insurance groups and that an internal modelling approach would appear more appropriate.

Q2 Section 3 Are there any instances of groups likely to be identified as IAIGs where it is likely supervisory judgement will need to be exercised in determining the level at which the group consolidated balance sheet should be prepared for ICS purposes? If "yes", what is the nature of the uncertainty in identifying the Head of the IAIG?

Answer

Q2.1 Section 3 If "yes" to Q2, is this uncertainty related to the insurance group or financial conglomerate forming part of a wider group? If "yes", please describe concerns with identifying the correct Head of the IAIG.

Answer

Q3 Section 3 Given the description of entities to be included in the consolidation for ICS purposes, are there uncertainties as to material entities that should be included within the perimeter of the ICS calculation? If "yes", for which types of entities are supervisors and IAIGs most likely to benefit from greater specification of the scope of the group?

Answer

Q4 Section 3 Are there any further comments on this section on the scope of group that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If "yes", please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q5 Section 4.1.1 Do the adjustments to GAAP specified in the 2016 Field Testing Technical Specifications for the construction of the MAV balance sheet succeed in providing a largely comparable picture of the financial situation of IAIGs and a consistent basis for the calculation of the ICS? Please explain.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

Section 4 – Valuation - General comments by IRSG • The Valuation basis is a critical aspect of the ICS, it is important that this reflects the insurance business model and does not introduce pro-cyclicality. The use of an appropriate discount rate is essential in this regard. Under Solvency II, in a European context, this area was discussed at length and specific long term measures were introduced to address this. Under the 'MAV approach' this aspect must be given greater focus to provide appropriate solutions consistent with the long term nature of insurance liabilities, asset liability management and the ability to hold investments for the long term. In addition further work should be undertaken to explore the extent to which a bridge to 'GAAP with adjustments' can be found in this area. • ICP 14.7.1 states "Technical provisions are assets or liabilities that represent the economic value of the insurer fulfilling its insurance obligations to policyholders and other beneficiaries arising over the lifetime of the insurer's portfolio of insurance policies". This approach should be equally reflected in the MAV and GAAP+ approach. • There are some very key basic foundations that do not yet seem to be agreed and it is hard to comment definitively on the proposals until they are resolved. These include * What is the purpose of the measurement framework: To ensure a company has sufficient financial resources to meet its customer commitments to a certain confidence limit or to maintain transferability at all times to a certain confidence limit? * Is the underlying balance sheet assumption that insurers' assets and liabilities are generally exposed to 100% forced selling risk but can only exceptionally avoid force sales or that insurers are generally assumed to be long-term investors but exceptionally can be forced sellers of some of their assets? • Fulfilling the insurance liabilities by the IAIG suggests a wider consequence for the ICS. The impact of applying a fulfilment does have not only have consequences for the valuation (discount rate for insurance liabilities) but should also have consequences for the approach taken when determining the appropriate methodology for the capital requirements. Thus for those fixed income investments which are used to back insurance liabilities and which are not subject to forced sales should be shocked against the default risk rather the spread risk.

Q6 Section 4.1.1 Are there any other material areas of divergence across existing GAAPs (or statutory accounts) that should be subject to adjustments when constructing the MAV balance sheet? If "yes", please explain.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

The current market adjusted valuation proposals fail to appropriately address the issue of artificial balance sheet volatility. This was a key concern in Solvency II and could equally be a key concern in the ICS. The IAIS should test options that fully capture the link between insurers' assets and their liabilities and should check the effectiveness of the valuation options by assessing the level of residual volatility in the available capital. The testing needs to include extreme market periods such as the recent financial crisis to ensure the framework really works as intended.

Q7 Section 4.1.3 Should MAV include a more economic approach to contract boundaries (eg renewal rate and stability of premiums) rather than focusing on contractual or legal aspects? If "yes", why would this provide a better assessment of the solvency position of IAIGs?

Answer

Q8 Section 4.1.3 If an economic approach were adopted, would that make the determination of the contract boundaries more complicated? Please explain.

Answer

Q9 Section 4.1.3 If an economic approach were adopted, the calibration of some ICS risk charges would need to be revised to capture the different exposure to risks (eg Lapse risk). What areas of the ICS capital requirement would be affected and how? Please explain in terms of the defined risks in the ICS capital requirement.

Answer

Q10 Section 4.1.3 To ensure the overall consistency of the framework, the definition of MOCE would need to be reviewed following the adoption of an economic approach to contract boundaries. Would a change to an economic approach to contract boundaries impact the specification of MOCE? Please explain.

Answer

	Q11 Section 4.1.3 If material amounts of future business were included in the valuation of insurance liabilities through the consideration of future expected renewals, would the resulting capital resources (future profits) continue to meet the criteria for inclusion in Tier 1 (eg regarding the criterion on availability)? Please explain.
Answer	

	Q12 Section 4.1.3 Would other components of the ICS, be affected by such change? If "yes", please specify those components and provide an explanation.
Answer	

	Q13 Section 4.1.4.3 Is the current 3-segment approach to the definition of IAIS base yield curves a sound basis to determine the base yield curve? Please explain.
Answer	Yes
Answer Comment	• Discount rate and procyclicality - whilst a number of options were tested in the Market Adjusted Valuation basis as part of the field study, none of these appropriately and sufficiently captures the underlying economic reality for well-matched illiquid liabilities portfolios such as annuities where the asset rate will be earned and the only exposure is default • There is nothing equivalent to the Matching Adjustment which is available under SII, which enables sufficiently granularity by liability type to capture this, hence such liabilities may be substantially overstated • When considering options for calculating the long-term forward rate (LTFR), the IAIS appears to be proposing a method based on availability of data rather than on economic logic. • The LTFR can be disaggregated into the sum of long-term expected real interest rates and expected inflation and calibrated by estimating each of these elements. In Europe there are sources of data for both of these elements. However, the IAIS proposed methodology is to disaggregate the LTFR into long-term growth rates and inflation. This produced a number but is not a correct derivation of the LTFR. The decision to calibrate in this way appears to be driven by the fact that consistent historical data sources are available for both of these elements for many currencies while such data sources are not available for the correct disaggregation of real interest rates and inflation. • The IRSG recommends that the LTFR is calibrated based on long-term real interest rate + long-term inflation using either direct data sources (as is available in Europe and is already used for SII) and where not available proxy estimates should be used, for example long-term growth rates may be considered a reasonable proxy for long-term real interest rates in some markets.

	Q14 Section 4.1.4.3 The base yield curves are based on either swaps or government bonds, depending on the liquidity of the underlying markets. Are any of the IAIS' choices of either swaps or government bonds as a basis for determining individual currency yield curves as set out in Table 4 inappropriate? If "yes", for which currencies is the choice inappropriate? Please explain your answer.
Answer	

	Q15 Section 4.1.4.3 For each currency, the extrapolation period begins at the point where the market for the instruments used no longer fulfils the criteria for being considered deep, liquid and transparent. Is the starting point of Segment 2 inappropriate for any currency? If "yes", for which currencies is the starting point inappropriate? Please explain.
Answer	

	Q16 Section 4.1.4.3 Currently, the IAIS has adopted the simplification that Segment 3 should start at maturity 60 for all currencies. Should the IAIS continue with this simplification? If "yes", are there any necessary amendments to that approach? If "no", should the IAIS seek to adopt a different approach to determining the start of Segment 3 based on one of the following options?
Answer	

	Q16.1 Section 4.1.4.3 Should the IAIS harmonise the length of Segment 2 at a set number of years? If "yes", what should be the length of Segment 2?
Answer	

Q16.2 Section 4.1.4.3 Should the IAIS consider determining a minimum convergence point as well as a consistent convergence time and take a maximum of the last point of Segment 1 plus the consistent convergence time and the minimum convergence point? If "yes", what should be the consistent convergence time and minimum convergence point?

