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1. Review of Treasury Scenarios vs. Acceptance Criteria
2. Review of Equity Fund Scenarios vs. Acceptance Criteria
Review of Treasury Scenarios vs. Acceptance Criteria
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| T1.T | Prevalence of High Rates, Upper Bound on Treasury Rates | a) The scenario set should reasonably reflect history, with some allowance for more extreme high and low interest rate environments  
   b) Upper Bound:  
      i. \([18\%] \geq [99.5\%]-\text{tile on the 1Y yield fan chart, and no more than} [0.5\%] \text{ of scenarios have 1Y yields that go above} [18\%] \text{ in the first 30 years}  
      ii. \([17\%] \geq [99.5\%]-\text{tile on the 20Y yield fan chart, and no more than} [0.5\%] \text{ of scenarios have 20Y yields that go above} [17\%] \text{ in the first 30 years}  |

### 10,000 UST Scenarios as of 12/31/23 Fan Charts by Percentile
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**T1.Tb**

**EOY 30 1st 30 Years**
Apply the following guidance for negative rates:

a) Maturities less than 20 years could experience negative interest rates
b) Interest rates may remain negative for multi-year time periods
c) 1Y rates should generally not be lower than -1.0%
d) 20Y rates should generally not be lower than 0.0%

Negative UST Rates, 12/31/23 Scenario Set
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a) Maturities greater than 5Y experience negative rates infrequently
b) This criteria is permissive
c) The minimum 1Y UST in the first 30 years is -0.9%
d) The minimum 20Y UST in the first 30 years is 0.2%
T3.T  
Initial Yield Curve Fit, Yield Curve Shapes in Projection, and Steady State Yield Curve Shape

a) Review initial actual vs. fitted spot curve differences for a sampling of 5 dates representing different shapes and rate levels for the entire curve and review fitted curves qualitatively to confirm they stylistically mimic the different actual yield curve shapes.

b) The frequency of different yield curve shapes in early durations should be reasonable considering the shape of the starting yield curve (e.g. a flatter yield curve leads to more inversions).

c) The steady state curve has normal shape (not inverted for short maturities, longer vs shorter maturities, or between long maturities).

### Inversion Statistics, 12/31/23 Scenario Set

**Historical Inversion Data**  
1m > 2y | 3m > 10y | 2y > 10y | 10y > 30y | 1y > 20y  
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---  
% Inversions, 4/1953 to 3/2021* | 10% | 10% | 19% | 22% | 16%  
% Inversions, 12/31/21 to 11/21/23** | 51% | 64% | 78% | 5% | 69%  
Average Inversion, 4/1953 to 3/2021* | 0.33% | 0.54% | 0.38% | 0.22% | 0.63%  
Average Inversion, 12/31/21 to 3/26/24** | 0.72% | 1.21% | 0.52% | 0.05% | 0.69%

*Based on month-end data  **Based on daily data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| T3.T | Initial Yield Curve Fit, Yield Curve Shapes in Projection, and Steady State Yield Curve Shape | a) Review initial actual vs. fitted spot curve differences for a sampling of 5 dates representing different shapes and rate levels for the entire curve and review fitted curves qualitatively to confirm they stylistically mimic the different actual yield curve shapes  
b) The frequency of different yield curve shapes in early durations should be reasonable considering the shape of the starting yield curve (e.g. a flatter yield curve leads to more inversions).  
c) **The steady state curve has normal shape (not inverted for short maturities, longer vs shorter maturities, or between long maturities)** |

**Median Yields at Selected Projection Months, 12/31/23 Scenario Set**

![Graph showing median yields at selected projection months.](image)

From the graph on the left, you can see that the median yield curve evolves from the inverted starting conditions to the normal yield curve that is targeted in the steady state.
### Category: Low For Long: 12/31/20 Starting Conditions

**Criteria**

- a) At least 7.5% of scenarios need a 10-year geometric average of the 20-year UST below \(1.45\%\).
- b) At least 3.75% of scenarios need a 30-year geometric average of the 20-year UST below \(1.95\%\).

**Note:** As part of the model acceptance process, a given calibration of the GOES will be tested at multiple starting dates. This criteria is relevant for the 12/31/20 starting yield curve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>90th Percentile of 10Y Geometric Average</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Pass / Fail</th>
<th>95th Percentile of 30Y Geometric Average</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Pass / Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>✔️ Pass</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>✔️ Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The calibration is comfortably meeting the low-for-long 12/31/20 calibration criteria.
Item | Category | Criteria
--- | --- | ---
b) Calculate the [1st] and [99th] percentiles of the distribution of geometric average rates (for both the 10 and 30-year horizons).  
c) Look up criteria based on the starting level of the 20-year UST yield (interpolate if necessary).

### Geometric Average of 20Y UST over 30 years

The calibration meets all of the 10-year geometric average low for long and high for long criteria for varying starting levels. However, there are some misses for the 3% to 8% starting environments on the high for long criteria. In order to meet all of these criteria, Conning could slow down the mean reversion speed or make other potential changes - leading to other tradeoffs.
Review of Equity Scenarios vs. Acceptance Criteria
The Large Capitalization (S&P 500) equity fund gross wealth factors (GWFs) are largely aligned with the targets across the bulk of the percentile GWF distribution over the projected durations. The first percentile does show some differences, with lower returns over time in the latest equity calibration compared to the targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentiles</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Simulated</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>8.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>