

**Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group
Maintenance Agenda Submission Form
Form A**

Issue: Review of *INT 03-02: Modification to an Existing Intercompany Pooling Arrangement*

Check (applicable entity):

	P/C	Life	Health
Modification of Existing SSAP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
New Issue or SSAP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interpretation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Description of Issue:

This agenda item provides a review of Interpretation (INT) 03-02: *Modification to an Existing Intercompany Pooling Arrangement*, because of conflicts between INT 03-02 and *SSAP No. 25—Affiliates and Other Related Parties*. This agenda item was prompted by the recent focus of Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group on related party transactions, recent queries to NAIC about how broadly to apply the guidance in INT 03-02 and the review of the SSAP No. 62R, paragraph INT 03-02 addresses the valuation of bonds in instances when bonds are used instead of cash for the payment among affiliates for amounts due on modifications to existing intercompany reinsurance pooling contracts. The discrepancy between the INT 03-02 and SSAP No. 25 has been identified through recent discussions evaluating related party transactions. Key excerpts of INT 03-02 are in the Authoritative Literature section below.

The primary accounting question that is a concern for this agenda item is INT 03-02, paragraph 11b which asks, “What is the appropriate valuation basis to be used for assets and liabilities that are transferred among affiliates in conjunction with the execution of a new reinsurance agreement(s) that serves to substantively modify an existing intercompany pooling arrangement?” The response provided in INT 03-02, paragraph 13 is, “The appropriate valuation basis to be used for assets and liabilities that are transferred among affiliates in conjunction with the execution of a new reinsurance agreement(s) that serves to substantively modify an existing intercompany pooling arrangement is statutory book value for assets and statutory value for liabilities. Book value is defined in the glossary of the *Accounting Practices and Procedure Manual*.”

INT 03-02 states that it is an interpretation of the following three reinsurance statements: *SSAP No. 61R—Life, Deposit-Type and Accident and Health Reinsurance*, *SSAP No. 62R—Property and Casualty Reinsurance* and *SSAP No. 63—Underwriting Pools*. *SSAP No. 25—Affiliates and Other Related Parties* is not listed as an interpreted statement. However, as described below, the consensus in INT 03-02, paragraph 13 is not consistent with the guidance in SSAP No. 25 regarding economic transactions between related parties.

The result of the consensus in INT 03-02, paragraph 13 allows assets used in affiliated payments for reinsurance contracts, which modify existing intercompany reinsurance pooling agreements, to be transferred using statutory book value. Note that in most cases, this means that bonds, which are likely the primary assets that would be used, would typically have a statutory book value that reflects amortized cost. The valuation of assets using statutory book value on transfer to an affiliate can result in substantial differences from the cash equivalent (fair value) for the payment due. For example, bonds reported at amortized cost book value could have a corresponding fair value that is materially higher or lower. This difference in valuation can result in an unacknowledged dividend or with the passing on of an investment loss.

SSAP No. 25 describes economic transactions and non-economic transactions (See Authoritative Literature). Economic transactions are defined as arm’s-length transactions which results in the transfer of the risks and rewards of ownership and represents a consummated act thereof, i.e., “permanence.” SSAP No. 25, paragraph 18 indicates that economic transactions between related parties shall be recorded at fair value at the date of the transaction and also notes that to the extent that the related parties are affiliates under common control, the controlling reporting

entity shall defer the effects of such transactions that result in gains or increases in surplus until such time that the asset is sold outside the group.

It is quite possible, by using transfers at book value instead of fair value, to design a transaction with a very significant economic effect. The following example illustrates the concern with the results of the guidance in INT 03-02. For this example, \$100 million is due on an existing intercompany reinsurance pooling agreement. INT 03-02 would allow bonds to be settled using statutory book value which may not be reflective of the fair value equivalent of a cash settlement.