Answer

Q17 Section 4.1.4.3 The proposed LTFR is based on a macroeconomic approach using OECD information. Is this methodology appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q17.1 Section 4.1.4.3 If "no" to Q17, should the IAIS develop an alternative methodology to derive the LTFR? Please provide an outline of such an alternative methodology.

Answer

Q18 Section 4.1.4.3 The discounting approach is based on a stable macro-economic long-term anchor while the methodology to derive it may show drifts or even steps over time. Should the IAIS also address the issue of frequency of assessment and ways to update the LTFR? If "yes", please provide details of how the IAIS should address the issue of frequency of assessment and ways to update the LTFR.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

• The LTFR should be defined as a stable long-term parameter and it should be avoided that the LTFR becomes in itself a source of volatility. • The IAIS should aim to avoid both volatility and uncertainty regarding the prudential valuation of technical provisions and capital requirements. • For example a recalibration of the LTFR could be done every 5 years and changes to the LTFR, once identified, should be spread in a predictable way over a number of years. An annual limit for the change in the LTFR should be defined eg 10bs. This would achieve the desired and needed long-term stable outcomes.

Q19 Section 4.1.4.3 Do you have any other proposals for refinement of the methodology to derive the base yield curves? If "yes", please provide a detailed rationale for your suggestions.

Answer

Q20 Section 4.1.4.4 Which approach to portfolio selection, as a basis for the calculation of the credit spread adjustment, is more appropriate for the MAV approach, taking into account the need to ensure a balance between complexity, comparability and basis risk? Please explain.

Answer

Q21 Section 4.1.4.4 Is it appropriate to have entity-specific elements in the valuation of insurance liabilities?

Answer

Q21.1 Section 4.1.4.4 If "yes" to Q21, to what extent is this appropriate?

Answer

Q21.2 Section 4.1.4.4 If "yes" to Q21, how can that be aligned with the market-based nature of the framework (evident in the approach used to value assets) and the need to protect all policyholders in an equal manner, independently of the individual choices made by each IAIG, as discussed above?

Answer

Q22 Section 4.1.4.4 Is it important for the valuation framework, together with the capital requirement framework, to not provide incentives for low quality investments undermining policyholder protection? Please explain.

Answer

Q22.1 Section 4.1.4.4 If “yes” to Q22, is the capping of the contribution to the Adjustment to that of a comparable BBB asset an effective way of achieving that objective? Please explain.

Answer

Q22.2 Section 4.1.4.4 If “no” to Q22.1, what other approaches could the IAIS explore to achieve that objective?

Answer

Q23 Section 4.1.4.4 Should insurance liabilities be segregated into buckets for the purpose of applying the credit spread adjustment?

Answer

Q23.1 Section 4.1.4.4 If “yes” to Q23, which criteria are appropriate to allocate liabilities to the different buckets?

Answer

• Under the GAAP with adjustment approach book yield/expected earned rate is utilised for liabilities and adjustments are being proposed to AOCI to remove unrealised gains /losses for assets to reflect the ability to hold assets to maturity and thereby avoid forced selling for certain liabilities. Getting this aspect right will be critical and potentially reducing the different outcomes between the two valuation approaches. • This same concept is relevant to discount rates under MAV and this area should be explored further as a potential bridge between the two valuation methods.

Q23.2 Section 4.1.4.4 If “yes” to Q23, what is an appropriate number of buckets?

Answer

Q23.3 Section 4.1.4.4 If “yes” to Q23, what should be the application ratios associated with each bucket?

Answer

Q23.4 Section 4.1.4.4 If ”no” to Q23, as an alternative to a criterion for predictability of insurance liabilities, could partial risk transfer to policyholders (eg market value adjusted products) be a criterion for determining the credit spread adjustment?

Answer

Q24 Section 4.1.4.4 Does the ability of IAIGs to earn credit spreads above the risk-free interest rates in a risk-free manner depend on the IAIGs’ ability to match liability cash-flows with asset cash-flows? Please explain.

Answer

Q25 Section 4.1.4.4 What level of granularity is more appropriate for the calculation of the credit spread adjustment? Please justify your answer.

Answer

Q26 Section 4.1.4.4 In the absence of requirements concerning asset-liability matching and ring-fencing, should supervisors require the proposed allocation be demonstrated and maintained throughout the lifetime of the corresponding insurance liabilities? Please explain and if “yes”, how could this be achieved?

Answer

	Q27 Section 4.1.4.4 Is the proposed approach for calculating the adjustments for default reasonable? If “no”, please explain how it could be improved.
Answer	
	Q28 Section 4.1.4.4 Should the IAIS consider introducing an adjustment to the LTFR? If “yes”, what would be the technical rationale for an adjustment to the LTFR and which methodologies should the IAIS explore?
Answer	
	Q29 Section 4.1.4.4 Is there a way to avoid or mitigate the issue of “inverted risk profile” (as described in Section 4.1.4.4)? If “yes”, please explain.
Answer	
	Q30 Section 4.1.4.4 Is the move to an adjustment defined as an absolute change (in bps) to the base yield curve appropriate, rather than a proportional movement? Please explain.
Answer	
	Q31 Section 4.1.4.5 Which of the proposed options strikes a better balance between the different policy issues under consideration by the IAIS? Please explain.
Answer	
	Q31.1 Section 4.1.4.5 Could the chosen option be modified to make it even more appropriate? If “yes”, please provide details of the suggested modifications to the chosen option.
Answer	
	Q32 Section 4.1.5 Are there any further comments on MAV that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.
Answer	
	Q33 Section 4.2.5 The AOCI adjustment is proposed to only apply to unrealised gains and losses related to debt securities backing long-term liabilities where it is more likely than not that the unrealised gains and losses would not be realised. Is this an appropriate way to segregate non-economic volatility from the fair value measurement of investments in debt securities? If “no”, what alternative would you propose, and why?
Answer	
	Q34 Section 4.2.5 Are there any refinements that should be made to identify assets backing long-term liabilities for purposes of the AOCI adjustment? For example, would a bucketing approach similar to that proposed for assets under MAV discounting option 3 (based on liquidity characteristics of the liabilities) be an appropriate way to identify assets backing long-term liabilities? Please explain.
Answer	
	Q35 Section 4.2.5 Is the “more likely than not” criterion to exclude certain unrealised gain/losses an appropriate element of the AOCI adjustment calculation? Please explain.
Answer	
	Q35.1 Section 4.2.5 Is this an appropriate way to segregate assets where unrealised gain/loss is more likely than not to be realised? If “no” what alternative would you propose and why?
Answer	

Q36 Section 4.2.5 Are there specific asset classes that should be included in the "more likely than not" category? If "yes", please explain.

