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I. **Evaluation of Switzerland as Reciprocal Jurisdiction**

The Qualified Jurisdiction (E) Working Group of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) has completed this *Summary of Findings and Determination* with respect to the evaluation of the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority FINMA, the lead insurance regulatory supervisor for Switzerland, as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction. It is the recommendation of the Working Group that the NAIC approve FINMA as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction and place it on the *NAIC List of Reciprocal Jurisdictions*, to be effective as of January 1, 2020. Further, the Working Group recommends that Missouri be the Lead State for purposes of regulatory cooperation and information sharing with FINMA. These recommendations are based on the following analysis:

II. **Procedural History**

On September 22, 2017, the United States and the European Union (EU) entered into the “*Bilateral Agreement Between the United States of America and the European Union on Prudential Measures Regarding Insurance and Reinsurance.*” A similar agreement with the United Kingdom (UK) was signed on December 18, 2018. Both agreements (collectively referred to as the “Covered Agreements”) will require the states to eliminate reinsurance collateral requirements for reinsurers licensed and domiciled in these jurisdictions within 60 months (five years) after signing or face potential federal preemption by the Federal Insurance Office (FIO) under the Dodd-Frank Act.

The NAIC adopted revisions to the *Credit for Reinsurance Model Law* (#785) and *Credit for Reinsurance Model Regulation* (#786) (collectively, the “Credit for Reinsurance Models”) on June 25, 2019, to recognize a new designation of “Reciprocal Jurisdiction” under which certain reinsurers licensed and domiciled in Reciprocal Jurisdictions are not required to post reinsurance collateral. A Qualified Jurisdiction which meets certain additional requirements described in the Credit for Reinsurance Models may be determined to be a Reciprocal Jurisdiction under the revised Credit for Reinsurance Models.

A list of Reciprocal Jurisdictions will be published through the NAIC committee process. Jurisdictions subject to an in-force Covered Agreement and states that meet the requirements of the NAIC Financial Standards and Accreditation Program are automatically included on the List of Reciprocal Jurisdictions. A state must consider this list in its determination of Reciprocal Jurisdiction status, and if the state approves a jurisdiction not on this list, the state must thoroughly document the justification for approving this jurisdiction in accordance with the standards for approving Reciprocal Jurisdictions contained in the Credit for Reinsurance Models.

On October 22, 2019, the Reinsurance (E) Task Force updated and revised the *Process for Evaluating Qualified and Reciprocal Jurisdictions* to specify how Qualified Jurisdictions that recognize key NAIC solvency initiatives, including group supervision and group capital standards, and also meet the other requirements under the revised Credit for Reinsurance Models, will be recognized as Reciprocal Jurisdictions and receive similar treatment as that provided under the EU and UK Covered Agreements, including the elimination of reinsurance collateral and local presence requirements by the states.
III. FINMA’s Status of a Qualified Jurisdiction

A Qualified Jurisdiction may not be reviewed for inclusion on the *NAIC List of Reciprocal Jurisdictions* unless it remains in good standing with the NAIC as a Qualified Jurisdiction. The NAIC originally designated FINMA as a Conditional Qualified Jurisdiction effective January 1, 2014, with the designation to continue for one year. On December 16, 2014, the NAIC approved FINMA as a Qualified Jurisdiction and placed it on the *NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions*, to be effective as of January 1, 2015. This designation as a Qualified Jurisdiction was to be valid for five years (absent a material change in circumstances) ending on December 31, 2019, after which FINMA would be re-evaluated.

The Working Group met in regulator-to-regulator session on October 7, 2019 and re-approved FINMA as a Qualified Jurisdiction. The Reinsurance (E) Task Force is expected to approve the re-evaluation of FINMA as a Qualified Jurisdiction, which is expected to be confirmed by the NAIC Executive (EX) Committee and Plenary at its 2019 Fall National Meeting. This *Summary of Findings and Determination* with respect to FINMA as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction is expressly made contingent upon the NAIC’s re-approval of FINMA as a Qualified Jurisdiction.

IV. Written Confirmation

In making its recommendation with respect to whether a Qualified Jurisdiction that is not automatically designated as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction should be added to the *NAIC List of Reciprocal Jurisdictions*, the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group shall undertake the following analysis in making its evaluation:

1. The Qualified Jurisdiction must confirm that an insurer which has its head office or is domiciled in that jurisdiction shall receive credit for reinsurance ceded to a U.S.-domiciled assuming insurer in the same manner as credit for reinsurance assumed by insurers domiciled in that jurisdiction is received by United States ceding insurers;

2. The Qualified Jurisdiction must confirm that it does not require a U.S.-domiciled assuming insurer to establish or maintain a local presence as a condition for entering into a reinsurance agreement with any ceding insurer subject to regulation by that jurisdiction or as a condition to allow the ceding insurer to recognize credit for such reinsurance;