Asset Used to Settle	Book Value (millions) Measurement for Settlement	Fair Value (millions)	Result	Consistent with SSAP No. 25 for an Economic Transaction?
Cash	\$100	\$100	No difference in basis	Yes
Bonds	\$100	\$ 85	\$15 difference in fair value means the paid party received an amount less than what is actually owed. This approach could allow reporting entities to transfer impaired assets to affiliates in lieu of assessing OTTI.	No
Bonds	\$100	\$110	\$10 difference in fair value means the paid party has received an asset greater than what was owed. This dynamic could result in an unrecognized gain or dividend.	No

The INT 03-02 direction to use statutory book value for the transfer of bonds between affiliated entities in most instances would conflict with the primary guidance on affiliated transactions contained in *SSAP No. 25—Affiliates and Other Related Parties*. For example, economic transactions between related parties are valued using fair value. (There are more nuances in SSAP No. 25 when payments have the possibility of being economic for one entity and noneconomic for an upper-level parent). NAIC staff recommends that the treatment of transfers of assets between affiliates should be consistent for all intercompany transactions and there is not a compelling need to be different if assets are transferred instead of cash for intercompany reinsurance.

Under INT 03-02, for intercompany reinsurance transactions, takes an approach that either SSAP No. 25 or SSAP No. 62R may apply, but multiple Working Group discussions have noted that SSAP No. 25 provides the overarching guidance that is relevant in evaluating all related party transactions. INT 03-02, paragraph 8 indicates that the statutory accounting intention is to avoid surplus gains for the ceding entity as a result of implementing a modification to an intercompany pooling arrangement. However, the guidance in SSAP No. 62R, paragraph 37 uses a more punitive method of accounting if there is a gain in surplus to the ceding entity as a result of the intercompany reinsurance transaction. Therefore, NAIC staff would characterize the SSAP No. 62R guidance as imposing an accounting penalty if there is a gain, rather than seeking to avoid recognizing such a gain. The INT also characterizes SSAP No. 25 as being for isolated transactions, which is inconsistent with discussions of the Working Group on the applicability of SSAP No. 25.

SSAP No. 62R, paragraph 36d (see Authoritative Literature) includes an exception to retroactive reinsurance accounting which allows prospective accounting treatment for intercompany reinsurance agreements and any amendments thereto, among companies 100% owned by a common parent or ultimate controlling person provided there is no gain in surplus as a result of the transaction. Paragraph 37 provides that if there is a gain to the ceding entity that a more restrictive method of accounting is required which is less beneficial to the financial statements. Whereas the INT tries to argue that statutory intent is to avoid surplus gain, NAIC staff would note that the goal is not to avoid gain as a result of the reinsurance transaction, but to impose a different accounting if there is a gain. NAIC staff would characterize evaluating reinsurance agreements for SSAP No. 62R, paragraph 36d or paragraph

37 as using the cash flows or corresponding equivalent fair value (cash equivalent) of the amounts payable or receivable in the reinsurance transactions to determine if there is a gain or loss to the ceding entity. The reinsurance cash flows evaluated should be the same as if the bond was sold for fair value and resulting cash equivalent obligation was paid. The fact that the bond sold has a gain or loss is not part of the reinsurance contract evaluation, the reinsurance contract that is an economic transaction evaluation is based on the cash equivalent value of the assets transferred less the liabilities transferred. The evaluation of gain or loss on the intercompany reinsurance transaction should give the same answer if either cash or assets were transferred.

Existing Authoritative Literature:

03-02: *Modification to an Existing Intercompany Pooling Arrangement* is attached in full. The following excerpts are from INT 03-02:

8. Therefore, based on the foregoing guidance and background, the statutory accounting intent is to avoid surplus gains for the ceding entity as a result of implementing a modification to an intercompany pooling arrangement. On that basis, such a modification does not represent an economic transaction to the insurance group or to the impacted companies. As such, the transfer of both the assets and the liabilities valued at statutory book value ensures that there is no impact to surplus as a result of implementing a modification to an existing pooling arrangement.
11. The accounting issues are:
 - a. What is the relevant guidance for modifications to intercompany pooling arrangements?
 - b. What is the appropriate valuation basis to be used for assets and liabilities that are transferred among affiliates in conjunction with the execution of a new reinsurance agreement(s) that serves to substantively modify an existing intercompany pooling arrangement?