Answer

Q37 Section 4.2.5 Is a default risk adjustment appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q38 Section 4.2.5 A possible method for calculating the default risk adjustment is to reference the credit rating at purchase (or previous write down) as compared to the current rating. The change in rating can be used to determine the portion of the credit spread related to default risk. Is this an appropriate method to estimate the unrealised loss related to default risk? Please explain. If "no", please suggest an alternative method that could be used to calculate the default risk spread.

Answer

Q39 Section 4.2.5 It has been suggested by some Volunteer IAIGs that the default risk spread could be highly volatile in certain periods of stress. Are there methods to evaluate this volatility over historically relevant periods, and is appropriate data available to do so? Please explain.

Answer

Q40 Section 4.2.5 Do the GAAP Plus principles and guidelines constitute a sufficient basis for the specification of an ICS Valuation Approach that fulfils the ICS Principles as defined by the IAIS? Please explain.

Answer

Q41 Section 4.2.5 Are there any internal inconsistencies in the GAAP Plus jurisdictional examples as outlined in the 2016 Field Testing Technical Specifications, or any area which is not aligned with the stated GAAP Plus principles and guidelines? If "yes", please explain what you would propose to amend in the examples.

Answer

Q42 Section 4.2.5 Under GAAP Plus there are differences between jurisdictions in the approach to valuing assets. Should all assets be valued under the same approach (whether that be fair value or a mix of cost and fair value) for all jurisdictions? Please explain.

Answer

Q43 Section 4.2.5 Under GAAP Plus there are differences between jurisdictions in the approach to valuing liabilities. Should all liabilities be valued under the same approach whether that be closer to book value or market value for all jurisdictions? Please explain.

Answer

Q44 Section 4.2.5 Are there any refinements that could be made to lead to a more comparable valuation outcome for insurance liabilities between jurisdictions? Please explain.

Answer

Q45 Section 4.2.5 A method for aggregating financial data for U.S. Statutory only filers has been developed for GAAP Plus (see section 7.3.2 of the 2016 Field Testing Technical Specifications). Does this method capture all material elements such that the resulting aggregated financial statements would be materially equivalent to U.S. GAAP consolidated statements? If "no", please provide details of other elements or adjustments that could address any material differences.

Answer

Q46 Section 4.2.5 Is there a way to evaluate the impacts of these proposed accounting standards on the ICS, and more specifically on GAAP Plus, in the absence of current data and prior to the implementation of the rules? Please explain.

Answer

Q47 Section 4.2.6 Are there any further comments on GAAP Plus that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If "yes", please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q48 Section 4.3.5 With respect to the CC MOCE calculations (both prudence and cost of capital approaches), are there any particular issues with the way that GAAP Plus liabilities are calculated that would necessitate a difference in the calculation of a CC MOCE under GAAP Plus from the CC MOCE under MAV? If "yes", please explain.

Answer Yes

Answer Comment

• The high level argumentation regarding the balance sheet valuation is not in place. It is unclear what MOCE exactly reflects. Is it a prudency margin, a transfer value? • The principles and the rationale underlying the MOCE concept need to be consistent with the overall structure of the ICS framework. • MOCE should not become an additional part of liabilities but remain as a calculated element contained within the solvency capital. Creating an addition to the liabilities will complicate the framework, may be unnecessarily conservative and introduce another potentially volatile element. This is the role of the solvency capital and to do this would be double counting and interfere with the solvency calibration. • The COC MOCE approach is based on stresses that are not reflecting the risk in the company (no use of internal model), so the MOCE then cannot mirror the add-on to obtain a transfer value. Nor does the CoC MOCE represent the minimum return expected by investors on capital to support the business where the capital underlying the calculation does not reflect the company's risks.

Q49 Section 4.3.5.1 *Margin observed in actual market transactions* - Based on your experience or any data analysis, are you able to observe or estimate the value of market transactions of insurance liabilities in comparison with the current estimate as defined in the MAV? If "yes", what value do you observe or estimate related to the current estimates (to be differentiated by type of liabilities, if appropriate). Please provide evidence or references to support the response.

Answer

Q50 Section 4.3.5.1 *Cost of capital parameter* - Should the hurdle cost of capital parameter be:

Answer

Q51 Section 4.3.5.1 *Projection of capital requirement* - Are the risks to be included in the projected capital requirement appropriate? If "no", please explain which risks should be excluded/added and why.

Answer

Q52 Section 4.3.5.1 *Projection of capital requirement* - Is the calculation of the global projected capital requirement appropriate? If "no", please suggest amendment(s) with supporting rationale.

Answer

Q53 Section 4.3.5.1 *Projection of capital requirement* - Is the approach to project the future capital requirements as part of the standard method appropriate considering the trade-off between accuracy/risk sensitivity and simplicity (eg outgoing cash flows excluding maturity benefit for Mortality risk or sums a risk)? If "no", please suggest and justify any proposed amendment.

Answer

	Q54 Section 4.3.5.1 *Projection of capital requirement* - Is an IAIG's ICS capital requirement (99.5% one-year VaR) the appropriate amount of capital on which to base the CoC MOCE? If "no", please provide an alternative suggestion with rationale.
Answer	
	Q55 Section 4.3.5.1 *Projection of capital requirement* - Should the projected future capital requirements reflect minimal, average, or optimal diversification benefits (considering a willing buyer which is likely to achieve a conceivable synergy from the transaction)? If "yes", how can the diversification benefit be reflected in the CoC MOCE calculation?
Answer	
	Q56 Section 4.3.5.1 *Discount factor* - If Market risks and most of the Credit risk are excluded from the projection of the future capital requirements as per the 2016 Field Testing Technical Specifications, does this imply that such MOCE only allows a recapitalisation where no Market risk and only limited Credit risk could be supported (ie with not enough resources to take on market risks)? If "no", please explain.
Answer	
	Q57 Section 4.3.5.1 *Discount factor* - If no Market risk and only limited Credit risk could be supported by the level of recapitalisation allowed by the level of MOCE, then should the future return from invested assets free of Market risk and Credit risk be the risk free rate? If "no", please explain.
Answer	
	Q58 Section 4.3.5.1 *Discount factor* - Assuming that the answers to the two questions above are "yes" then is it consistent to discount the projected future capital requirement by the risk free rate? If "no", please provide an alternative suggestion with rationale.
Answer	
	Q59 Section 4.3.5.1 *Discount factor* - Should the discount factor be linked in some way to the hurdle rate (cost of capital parameter)? If "yes", please provide an alternative suggestion to discounting at risk free rate and the rationale.
Answer	
	Q60 Section 4.3.5.1 *Interaction with capital resources and capital requirement* - Should the CoC MOCE be part of the valuation of insurance liabilities and not included in capital resources? If "no", please explain.
Answer	
	Q61 Section 4.3.5.1 *Interaction with capital resources and capital requirement* - Is holding the CoC MOCE, in addition to a 99.5% VaR calibrated capital requirement, a condition to ensure that the IAIG remains prudentially viable with a 99.5% probability (by providing the cost to serve a level of capital meeting the supervisory capital requirement)? If "no", please explai
Answer	
	Q62 Section 4.3.5.1 *Interaction with capital resources and capital requirement* - If CoC MOCE is targeted to a level of prudential viability, is the current definition of capital resources appropriate? If "no", please explain, including details of what level of prudential viability should be maintained, and whether other forms of capital resources should be considered for that purpose.
Answer	
	Q63 Section 4.3.5.1 *Interaction with capital resources and capital requirement* - Is there any double counting between the CoC MOCE and the capital requirement? Please explain.
Answer	

Q64 Section 4.3.5.2 Should the P-MOCE be loss absorbing? Please explain and if "yes", elaborate on the circumstance(s) in which this loss absorption may occur.

