While only a few LATF members spoke up in support of, or objection to, the ACLI/CAI and Academy edits related to the MVA, valid arguments were made, and I am concerned that reaching strong consensus may be difficult and time consuming if not impossible. A solution to this issue is presented in the attached version of the guideline that could be considered for re-exposure. The revisions remove any specific requirement regarding an MVA and revises the drafting note to explain that a state may want to consider whether an MVA is appropriate. Basically, rather than addressing the application of an MVA in the Guideline, this version defers to individual states to decide what is appropriate with respect to application of an MVA. The first principle of the AG is that interim values must provide equity between the contract holder and the insurance company. That principle should help guide state determinations as to whether an MVA is appropriate or not.