The Working Group reached a consensus as follows:

12. SSAP No. 62R provides accounting for property and casualty reinsurance agreements including specific guidance on intercompany pooling agreements. SSAP No. 62R provides two methods of accounting for changes in intercompany pooling agreements, depending on whether or not the pooling results in a gain in surplus.
13. The appropriate valuation basis to be used for assets and liabilities that are transferred among affiliates in conjunction with the execution of a new reinsurance agreement(s) that serves to substantively modify an existing intercompany pooling arrangement is statutory book value for assets and statutory value for liabilities. Book value is defined in the glossary of the *Accounting Practices and Procedure Manual*.

SSAP No. 25—Affiliates and Other Related Parties

Transactions Involving the Exchange of Assets or Liabilities

14. An arm's-length transaction is defined as a transaction in which willing parties, each being reasonably aware of all relevant facts and neither under compulsion to buy, sell, or loan, would be willing to participate. A transaction between related parties involving the exchange of assets or liabilities shall be designated as either an economic transaction or non-economic transaction. An economic transaction is defined as an arm's-length transaction which results in the transfer of the risks and rewards of ownership and represents a consummated act thereof, i.e., "permanence." The appearance of permanence is also an important criterion in assessing the economic substance of a transaction. In order for a transaction to have economic substance and thus warrant revenue (loss) recognition, it must appear unlikely to be reversed. If subsequent events or transactions reverse the effect of an earlier transaction prior to the issuance of the financial statements, the reversal shall be considered in determining whether economic substance existed in the case of the original transaction. Subsequent events are addressed in SSAP No. 9—Subsequent Events. An economic transaction must represent a bonafide business purpose demonstrable in measurable

terms. A transaction which results in the mere inflation of surplus without any other demonstrable and measurable betterment is not an economic transaction. The statutory accounting shall follow the substance, not the form of the transaction.

15. In determining whether there has been a transfer of the risks and rewards of ownership in the transfer of assets or liabilities between related parties, the following—and any other relevant facts and circumstances related to the transaction—shall be considered:

- a. Whether the seller has a continuing involvement in the transaction or in the financial interest transferred, such as through the exercise of managerial authority to a degree usually associated with ownership;
- b. Whether there is an absence of significant financial investment by the buyer in the financial interest transferred, as evidenced, for example, by a token down payment or by a concurrent loan to the buyer;
- c. Whether repayment of debt that constitutes the principal consideration in the transaction is dependent on the generation of sufficient funds from the asset transferred;
- d. Whether limitations or restrictions exist on the buyer's use of the financial interest transferred or on the profits arising from it;
- e. Whether there is retention of effective control of the financial interest by the seller.

16. A transaction between related parties may meet the criteria for treatment as an economic transaction at one level of financial reporting but may not meet such criteria at another level of financial reporting. An example of such a transaction is a reporting entity purchasing securities at fair value from an affiliated reporting entity that carried the securities at amortized cost. This transaction meets the criteria of an economic transaction at this level of financial reporting, and therefore, the selling reporting entity would record a gain and the acquiring reporting entity would record the securities at their cost (fair value on the transaction date). At the common parent level of reporting, this transaction has resulted in the mere inflation of surplus, and therefore, is a non-economic transaction. The parent reporting entity shall defer the net effects of any gain or increase in surplus resulting from such transactions by recording a deferred gain and an unrealized loss. The deferred gain shall not be recognized by the parent reporting entity unless and until arms-length transaction(s) with independent third parties give rise to appropriate recognition of the gain.

17. A non-economic transaction is defined as any transaction that does not meet the criteria of an economic transaction. Similar to the situation described in paragraph 16, transfers of assets from a parent reporting entity to a subsidiary, controlled or affiliated entity shall be treated as non-economic transactions at the parent reporting level because the parent has continuing indirect involvement in the assets.

18. When accounting for a specific transaction, reporting entities shall use the following valuation methods:

- a. Economic transactions between related parties shall be recorded at fair value at the date of the transaction. To the extent that the related parties are affiliates under common control, the controlling reporting entity shall defer the effects of such transactions that result in gains or increases in surplus (see paragraph 16);
- b. Non-economic transactions between reporting entities, which meet the definition of related parties above, shall be recorded at the lower of existing book values or fair values at the date of the transaction;
- c. Non-economic transactions between a reporting entity and an entity that has no significant ongoing operations other than to hold assets that are primarily for the direct or indirect benefit or use of the reporting entity or its affiliates, shall be recorded at the fair value at the date of the transaction; however, to the extent that the transaction results in a gain, that gain shall be deferred until such time as permanence can be verified;

- d. Transactions which are designed to avoid statutory accounting practices shall be reported as if the reporting entity continued to own the assets or to be obligated for a liability directly instead of through a subsidiary.