Answer

Q65 Section 4.3.5.2 Should the P-MOCE be stressed along with other balance sheet items in the calculation of the ICS capital requirement? Please explain.

Answer

Q66 Section 4.3.6 Are there any further comments on MOCE that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If "yes", please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q67 Section 4.4 Should all reinsurance contracts be identified using a consistent definition across all jurisdictions? If "yes", please propose a definition.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

The general principle that should apply is that the economic benefit of the reinsurance contract should be allowed and the definition of a reinsurance contract needs to facilitate this

---

Q68 Section 4.4 Considering proportionality and the desire for pragmatism, would it be appropriate to limit a consistent approach across jurisdictions to only certain types of reinsurance contracts? If "yes", what kind of contracts? Please explain.

Answer

Q69 Section 4.4.1 Are there any further comments on reinsurance recognition that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If "yes", please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q70 Section 5.3.1 Should Tier 1 Limited financial instruments be required to have a principal loss absorbency mechanism?

Answer

Q70.1 Section 5.3.1 If "no" to Q70, should the principal be considered to provide loss absorbency on a going concern basis? Please explain how the instrument demonstrates loss absorbency on a going concern basis.

Answer

Q71 Section 5.3.2 Is there an objective methodology that the IAIS could use to determine the amount of financial instruments issued by consolidated subsidiaries of the IAIG and held by third parties that is not available to the group for the protection of policyholders of the IAIG? Please explain.

Answer

Q72 Section 5.3.3 Is there an objective methodology that the IAIS could use to determine the amount that should be added back to Tier 2 for those items deducted from Tier 1? Please explain.

Answer

Q73 Section 5.3.4 Is structural subordination sufficient to guarantee that policyholders will be paid first in a winding up? Please explain.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

Section 5.3.4 “Structural vs contractual subordination (treatment of senior debt)” discusses the subordination, especially for those instruments issued by non-insurance parts of the group. Judging from the questions raised here in Q73 and in Q74 it seems the IAIS may want to follow the route of the structural subordination. This approach could have serious consequences for the possibility of financing non-insurance activities within a group. If all senior debt has to rank after policyholders somewhere in the group this will impact the terms and conditions of future senior debt and the required coupons to be paid. It is also unsure whether a legislation across the globe will accommodate this requirement.

Q74 Section 5.3.4 Does structural subordination produce the same outcomes as legal or contractual subordination? Please explain.

Answer

Q75 Section 5.3.5 Is a requirement for supervisory approval prior to the redemption of a financial instrument at contractual maturity sufficient for that instrument to be considered perpetual? Please explain.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

Yes, it should be considered sufficient that a supervisory approval is required before the redemption of a financial instrument issued by a (re)insurance group for the instrument to be considered perpetual, at least if the instrument in itself has no contractual maturity. To get an approval to redeem the financial instrument, the mutual insurance company must have sufficient other capital to comply with the capital requirement.

Q76 Section 5.3.5 Is a requirement for supervisory approval of distributions prior to contractual maturity (eg interest payments, dividends) sufficient for the distributions to be considered non-cumulative? Please explain.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

Yes, for financial instruments issued by a (re)insurance group it should be considered sufficient with a supervisory approval of distributions prior to contractual maturity for distributions to be considered non-cumulative. It could also be sufficient that payments of interest complies with jurisdictional law as regarding to the possibilities to make a payment. The reason for that is that the terms of the initial fund (please refer to question 77) including the terms of distributions is subject to approval of the supervisory authorities.

Q77 Section 5.3.5 Do existing financial instruments issued by mutual IAIGs (for example, but not limited to surplus notes, Kikin and other forms of subordinated financial instruments) absorb losses on a going concern basis? Please identify which instrument and explain.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

There is a financial instrument “initial fund” that is issued by a mutual insurer at start or if needed during operations. It shall be refunded when it is no longer needed in the company. The repayment is subject to supervisory approval. The refund requires that the capital situation in the company is satisfying with regards to complying with the capital requirements and the operations of the company generally. The instrument is therefore available for as long as the company needs it. It cannot be refunded if no other capital such as retained earnings has been accumulated. The initial fund is the most subordinated claim in liquidation. It is possible to pay interest to the holder of the initial fund. The payment of interest is subject to restrictions. The initial fund therefore has loss-absorbing capacity on a going-concern basis.

Q78 Section 5.3.5 Should the Tier 1 criteria (unlimited or limited) be changed in some way to better classify the financial instruments of mutual IAIGs? Please explain.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

• According to the Public 2016 Field Testing Technical Specifications part 11.1.2.1 paragraph 333 regarding tier 1 unlimited the following criteria should be changed to better classify the financial instrument in the form of initial fund issued by a mutual: • e) and f) regards repayment of the instrument. Especially f) with the criteria that no expectation should be created to indicate the possibility of repayment is problematic. The initial fund issued by mutuals is by nature meant to be refunded as soon as it is no longer needed, subject to supervisory approval. Therefore the criteria f) should be removed or amended. • g) and h) regards distributions. It is not clear if only distributions in the form of dividends are intended or if also interest is included. Especially for h) it should be clarified that if the terms of the instrument include the possibility of payments of interest, the criteria that distributions shall reduce equity rather than profit and loss may not be relevant according to the way that the mutual accounts for the cost of interest. • Regarding paragraph 334 tier 1 limited capital there is criteria g) and i) that are the same as f) and h) in paragraph 333. The same comments as above are relevant.

Q79 Section 5.3.5 What would prevent mutual IAIGs from issuing other financial instruments that meet the qualifying criteria for Tier 1 capital resources as set out in the 2016 Field Testing Technical Specifications? Please explain.

Answer

• Mutuals around the world are structured in different ways, according to the national jurisdictional law. It could be that national law does not permit a mutual to issue a financial instrument that fulfils all the criteria in the Technical Specifications. Therefore it is appropriate to make some adjustments in the general principles in the standard for those different circumstances. • The purpose for a mutual company is to fulfil a need of insurance, whereas a shareholders company has as an objective to generate profits for investors. Mutuals are therefore often self-financed. When external capital is raised in a mutual there are questions of how to balance the influence from external investors with that of the policyholders in the mutual. External capital is often raised when needed which means that retained earnings may be insufficient. Therefore it is important not to unduly restrict the possibility for mutual companies to classify issued financial instruments as “tier one capital unlimited”. • The initial fund is by nature meant to be refunded and is issued by the mutual only for as long as it is needed. Therefore the criteria in paragraph 333 f) and paragraph 334 g) that stipulates that there must be no expectations of repurchase of the instrument does not fit with the nature of the initial fund and should be adjusted accordingly. Also the criteria in paragraph 333 h) and paragraph 334 i) could be too restrictive as the accounting practices may differ in different jurisdictions.

Q80 Section 5.3.6 Should non-paid-up items be included in ICS qualifying capital resources? Please explain.

Answer

Q80.1 Section 5.3.6 If “yes” to Q80, do the qualifying criteria set out in the 2016 Technical Specifications capture all the requirements that should be applied to the assessment of non-paid up items? Please explain.