3. The Qualified Jurisdiction must recognize the U.S. state regulatory approach to group supervision and group capital, by providing written confirmation by its competent regulatory authority that insurance groups that are domiciled or maintain their worldwide headquarters in this state or another jurisdiction accredited by the NAIC shall be subject only to their U.S. home jurisdiction’s worldwide prudential insurance group supervision, including worldwide group governance, solvency and capital, and reporting, as applicable, and will not be subject to group supervision at the level of the worldwide parent undertaking of the insurance or reinsurance group by the Qualified Jurisdiction;
4. The Qualified Jurisdiction must provide written confirmation by its competent regulatory authority that information regarding insurers and their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated entities, if applicable, shall be provided to the states in accordance with a memorandum of understanding or similar document between a state and the Qualified Jurisdiction, including but not limited to the IAIS MMoU or other multilateral memoranda of understanding coordinated by the NAIC. This requirement may be satisfied by an MOU with a Lead State, which shall provide for appropriate confidentiality safeguards with respect to the information shared between the jurisdictions, similar to the MOU requirement outlined in paragraph 11 of this section III; and

5. The Qualified Jurisdiction must confirm that it will provide to the states on an annual basis confirmation that each eligible assuming insurer that is domiciled in the Qualified Jurisdiction continues to comply with the requirements set forth in Section 9C(2) and (3) of Model #786; i.e., must maintain minimum capital and surplus of no less than $250,000,000, and maintains on an ongoing basis the required minimum solvency or capital ratio, as applicable.

FINMA provided the NAIC and the chief insurance regulators of the 50 states, the District of Columbia and five U.S. territories with this written confirmation by letter dated October 29, 2019. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group performed a due diligence review of available public and confidential documents to confirm that to the best of its determination, the representations in the letter are true and accurate on November 5, 2019.

V. Minimum Solvency or Capital Ratio

The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group, working in coordination with the Qualified Jurisdiction and the Reinsurance Financial Analysis (E) Working Group, must make a determination on a minimum solvency or capital ratio under which reinsurers licensed and domiciled in the Qualified Jurisdiction may assume insurance from U.S. ceding companies without posting reinsurance collateral. The applicable minimum solvency or capital ratio must be an effective measure of solvency, comparable to either an NAIC risk-based capital (RBC) ratio of three hundred percent (300%) of the authorized control level, or one hundred percent (100%) of the solvency capital requirement (SCR) as calculated under the Solvency II Directive issued by the European Union, giving due consideration to any applicable equivalency assessment conducted by the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA) on the Qualified Jurisdiction with respect to Solvency II.

In the 2015 EIOPA Advice to the European Commission: Equivalence assessment of the Swiss supervisory system in relation to Articles 172, 227 and 260 of the Solvency II Directive (EIOPA-BoS-15/041), EIOPA made the following observations on Switzerland’s ladder of supervisory intervention:

Under the Swiss Solvency Test (SST), the capital requirement which is more commonly referred to as the Target Capital (TC) under the SST, is calculated to cover unexpected losses arising from existing business that correspond to the Tail Value-at-Risk (Tail-VaR) of the Risk Bearing Capital (RBC) subject to a confidence level of 99% over a one-year period....
The SST ratio of an insurer determines its supervisory zone (green, yellow, amber or red) and the corresponding degree of supervisory intervention:

- **If the SST ratio is 100% or more, there will be no supervisory intervention** – i.e. the insurer will be subject to normal supervisory monitoring. [Emphasis added].

- If the SST ratio falls below 100%, the intensity of supervisory intervention and the intrusiveness of supervisory actions will increase as the SST ratio decreases.

- If the SST ratio falls below 33%, the insurer will be required to take immediate actions to restore the SST ratio, the failure of which will trigger FINMA to revoke its license.

In its consultation letter to the NAIC dated October 2, 2019, FINMA advised as follows:

FINMA would consider in principle 100% SST to be comparable to some extent to 100% SCR under Solvency II. In addition, we would like to make the following comments:

- There is a significant degree of commonalities between the two solvency regimes, but also some different approaches applied.
- The application for the tail value-at-risk with a confidence level of 99% under the SST as opposed to the value-at-at risk with a confidence level of 99.5% leads in the case of a reinsurer typically to more conservative results, i.e. to a higher insurance target capital.
- In this context, one can also refer to recent IMF FSAP Reports.

The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group approved 100% SST as the minimum solvency or capital ratio for reinsurers domiciled in Switzerland, and the Reinsurance Financial Analysis (E) Working Group approved 100% SST as the minimum solvency or capital ratio on October 11, 2019.

VI. Summary of Findings and Recommendation

Therefore, it is the recommendation of the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group that the NAIC recognize FINMA as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction and place it on the *NAIC List of Reciprocal Jurisdictions*, with such evaluation to be effective as of January 1, 2020. Further, the Working Group recommends that the minimum solvency or capital ratio for eligible reinsurers domiciled in Switzerland to be a 100% SST ratio.