Examples of transactions deemed to be non-economic include security swaps of similar issues between or among affiliated companies, and swaps of dissimilar issues accompanied by exchanges of liabilities between or among affiliates.

Transactions Involving Services

19. Transactions involving services between related parties can take a variety of different forms. One of the significant factors as to whether these transactions will be deemed to be arm's length is the amount charged for such services. In general, amounts charged for services are based either on current market rates or on allocations of costs. Determining market rates for services is difficult because the circumstances surrounding each transaction are unique. Unlike transactions involving the exchange of assets and liabilities between related parties, transactions for services create income on one party's books and expense on the second party's books, and therefore, do not lend themselves to the mere inflation of surplus. These arrangements are generally subject to regulatory approval.

20. Transactions involving services provided between related parties shall be recorded at the amount charged¹. Regulatory scrutiny of related party transactions where amounts charged for services do not meet the fair and reasonable standard established by Appendix A-440, may result in (a) amounts charged being recharacterized as dividends or capital contributions, (b) transactions being reversed, (c) receivable balances being nonadmitted, or (d) other regulatory action. Expenses that result from cost allocations shall be allocated subject to the same fair and reasonable standards, and the books and records of each party shall disclose clearly and accurately the precise nature and details of the transaction. See *SSAP No 70—Allocation of Expenses* for additional discussion regarding the allocation of expenses.

SSAP No. 62R—Property and Casualty Reinsurance provides the following (**bolding added for emphasis**):

36. The accounting principles for retroactive reinsurance agreements in paragraph 34 shall not apply to the following types of agreements (which shall be accounted for as prospective reinsurance agreements unless otherwise provided in this statement):

- a. Structured settlement annuities for individual claims purchased to implement settlements of policy obligations;
- b. Novations (i.e., (i) transactions in which the original direct insurer's obligations are completely extinguished, resulting in no further exposure to loss arising on the business novated or (ii) transactions in which the original assuming entity's obligations are completely extinguished) resulting in no further exposure to loss arising on the business novated, provided that (1) the parties to the transaction are not affiliates (or if affiliates, that the transaction has the prior approval of the domiciliary regulators of the parties) and (2) the accounting for the original reinsurance agreement will not be altered from retroactive to prospective;
- c. The termination of, or reduction in participation in, reinsurance treaties entered into in the ordinary course of business;

¹ The amount charged shall be reviewed when there are any modifications or waivers subsequent to the establishment of the contract terms. If waivers or modifications to amounts charged occur, the related party transaction shall be reassessed to determine whether the contract continues to reflect fair and reasonable standards. If the transaction was with a parent or other stockholder and the charge for services has been fully waived, then the guidance in *SSAP No. 72* for recognition as contributed capital (forgiveness of reporting entity obligation) or as a dividend (forgiveness of amount owed to the reporting entity) shall apply.

- d. **Intercompany reinsurance agreements, and any amendments thereto, among companies 100% owned by a common parent or ultimate controlling person provided there is no gain in surplus as a result of the transaction; or**
 - e. Reinsurance/retrocession agreements that meet the criteria of property/casualty run-off agreements described in paragraphs 102-105.
37. **Retroactive reinsurance agreements resulting in surplus gain to the ceding entity (with or without risk transfer)** entered into between affiliates or between insurers under common control (as those terms are defined in Appendix A-440) shall be reported as follows:
- a. The consideration paid by the ceding entity shall be recorded as a deposit and reported as a nonadmitted asset; and
 - b. No deduction shall be made from loss and loss adjustment expense reserves on the ceding entity's balance sheet, schedules, and exhibits.