Answer

Q81 Section 5.3.6 If non-paid-up capital items are permitted, is the capital composition limit proposed in 2016 Technical Specifications appropriate? If “no”, how should the limit be set?

Answer

Q82 Section 5.3.7 What theoretical basis could the IAIS use to determine appropriate capital composition limits?

Answer

Q83 Section 5.3.8 When should prior supervisory approval of the redemption of a financial instrument issued by an IAIG be required?

Answer

Q83.1 Section 5.3.8 Should any other factors (eg lock-in and amortisation) be taken into consideration? Please explain.

Answer

Q84 Section 5.3.8 Does a lock-in feature provide the same safeguard as supervisory approval prior to redemption of a financial instrument? Please explain.

Answer

Q84.1 Section 5.3.8 If "yes" to Q84, should the ICS qualifying criteria be amended to remove the requirement for prior supervisory approval where a financial instrument possesses a lock-in feature? Please explain.

Answer

Q85 Section 5.3.9 Do any of the above AOCI elements provide loss absorbing capacity on a going concern basis? Please provide an explanation as to how the element(s) absorbs losses.

Answer

Q86 Section 5.3.9 Are there any additional elements that are included in AOCI under specific jurisdictional GAAPs that could be considered to be loss absorbing on a going concern basis, and therefore should be included in capital resources? Please explain.

Answer

Q87 Section 5.3.10 Is the definition of insurance liability/reinsurance adjustment offset as described appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q88 Section 5.3.10 Are there any valuation adjustment amounts that should be included or excluded? Please explain.

Answer

Q89 Section 5.3.10 Would the inclusion of insurance liability/reinsurance adjustment offset generate significant volatility in capital resources? If "yes", how should the volatility be addressed?

Answer

Q90 Section 5.4 Are there any further comments on capital resources that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If "yes", please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q91 Section 6.3.4.1 Is the principle of allowing for the effect of risk mitigation techniques in the ICS capital requirement only on the basis of assets and liabilities existing at the reference date of the ICS calculation appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q92 Section 6.3.4.1 Should dynamic hedging arrangements be included in the scope of recognised risk mitigation techniques for ICS Version 2.0? Please explain.

Answer

Q92.1 Section 6.3.4.1 If "yes" to Q92, please comment on dynamic hedging programs that should be recognised in the ICS.

Answer

Q92.2 Section 6.3.4.1 If “yes” to Q92, please comment on how the principle of allowing for the effect of risk mitigation techniques in the ICS capital requirement only on the basis of assets and liabilities existing at the reference date of the ICS calculation could be amended in a manner appropriate to the ICS and the way it is currently constructed (ie the use of instantaneous shocks for market risk).

Answer

Q92.3 Section 6.3.4.1 If “yes” to Q92, please comment on what criteria should be met to allow the effect of dynamic hedging arrangements to be recognised in the ICS capital requirement.

Answer

Q93 Section 6.3.4.2 Is the general treatment given for risk-mitigation techniques that are in force for less than the next 12 months appropriate for the ICS standard method? Please explain. If “no”, please provide details of a practical alternative that would be appropriate for the ICS standard method.

Answer

Q94 Section 6.3.4.3 Are the criteria for recognising the renewal of Non-life risk mitigation arrangements appropriate for the ICS standard method? Please explain. If “no”, please detail which criteria should be amended, including rationale and suggested amended wording.

Answer

Q95 Section 6.3.4.4 With regard to risks arising from the balance sheet as at the reference date, should renewal of risk mitigation arrangements other than those relating to non-life insurance risks also be recognised? Please explain.

Answer

Q95.1 Section 6.3.4.4 If “yes” to Q95, please provide specific suggestions for criteria that can be applied to the recognition of such renewals.

Answer

Q95.2 Section 6.3.4.4 If “yes” to Q95, please provide specific examples of risk mitigation arrangements that would qualify as such, including details of the risks addressed and the materiality of these arrangements.

Answer

Q95.3 Section 6.3.4.4 If “yes” to Q95, please provide suggestions on how the issues such as future availability, future cost and uncertainty of the decision should be addressed.

Answer

Q96 Section 6.3.4.5 Should a materiality threshold for basis risk arising from any risk mitigation techniques be defined? If “yes”, please provide a detailed suggestion of a definition that would be appropriate for the ICS and your rationale.

Answer

Q97 Section 6.3.4.5 Are you aware of organisations that account for basis risk arising from risk mitigation techniques? If “yes”, please provide details on how this is done in practice.

Answer

Q98 Section 6.3.5 Are there any further comments on risk mitigation that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q99 Section 6.4.1 Are there any comments on look-through that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q100 Section 6.5.2 Is this extension of the definition of management actions to include limited premium increases for health business appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

As a general principle the benefit of management actions (section 6.5) should be allowed for where the IAIG has the ability to amend the premium. In this context the definition of management actions should be extended to allow for the appropriate premium increases for business on (re)insurance contracts other than health where the features of those contracts allow for such premium increases. Where the premium increases are economically justified in line with the nature of the contract they should not be subject to a cap

Q101 Section 6.5.3.1 Are there examples of other instances for which an extension of management actions to allow for the recognition of premium adjustments may be appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q102 Section 6.5.3.2 Is the method to determine the effect of management actions in a stress scenario inconsistent with the recognition of future premium increases in stress scenarios? If “yes”, please suggest a solution.

Answer

Q103 Section 6.5.4 Are there any further comments on management actions that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q104 Section 6.6.2 Should the trend component be explicitly considered within Mortality risk? Please explain.

Answer

Q105 Section 6.6.2 Are the stress levels for Mortality risk appropriate? Please explain. If “no”, please provide supporting evidence and rationale for a different stress level.

Answer

Q106 Section 6.6.2 Should the trend component be explicitly considered within Longevity risk? Please explain.

Answer

Q107 Section 6.6.2 Are the stress levels for Longevity risk appropriate? Please explain. If “no”, please provide supporting evidence and rationale for a different stress level.

Answer

Q108 Section 6.6.3 Is there evidence to support the use of stresses for Mortality and Longevity risk that vary by geographical region? Please explain and provide supporting evidence.

Answer

Q109 Section 6.6.3 Is there a specific methodology and reference data that the IAIS should use to determine appropriate mortality and longevity stress levels by geographic region? Please explain.

Answer

Q110 Section 6.6.4 Are there any further comments on Mortality and Longevity risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q111 Section 6.7.2.1 Is the proposed segmentation for health business appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q112 Section 6.7.2.1 Are the stress levels for the health segments appropriate? Please explain. If “no”, please provide supporting evidence and rationale for a different stress level.

Answer

Q113 Section 6.7.2.1 Is the shock for Health lapse risk appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q114 Section 6.7.2.2 Are the two product segments as defined appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q115 Section 6.7.2.2 Are the stress levels appropriate? Please explain. If “no”, please provide supporting evidence and rationale for a different stress level.

Answer

Q116 Section 6.7.3.1 Is there evidence that the volatility of health claims (Option 1) varies by geographical region, thereby justifying a more refined granularity? Please explain.

Answer

Q117 Section 6.7.3.1 Is there a specific methodology and reference data that the IAIS should use to determine appropriate Health stress levels by geographic region? Please explain.

Answer

Q118 Section 6.7.3.1 Is there evidence to support the use of stresses for Morbidity/Disability risk (Option 2) that vary by geographical region? Please explain and provide supporting evidence.

Answer

Q119 Section 6.7.3.1 Is there a specific methodology and reference data that the IAIS should use to determine appropriate Morbidity/Disability stress levels by geographic region? Please explain.

Answer

Q120 Section 6.7.3.2 Is Option 1 (Health risk) or Option 2 (Morbidity/Disability risk) the most appropriate to adopt within ICS Version 1.0? Please explain.

Answer

Q121 Section 6.7.3.2 Should any revisions or modifications be made to the approach selected in Q120 to make it more appropriate for ICS Version 1.0? Please explain.

Answer

Q122 Section 6.7.4 Are there any further comments on Health or Morbidity/Disability risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q123 Section 6.8.2 Is the stress level for the level and trend component appropriate? Please explain. If “no”, please provide supporting evidence and rationale for a different stress level.

Answer

Q124 Section 6.8.2 Is the stress level for Mass Lapse risk appropriate? Please explain. If “no”, please provide supporting evidence and rationale for a different stress level.

Answer

Q125 Section 6.8.2 Is the treatment of dynamic lapses appropriate? Please explain. If “no”, please suggest an alternative treatment.

Answer

Q126 Section 6.8.2 Is the approach of taking the maximum of the level and trend components and the mass lapse component appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q127 Section 6.8.3.1 Is there evidence to support the use of stresses for Lapse risk that vary by geographical region? Please explain and provide supporting evidence.

Answer

Q128 Section 6.8.3.1 Is there a specific methodology and reference data that the IAIS should use to determine appropriate lapse stress levels by geographic region? Please explain.

Answer

Q129 Section 6.8.3.2 Should the mass lapse stress be applied to all surrenderable policies, regardless of surrender strain? Please explain.

Answer

Q130 Section 6.8.3.2 Should the mass lapse stress be applied only to surrenderable policies with positive surrender strain? Please explain.

Answer

Q131 Section 6.8.4 Are there any further comments on Lapse risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q132 Section 6.9.2 Is the stress level for Expense risk appropriate? Please explain. If “no”, please provide supporting evidence and rationale for a different stress level.

Answer

Q133 Section 6.9.3.1 Is there evidence to support the use of stresses for Expense risk that vary by geographical region? Please explain and provide supporting evidence.

Answer

Q134 Section 6.9.3.1 Is there a specific methodology and reference data that the IAIS should use to determine appropriate expense stress levels by geographic region? Please explain.

Answer

Q135 Section 6.9.3.1 Is there evidence that the volatility of expense inflation experience for insurance companies varies from that of general inflation? Please explain.

Answer

Q136 Section 6.9.3.2 Should the IAIS assume 100% correlation between unit expense and expense inflation? Please explain. If "no", how could correlation be built into the assumptions

Answer

Q137 Section 6.9.3.2 Are there data sources available that could be used to calibrate the correlation between unit expense and expense inflation? If "yes", please provide information on the source.

Answer

Q138 Section 6.9.3.3 Should the IAIS consider introducing a cap to moderate the compounding effect of expense inflation? If "yes", what would be a reasonable level for the cap? Please provide rationale for the proposed level of the cap.

Answer

Q139 Section 6.9.4 Are there any further comments on Expense risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If "yes", please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q140 Section 6.10.4.1 Non-life exposures should be reported based on the location of risks to ensure consistency across IAIGs. Regarding the reporting segment, which of the following should be used:

Answer

Q141 Section 6.10.4.1 Should projected net earned premiums be used as the exposure base for Premium risk? If "no", please specify what other measure should be used and why.

Answer

Q142 Section 6.10.4.1 Should net current claims estimates be used as the exposure base for Claims Reserve risk? If "no", please specify what other measure should be used and why.

Answer

Q143 Section 6.10.4.2 For the purposes of the ICS standard method, is the approach taken in 2015 and 2016 Field Testing adequate to account for diversification effects in Premium and Claims Reserve risks? If "no", please provide a more appropriate alternative suggestion including rationale, keeping in mind the need to apply a consistent methodology across all jurisdictions, and to balance practicality and materiality with risk sensitivity in a standard method.

Answer

Q144 Section 6.10.4.2 Are the correlation factors appropriate for the ICS standard method? If "no", please provide rationale and alternative suggestions supported by evidence.

Answer

Q145 Section 6.10.4.2 Is the 50% correlation factor between categories appropriate for the ICS standard method? If "no", please provide rationale and alternative suggestions supported by evidence.

Answer

	Q146 Section 6.10.4.2 Is the 25% correlation factor between regions appropriate for the ICS standard method? If “no”, please provide rationale and alternative suggestions supported by evidence.
Answer	
	Q147 Section 6.10.4.3 Is there a methodology that the IAIS could use for the calibration of Premium and Claims Reserve risk factors that can be easily and consistently applied across jurisdictional lines of business using the supplementary data requested in 2016 Field Testing? If “yes”, please provide specific details, technical references and rationale. Please indicate if some methods are more appropriate for particular segments or particular types of data.
Answer	
	Q148 Section 6.10.4.3 In the absence of adequate data, is there a way that the IAIS could determine appropriate Premium and Claims Reserve risk factors for lines of business. If “yes”, please explain.
Answer	
	Q149 Section 6.10.4.3 Is there a methodology that the IAIS could use to determine the appropriate number of buckets and factors, taking into consideration the context of the ICS standard method and the aim to achieve comparable results across comparable risks? Please explain.
Answer	
	Q150 Section 6.10.4.4 Are there practical methods for determining these adjustments in the context of the ICS standard method (considering, in particular, the trade-off between materiality of the impact and complexity of the method)? If “yes”, please provide details. If necessary please differentiate by risk and reporting segments.
Answer	
	Q151 Section 6.10.5 Are there any further comments on Premium and Claims Reserve risks that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.
Answer	
	Q152 Section 6.11.2.2 Is the new specification of “latent liability risk” appropriate? Please explain.
Answer	
	Q153 Section 6.11.2.2 Should the mass tort scenario be used to represent latent liability risk in the ICS? Please explain.
Answer	
	Q154 Section 6.11.2.2 Are any other scenarios/refinements needed for the latent liability scenario? If “yes”, please specify and provide rationale.
Answer	
	Q155 Section 6.11.3.1 In addition to the perils covered in 2016 Field Testing (listed above), are there other material Catastrophe perils to which IAIGs may be materially exposed for which a scenario should be defined in the ICS standard method ? If “yes”, please provide a list, including a definition of the peril and any other specific details to support the suggestion(s).
Answer	
	Q156 Section 6.11.3.1 Are there scenarios used in 2015 and 2016 Field Testing (listed above) which, for materiality or other reasons, should not be included in the Catastrophe risk component? If “yes”, please provide a list, including the rationale.

Answer

Q157 Section 6.11.3.2 Should the IAIS allow the use of catastrophe models for ICS Version 1.0? Please explain.

Answer

Q158 Section 6.11.3.2 If the IAIS allows the use of catastrophe models in ICS Version 1.0, should there be requirements to ensure that the use of catastrophe models results in a fair and comparable assessment of the natural catastrophe risk? If "yes", please comment on requirements that should be included.

Answer

Q159 Section 6.11.3.2 Is there information about catastrophe models and their use by the IAIG that should be reported to the group-wide supervisor? If "yes", please provide specific examples.