Activity to Date (issues previously addressed by the Working Group, Emerging Accounting Issues (E) Working Group, SEC, FASB, other State Departments of Insurance or other NAIC groups):

INT 03-02 was exposed in March of 2003 and adopted in June 2003. The interpretation was not subsequently amended. The final vote on this consensus had three members opposed. The March 2003 exposure received six different comment letters to the Emerging Accounting Issues (E) Working Group from: 1) Ohio (EAIWG member); 2) New Hampshire (EAIWG member); 3) Interested parties, 4) Liberty Mutual and 5) PricewaterhouseCoopers (one of the very few letters ever submitted directly by the firm.) and 6) CNA. Five out of the six commenters noted concerns that the proposed guidance (which was ultimately adopted) would conflict with SSAP No. 25 guidance regarding economic transactions. While the interested parties' comment letter was more neutral, the verbal comments provided supported the use of SSAP No. 25.

Several commenters recommended not adopting the guidance regarding the use of book value and instead following SSAP No. 25 guidance for economic and non-economic transactions. The commenters noted that SSAP No. 25 directs the use of fair value when such transactions meet the definition of an economic transaction and that tax regulations would provide a result similar to SSAP No. 25. Multiple comments noted concerns similar to those highlighted in the illustration above. Commenters also noted that intercompany pooling reinsurance transactions are economic transactions. They noted that when assets (such as bonds valued at amortized cost) are transferred, if the assets have a different fair value than book value, that difference should be recognized since the transferor no longer controls the assets. Commenters also noted that treatment for reinsurance transactions for asset transfers should not be different than the treatment for other intercompany transactions.

CNA comments were supportive of adopting the exposed consensus, the comment letter provided illustrations and noted that intercompany reinsurance agreements were subject to regulatory approval. The comments tried to illustrate concerns possibly having premature gain / surplus recognition.

The June 2003 minutes Emerging Accounting Issues (E) Working Group discussion on the INT 03-02 are excerpted below.

The working group was referred to INT 03-02: *Modification to an existing intercompany pooling arrangement* (Attachment D). Written comments were received from Ohio, New Hampshire and interested parties. Ohio and New Hampshire believe that the transfer of assets and liabilities in an intercompany pooling arrangement constitute an economic transaction and the accounting guidance in SSAP No. 25—*Accounting for and Disclosures about Transactions with Affiliates and Other Related Parties* (SSAP No. 25), should be followed. As such, the assets should be transferred at fair value and the ceding entity should record a realized gain or loss. Keith Bell (Travelers) spoke on behalf of interested parties. Interested parties commented that if the transaction was considered to be an economic transaction, SSAP No. 25 should be followed. If the modification of an intercompany pooling arrangement is considered a noneconomic transaction, the guidance in SSAP No. 62—*Property and Casualty Reinsurance* (SSAP No. 62) is applied,

as such, statutory book value should be used for assets and statutory value should be used for liabilities. Jeff Alton (CNA) presented his comments by summarizing the statements made in his comment letter. Mr. Alton stated that no revenue recognition should occur and suggested using a modified statutory book value for transferring assets and liabilities. Mr. Clark stated that the Statutory Accounting Principles Working Group must address the recommended transfer at modified statutory book value as this recommendation would require substantive adjustments to statutory accounting principles. Shelly Zimmerman (Liberty Mutual) provided comments which supported that intercompany pooling changes should follow the accounting guidance in SSAP No. 25 as these are economic transactions between affiliates. Jean Connelly (PriceWaterhouseCoopers) provided comments that summarize those outlined in the comment letter. Ms. Connelly stated that intercompany pooling arrangements are economic transactions and that INT 03-01 provides a substantive change to SSAP No. 25.

Mr. Johnson then stated that he believes there is a stronger case for non-economic transaction treatment and as such, statutory book value is appropriate for valuation purposes. Additionally, all these transactions are subject to regulatory review under the Insurance Holding Company Act, affording regulators some control over the approval of these transactions. Mr. Fritsch commented that if this guidance is not adopted in the form of a new interpretation, SSAP No. 25 should be followed. Mr. Alton stated that he believes the current guidance in effect for intercompany pooling arrangements exists in SSAP No. 62, paragraph 30d which supports surplus neutrality: hence, the need is for an interpretation of paragraph 30d. Mr. Johnson stated that language clarification in SSAP No.61—*Life, Deposit-Type and Accident and Health Reinsurance*(SSAP No. 61) and SSAP No. 62 should be addressed as a project of the reinsurance subgroup of the SAPWG. Mr. Johnson made a motion to adopt Interpretation 03-02 with deletion of the first two sentences in paragraph 11. Mr. Stolte seconded the motion. Mr. Johnson requested a roll call vote. There were 9 yeas from Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Texas, Pennsylvania and Virginia. There were 3 nays from New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Therefore, the working group adopted Interpretation 03-02 by consensus. Mr. Johnson also made a motion to refer to the Reinsurance Subgroup of the SAPWG, review of the current guidance in SSAP No. 61, SSAP No. 62 and SSAP No. 63—*Underwriting Pools and Associations Including Intercompany Pools*. Mr. Ford seconded the motion. The working group unanimously adopted the referral.