Answer

Q160 Section 6.11.3.2 Are there additional conditions or restrictions about catastrophe models or their use by IAIGs that should form part of ICS Version 1.0? Please explain.

Answer

Q161 Section 6.11.3.2 If an IAIG were unable to meet the requirements that were set out in the specifications of the ICS, are there measures that the group supervisor should take in order to correct the weaknesses? If "yes", please provide details of suggested measures and the rationale.

Answer

Q162 Section 6.11.3.3 Is the man-made catastrophe scenario (as defined in the 2016 Technical Specifications) appropriate for the ICS standard method? If "no", please provide specific suggestions supported by reference or evidence to amend the scenario(s).

Answer

Q163 Section 6.11.3.4 Is the approach to calculate the contingent Credit risk associated with reinsurance recovery appropriate for the purposes of ICS Version 1.0? Please explain. If "no", please provide details of an alternative approach that would be more appropriate for the ICS standard method.

Answer

Q164 Section 6.11.4 Are there any further comments on Catastrophe risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If "yes", please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

The IRSG does not support a volatility shock to be applied to equity investments, as this would lead to a significant exaggeration of the actual risk exposure that insurers face when investing in this asset class. Volatility is already reflected in the calibration of the shock based on market pricing of equity.

Q165 Section 6.12.1.4 Are there any calibration methodologies for stressed yield curves that work in both the current negative and low interest rate environment in developed countries and where base yield curves are as they have been in the past with higher rates observed at all maturities? If "yes", please provide details.

Answer

	Q166 Section 6.12.1.4 Is the IAIS approach to calibrate Interest Rate risk stresses using six years of historical data appropriate? If “no”, please comment on the appropriate length of data to calibrate Interest Rate risk stresses to a target level of VaR 99.5% over a one-year time horizon. If a shorter time series is preferred, please comment on how to deal with changing market conditions and the frequency of recalibrating the ICS Interest Rate risk stresses.
Answer	
	Q167 Section 6.12.1.4 Should the ICS only assess the principal observed driver in yield curve evolutions (upward and downward movements), or should twists (flattening or steepening) be included in the risk assessment? Specifically, which of the following should be used? Please explain your answer.
Answer	
	Q168 Section 6.12.1.4 Is the methodology used by the IAIS to determine Interest Rate risk post-diversification appropriate? If “no”, please suggest an alternative methodology.
Answer	
	Q169 Section 6.12.1.4 Should the IAIS recognise diversification of Interest Rate risk between currencies? Please explain and provide details of how this could be done.
Answer	
	Q170 Section 6.12.1.4 Which of the alternative methods for GAAP Plus (1 or 2) is a better measure of Interest Rate risk? Please explain. If neither are considered suitable, please suggest an alternative method or refinements to the current method.
Answer	
	Q171 Section 6.12.1.4 Method 2 is based on the assumption that certain assets backing liabilities are intended to be held to maturity, and consequently are only exposed to reinvestment risk. Should the IAIS consider developing criteria to identify such assets? If “yes” please explain and provide suggestions for such criteria.
Answer	
	Q171.1 Alternatively, should method 2 make allowance for the fact that some of these assets may in fact not be held to maturity? If “yes”, please explain and suggest how this may be done.
Answer	
	Q172 Section 6.12.1.5 Are there any further comments on Interest Rate risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.
Answer	
	Q173 6.12.2.1 Is the four-bucket approach to the segmentation of equities appropriate? Please explain. If “no”, please provide an alternative suggestion and rationale.
Answer	
	Q174 Section 6.12.2.3 Should an equity volatility stress be included in the ICS standard method? Please explain.
Answer	
	Q175 Section 6.12.2.3 Is the design of the equity volatility stress in 2016 Field Testing appropriate? If “no”, please provide specific suggestions, as well as supporting rationale and evidence.
Answer	

Q176 Section 6.12.2.3 Is the multiplicative approach suitable for the ICS standard method? Please explain. If “no”, please highlight the key design and data considerations for developing an alternative approach (eg additive volatility stress).

Answer

Q177 Section 6.12.2.3 Is the treatment of long-term equity investments appropriate? Please explain. If “no”, how should they be treated differently and what criteria should be used to define long-term equity investments? Please highlight key design features and provide supporting evidence (including data).

Answer

Q178 Section 6.12.2.3 Is there evidence that supports the application of a correlation matrix for determining the Equity risk charge? If “yes”, please provide evidence supporting suggested correlations.

Answer

Q179 Section 6.12.2.3 Should the Equity risk charge include a countercyclical measure to reduce pro-cyclical behaviour? Please explain. If “yes”, how should such a measure be designed and calibrated? Please highlight key data considerations where relevant.

Answer

Q180 Section 6.12.2.3 Are the current approaches in the ICS appropriate for products with path dependent valuations? Please explain.

Answer

Q181 Section 6.12.2.3 Does the ICS capture all of the material risks for these types of contracts? Please explain.

Answer

Q182 Section 6.12.2.3 Are there alternative approaches that would capture path dependent Equity and Interest Rate risk? Please explain.

Answer

Q183 Section 6.12.2.4 Are there any further comments on Equity risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q184 Section 6.12.3.2 Is the approach adopted for Real Estate risk in 2016 Field Testing appropriate for the ICS standard method under MAV? Please explain. If “no”, please provide specific proposals to amend the approach as well as supporting rationale and evidence.

Answer

Q185 Section 6.12.3.2 Is the approach adopted for Real Estate risk in 2016 Field Testing appropriate for the ICS standard method under GAAP Plus? Please explain. If “no”, please provide specific proposals to amend the approach as well as supporting rationale and evidence.

Answer

Q186 Section 6.12.3.3 Are there any further comments on Real Estate risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q187 Section 6.12.4.2 Is the methodology used to determine the level of the Currency risks stresses appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q188 Section 6.12.4.2 Is the assumption of a single correlation factor of 50% for all currencies appropriate in a time of stress? Please explain. If “no”, what methodology could the IAIS use to determine an appropriate correlation matrix for Currency risk?

Answer

Q189 Section 6.12.4.2 Is the treatment of currency pegs appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q190 Section 6.12.4.2 Should the IAIS allow for a partial exemption for investments in foreign subsidiaries? Please explain.

Answer

Q191 Section 6.12.4.2 Is the exemption for investments in foreign subsidiaries appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q192 Section 6.12.4.2 Is there a better proxy of the subsidiary’s contribution to the ICS? Please explain.

Answer

Q193 Section 6.12.4.2 Are there any further comments on the approach described for 2016 Field Testing? Please explain.

Answer

Q194 Section 6.12.4.2 Is the treatment of currency exposures with a maturity of less than one year appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q195 Section 6.12.4.3 Are there any further comments on Currency risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q196 Section 6.12.5.2 Is the approach adopted for Asset Concentration risk in 2016 Field Testing appropriate for the ICS standard method? Please explain. If “no”, please provide specific proposals to amend the approach as well as supporting rationale and evidence.

Answer

Q197 Section 6.12.5.3 Are there any further comments on Asset Concentration risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q198 Section 6.13.3.1 Do you support the approach used for 2016 Field Testing with respect to allowing the use of external credit ratings for ICS Credit risk purposes? Why or why not?

Answer

Q199 Section 6.13.3.1 Does any alternative to the use of ratings issued by credit rating agencies exist in the regulatory framework of your jurisdiction (eg supervisory-owned processes)? Please provide details.

Answer

Q200 Section 6.13.3.1 Should the IAIS allow the use of ratings and/or designations that are not issued by credit rating agencies, for example, ratings and/or designations that are issued by a supervisory-owned process (eg, the NAIC Securities Valuation Office)? Please explain.

Answer

Q200.1 Section 6.13.3.1 If "yes" to Q200, should the IAIS consider modifying the criteria for the recognition of rating providers, taking account of the specific features of the supervisory-owned process? Please explain.

Answer

Q200.2 Section 6.13.3.1 If "yes" to Q200, are the criteria for credit rating agencies appropriate for alternatives to the use of credit rating agencies? Please explain.

Answer

Q201 Section 6.13.3.1 Are there any additional factors the IAIS should consider when deciding on whether to allow in the ICS the use of credit assessments (eg ratings or designations) from sources other than credit rating agencies? If "yes", please explain and provide details.

Answer

Q202 Section 6.13.3.2 Is the approach adopted for 2016 Field Testing for commercial and residential mortgage Credit risk charges appropriate for the ICS standard method? Please explain. If "no", please provide specific proposals for how it should be changed as well as supporting rationale and evidence.

Answer

Q203 Section 6.13.3.3 Should the IAIS continue to explore a different approach for Credit risk from reinsurance exposures, and in particular, for collateralised reinsurance? Why or why not? If "yes", please provide specific proposals, rationale and evidence to support the proposals.

Answer

Q204 Section 6.13.4 Are there any further comments on Credit risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If "yes", please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q205 Section 6.14.3 Should the IAIS use exposures that are reported before the impact of ceded reinsurance for determining the Operational risk charge? Please explain.

Answer

Q206 Section 6.14.3 Are the proposed Operational risk exposures appropriate for the ICS standard method? Please explain.

Answer

Q207 Section 6.14.3 Are the proposed Operational risk factors appropriate for the ICS standard method, both in terms of size and relativity? Please explain.

Answer

Q208 Section 6.14.4 Are there any further comments on Operational risk that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If "yes", please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q209 Section 6.15.3.1 Is the structure of the correlation matrices used for 2016 Field Testing appropriate? If "no", please provide specific alternative suggestions and evidence on why this approach would be more appropriate.

Answer

Q210 Section 6.15.3.2 Should the calibration of the correlation parameters for the ICS standard method include a material degree of judgement since relevant and available data are limited? Please explain. If "no", please provide rationale, specific suggestions and evidence or references to support an alternative approach.

Answer

Q211 Section 6.15.3.2 How could the IAIS combine data and judgement in the calibration of correlation parameters for aggregation and diversification?

Answer

Q212 Section 6.15.3.2 Are there available data that would be relevant for the calibration of the correlation parameters of the ICS standard method? Please explain.

Answer

Q213 Section 6.15.3.2 Are the correlation factors being used between ICS risks appropriate for the ICS standard method? Please explain. If "no", please provide rationale and alternative suggestions supported by evidence.

Answer

Q214 Section 6.15.3.2 Are the correlation factors being used for Life risks appropriate for the ICS standard method? If "no", please provide rationale and alternative suggestions supported by evidence.

Answer

Q215 Section 6.15.3.2 Are the correlation factors being used for Market risks appropriate for the ICS standard method? If "no", please provide rationale and alternative suggestions supported by evidence.

Answer

Q216 Section 6.15.4 Are there any further comments on Aggregation and Diversification that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If "yes", please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q217 Section 7.2.1 What would be an appropriate level of granularity that would strike a balance between accuracy and operational feasibility/complexity?

Answer

Q218 Section 7.2.1 Would an approach that utilises an effective tax rate at the country level be appropriate? Please explain.

Answer

Q219 Section 7.2.1 Please provide any commentary on what would be considered an appropriate method to derive a global effective tax rate. Please support any proposed method with a short list of pros and cons.

Answer

Q220 Section 7.2.1 If post valuation adjustment DTAs would be included as a component of capital, a method to determine realisability or a partial deduction would also likely be an element of the calculation. Do you have any suggestions for an appropriate method to determine realisability of DTAs given a top-down approach? Would you prefer a partial deduction method? Please provide a rationale for your answer.

Answer

Q221 Section 7.2.1 Should the IAIS pursue a more bottom up approach to determining deferred taxes post valuation adjustment? If “yes”, please provide any commentary to support this view.

Answer

Q222 Section 7.2.1 Please provide any other options that should be considered by the IAIS with respect to reflecting the impact of revaluation under GAAP Plus and MAV on deferred taxes.

Answer

Q223 Section 7.2.1 Should DTAs and DTLs be adjusted in both the MAV and GAAP Plus approaches to take into account the effect of discounting to ensure they are valued consistently with other material balance sheet items? Please explain.

Answer

Q224 Section 7.2.1 If the answer to the above question is “yes”, should a restriction be applied to the discounting of only one type of DTA or DTL, eg long-dated item? Please explain

Answer

Q225 Section 7.2.1 Should an approximation of the discounting effect on a post-stress DTA be taken into account in any tax adjustment to the ICS capital requirement? Please explain.

Answer

Q226 Section 7.2.2 Should MOCE be tax effected? If “yes”, what effective tax rate should be applied, and why? Please answer for both prudence and cost of capital MOCE.

Answer

Q227 Section 7.2.2 Should deferred tax assumptions be incorporated into the cost of capital MOCE calculation? If “yes”, please specify.

Answer

Q228 Section 7.2.3 Please provide any specific recommendations for an appropriate realisability methodology.

Answer

Q229 Section 7.2.3 Please provide any input or feedback on the consideration to limit the DTA in capital resources either through a partial deduction and/or an overall limit.

Answer

Q230 Section 7.2.4 Is there an appropriate methodology for evaluating the realisability of DTAs under stress which would lead to an appropriate treatment of deferred tax in the ICS capital requirement? If “yes”, please explain.

Answer

Q231 Section 7.2.4 Which of the following approach should the IAIS consider for including the impact of taxes in the calculation of the ICS capital requirement? Please explain, including providing a list of pros and cons.

Answer

Q232 Section 7.2.4 Should tax strategies/management actions and diversification impacts be reflected/allocated to tax jurisdictions if the deferred tax impact is calculated using a bottom-up approach? If “yes”, how should this be reflected/allocated?

Answer

Q233 Section 7.2.4 Should the IAIS address the substantiation of the realisability of DTAs? If “yes”, please explain, taking into account issues related to a stress DTA (including defining future tax profits, reflecting the shock on future profits and avoiding double counting).

Answer

Q234 Section 7.2.4 Should groups be able to assume they can obtain value for the tax effects of the stress loss by selling tax losses to unregulated group companies which have taxable profits? If “yes”, how would they assess whether these group companies would still be profitable in stress?

Answer

Q235 Section 7.3 Are there any further comments on the approach to tax within the ICS that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS Version 1.0? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Q236 Additional comments on any section Are there any additional comments that the IAIS should consider in the development of ICS version 1.0 that have not been addressed in any of the previous questions? If “yes”, please explain with sufficient detail and rationale.

Answer

Yes

Answer Comment

An executive summary of IRSG´s opinion was included in the response to question 1.