Information or issues (included in *Description of Issue*) not previously contemplated by the Working Group:
None

Convergence with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS): Not Applicable

Staff Review Completed by: Robin Marcotte – NAIC Staff, July - 2022

Staff Recommendation: NAIC staff recommends that the Working Group move this item to the active listing, categorized as a SAP clarification, and expose the intent to nullify INT 03-02, as it is inconsistent with SSAP No. 25 guidance regarding economic and non-economic transactions between related parties. The guidance in INT 03-02 can result with in essence, unrecognized gains (dividends) or losses through the using the statutory book valuation when using assets (bonds) to make payments to affiliates for modifications to existing intercompany reinsurance pooling agreements. Treatment of transfers of assets between affiliates should be consistent for all intercompany transactions and there is not a compelling need to be different when valuing assets for intercompany reinsurance transactions.

Status:

On August 10, 2022, the Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group moved this agenda item to the active listing, categorized as a SAP clarification, and exposed the intent to nullify INT 03-02.

On December 13, 2022, the Working Group moved this agenda item to the active listing, categorized as a SAP clarification, and re-exposed the intent to nullify INT 03-02. This re-exposure requested industry to provide comments on specific instances in which the interpretation was being applied. In addition, the following key points were noted for consideration during the exposure in response to some of the comments received.

1. In the current interest rate environment, the fair value of many bonds is below book value. For example, a bond with an amortized cost of 100 with a fair value of 85. The way INT 03-02 is written a bond with a fair value of 85 could be used to settle an intercompany reinsurance pooling obligation of 100. If the reporting entity paid with cash, they would be required to pay \$100. The actual cash value of obligations when they are extinguished is a relevant measure of the transaction.
2. Using book value for measurement of payments between affiliates can result in either unrecognized or in effect dividend or losses. SSAP No. 25 requires such transfers of assets between affiliates to use fair value. If a subsidiary can pay the parent with assets that have a lower fair value than book value (ex, owes \$100 but pays with a bond of 85), this has a similar effect as an unrecognized capital contribution to the subsidiary. SSAP No. 72 requires a capital contribution to be valued using fair value.
3. At the ultimate parent level such transfer of assets (in accordance with SSAP No. 25 guidance) may be noneconomic in that the parent continues to hold an interest in the same assets. Therefore, at the parent level, such transfers of assets may result in the deferral of gains. Staff believes that losses would not be deferred at the ultimate parent level.
4. While it may be more expedient to pay intercompany reinsurance pooling transactions with assets, the valuation used should be similar to if the obligation was extinguished with cash. Therefore, an entity can still choose to pay with assets, they just need to be valued consistently with SSAP No. 25 guidance.
5. SSAP No. 62R, paragraph 36d provides an exception to retroactive reinsurance accounting guidance which allows for prospective accounting treatment for intercompany reinsurance among 100% owned affiliated provided there is no gain to the ceding entity. If there is gain to the ceding entity, there is guidance in SSAP No. 62R, paragraph 37 which requires a more punitive method of accounting than either prospective or retroactive reinsurance accounting. Therefore, NAIC staff comment is that the statutory accounting objective is to provide different treatment for retroactive reinsurance contracts if there is a gain to the ceding entity. This is another reason that the guidance in INT 03-02 is problematic. The object is to correctly measure the effects of the contract, which drives the accounting. The objective is not to obscure whether there is a gain to the ceding entity, which can happen in the event that the assets used in payment are not measured correctly.
6. Interested parties noted that modifications to intercompany pooling arrangements are typically effective retroactive to the beginning of the year. Staff notes that the payment value when the transaction is settled should be equivalent to the cash value of what is owed on the date of extinguishment of the liability.
7. Many of the interested parties' comments regarding GAAP use of book value are more relevant to consolidated basis accounting which is not consistent with the legal entity basis of statutory accounting.
8. Interested parties' comments noted that there is a difference in treatment for intercompany pooling participants who are not 100% owned by a common parent. NAIC staff notes that retroactive pooling agreement changes with participants that are not 100% under common control do not meet the exception to retroactive accounting provided in SSAP No. 62R, paragraph 36d. NAIC staff notes that SSAP No. 62R, paragraph 37 provides guidance for retroactive reinsurance agreements among affiliates where there is a gain to the ceding entity. Therefore, the regulatory objective is not to avoid gain but to properly account for intercompany retroactive contracts that include gains.

On March 22, 2023, the Working Group re-exposed the intent to nullify INT 03-02, effective December 31, 2023. The nullification is proposed as INT 03-02 is inconsistent with SSAP No. 25 guidance regarding economic and non-economic transactions between related parties. The guidance in INT 03-02 can result with, in essence, unrecognized gains (dividends) or losses through the using the statutory book valuation when using assets (bonds) to make payments to affiliates for modifications to existing intercompany reinsurance pooling agreements.

Treatment of transfers of assets between affiliates should be consistent for all intercompany transactions and there is not a compelling need to be different when valuing assets for intercompany reinsurance transactions.

On August 13, 2023, the Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group re-exposed the intent to nullify INT 03-02 and directed NAIC staff to work with industry regarding some of their comments and examples to be submitted by industry.

On December 1, 2023, the Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group deferred action on this agenda item and directed NAIC staff to continue working with interested parties on the proposal.

On March 16, 2024, the Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group exposed its intent to nullify INT 03-02, and exposed revisions to *SSAP No. 25—Affiliates and Other Related Parties* and *SSAP No. 63—Underwriting Pools* to address transfers of assets when modifying intercompany pooling agreements. The exposed revisions were based on interested parties' comments with minor edits proposed by NAIC staff.

Exposed Revisions to SSAP No. 25 and SSAP No. 63 are illustrated below.

SSAP No. 25—Affiliates and Other Related Parties

4. If a company transfers assets or liabilities to effectuate a modification to an existing intercompany pooling arrangement, the transaction, including the transfer of assets, shall be accounted for and valued in accordance with the guidance in SSAP No. 63—Underwriting Pools. The guidance in SSAP No. 63 regarding the transfers of assets or liabilities to effectuate a modification of an intercompany pooling arrangements shall not be applied or analogized to other transactions involving transfers of assets and liabilities.

SSAP No. 63—Underwriting Pools (only impacted paragraph are reflected.)

1. This statement establishes statutory accounting principles for underwriting pools and associations, including intercompany pooling arrangements.

8. Insurance groups that utilize intercompany pooling arrangements often modify these arrangements from time to time for various business reasons. These business reasons commonly include mergers, acquisitions, dispositions, or a restructuring of the group's legal entity structure. In order to effectuate a relatively simple modification, such as changing pooling participation percentages without changing the pool participants, companies often simply amend the existing pooling agreement. Alternatively, in order to effectuate a more complex modification, such as changing (by adding or removing) the number of pool participants, a company may commute the existing pooling agreement and execute a new pooling agreement(s). In conjunction with executing the appropriate intercompany pooling agreements, a transfer of assets and liabilities amongst the impacted affiliates may also be required in order to implement the new pooling agreement(s). The following subparagraphs provide guidance specific to modifications of intercompany pooling arrangements and shall not be applied to an analogous transaction or event.

a. The appropriate valuation basis to be used for assets and liabilities that are transferred among affiliates in conjunction with the execution of a new intercompany pooling agreement(s) that serves to substantively modify an existing intercompany pooling arrangement is statutory book value for assets and statutory value for liabilities.

b. The net amount of the assets and liabilities being moved among entities as a result of a modification to an intercompany pooling shall be used to settle the intercompany payable/receivable (i.e., the assets that are transferred in conjunction with the modification) to minimize the amount of assets transferred in the modification.

12. Note that other applicable reinsurance guidance from SSAP No. 61R—Life, Deposit Type and Accident and Health Reinsurance or SSAP No. 62R—Property and Casualty Reinsurance, depending on

the type of business, applies to intercompany pooling arrangements and voluntary and involuntary pools. This includes the SSAP No. 62R guidance in paragraphs 33 through 39 regarding retroactive reinsurance.

New disclosure in paragraph 13

13.i For modifications to an existing intercompany pooling arrangement that involve the transfer of assets with fair values that differ from cost or amortized cost, the statement value and fair value of assets received or transferred by the reporting entity.

On August 13, 2024, the Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group adopted as final, revisions to *SSAP No. 25—Affiliates and Other Related Parties* and *SSAP No. 63—Underwriting Pools* to address transfers of assets when modifying intercompany pooling agreements. Effective upon adoption, this agenda item also nullifies *INT 03-02: Modification to an Existing Intercompany Pooling Arrangement*. The exposed disclosure to *SSAP No. 63*, paragraph 13i, was modified from the exposure to incorporate revisions suggested by interested parties.

Adopted revisions are illustrated below.

SSAP No. 25—Affiliates and Other Related Parties

4. If a company transfers assets or liabilities to effectuate a modification to an existing intercompany pooling arrangement, the transaction, including the transfer of assets, shall be accounted for and valued in accordance with the guidance in *SSAP No. 63—Underwriting Pools*. The guidance in *SSAP No. 63* regarding the transfers of assets or liabilities to effectuate a modification of an intercompany pooling arrangements shall not be applied or analogized to other transactions involving transfers of assets and liabilities.

SSAP No. 63—Underwriting Pools (only impacted paragraphs are reflected.)

1. This statement establishes statutory accounting principles for underwriting pools and associations, including intercompany pooling arrangements.

8. Insurance groups that utilize intercompany pooling arrangements often modify these arrangements from time to time for various business reasons. These business reasons commonly include mergers, acquisitions, dispositions, or a restructuring of the group's legal entity structure. In order to effectuate a relatively simple modification, such as changing pooling participation percentages without changing the pool participants, companies often simply amend the existing pooling agreement. Alternatively, in order to effectuate a more complex modification, such as changing (by adding or removing) the number of pool participants, a company may commute the existing pooling agreement and execute a new pooling agreement(s). In conjunction with executing the appropriate intercompany pooling agreements, a transfer of assets and liabilities amongst the impacted affiliates may also be required in order to implement the new pooling agreement(s). The following subparagraphs provide guidance specific to modifications of intercompany pooling arrangements and shall not be applied to an analogous transaction or event.

a. The appropriate valuation basis to be used for assets and liabilities that are transferred among affiliates in conjunction with the execution of a new intercompany pooling agreement(s) that serves to substantively modify an existing intercompany pooling arrangement is statutory book value for assets and statutory value for liabilities.

b. The net amount of the assets and liabilities being moved among entities as a result of a modification to an intercompany pooling shall be used to settle the intercompany payable/receivable (i.e., the assets that are transferred in conjunction with the modification) to minimize the amount of assets transferred in the modification.

13. Note that other applicable reinsurance guidance from *SSAP No. 61R—Life, Deposit Type and Accident and Health Reinsurance* or *SSAP No. 62R—Property and Casualty Reinsurance*, depending on

the type of business, applies to intercompany pooling arrangements and voluntary and involuntary pools. This includes the SSAP No. 62R guidance in paragraphs 33 through 39 regarding retroactive reinsurance.

New disclosure in paragraph 13 as modified after exposure:

13.i The statement value and fair value of assets received or transferred by the reporting entity for modifications to an existing intercompany pooling arrangement that involved the transfer of assets with fair value that differ from statement value.

[https://naiconline.sharepoint.com/teams/FRSStatutoryAccounting/NationalMeetings/A.NationalMeetingMaterials/2024/08-13-24 Summer National Meeting/Adoptions/22-12 - Review INT 03-02.docx](https://naiconline.sharepoint.com/teams/FRSStatutoryAccounting/NationalMeetings/A.NationalMeetingMaterials/2024/08-13-24SummerNationalMeeting/Adoptions/22-12-ReviewINT03-02.docx)