

Date: 11/18/19

*2019 Fall National Meeting
Austin, Texas***FINANCIAL CONDITION (E) COMMITTEE****Monday, December 9, 2019****1:00 – 1:30 p.m.****JW Marriott Austin—Lone Star Ballroom A-C—Level 3****ROLL CALL**

David Altmaier, Chair	Florida	Chlora Lindley-Myers	Missouri
Kent Sullivan, Vice Chair	Texas	Matthew Rosendale	Montana
Ricardo Lara	California	Marlene Caride	New Jersey
Michael Conway	Colorado	Glen Mulready	Oklahoma
Robert H. Muriel	Illinois	Raymond G. Farmer	South Carolina
Eric A. Cioppa	Maine	James A. Dodrill	West Virginia
Steve Kelley	Minnesota	Jeff Rude	Wyoming
Mike Chaney	Mississippi		

NAIC Support Staff: Dan Daveline/Julie Gann/Bruce Jenson

AGENDA

1. Consider Adoption of its Oct. 31, Aug. 29, and Summer National Meeting Minutes
—*Commissioner David Altmaier (FL)* Attachment One
2. Consider Adoption of its Task Force and Working Group Reports
—*Commissioner David Altmaier (FL)*
 - a. Accounting Practices and Procedures (E) Task Force Pending
 - b. Capital Adequacy (E) Task Force Pending
 - c. Examination Oversight (E) Task Force Pending
 - d. Receivership and Insolvency (E) Task Force Pending
 - e. Reinsurance (E) Task Force Pending
 - f. Risk Retention Group (E) Task Force Pending
 - g. Valuation of Securities (E) Task Force Pending
 - h. Group Capital Calculation (E) Working Group Pending
 - i. Mortgage Guaranty Insurance (E) Working Group Pending
 - j. National Treatment and Coordination (E) Working Group Pending
 - k. Restructuring Mechanisms (E) Working Group Pending
 - l. Group Solvency Issues (E) Working Group Pending
3. Adopt *Financial Condition Examiners Handbook* Salary Update Recommendation
—*Commissioner David Altmaier (FL)* Attachment Fourteen
4. Adopt Revisions to the Process for Evaluating Qualified and Reciprocal Jurisdictions
—*John Rehagen (MO)* Attachment Fifteen
5. Discuss Any Other Matters Brought Before the Committee—*Commissioner David Altmaier (FL)*
6. Adjournment

W:\National Meetings\2019\Fall\Cmte\E\Materials\Preliminary Materials\E Committee Agenda.docx

Draft: 11/6/19

Financial Condition (E) Committee
Conference Call
October 31, 2019

The Financial Condition (E) Committee met via conference call Oct. 31, 2019. The following Committee members participated: David Altmaier, Chair (FL); Kent Sullivan, Vice Chair, represented by Doug Slape, Jamie Walker and James Kennedy (TX); Ricardo Lara represented by Susan Bernard and Kim Hudson (CA); Michael Conway represented by Rolf Kaumann (CO); Robert H. Muriel represented by Susan Berry (IL); Chlora Lindley-Myers represented by John Rehagen (MO); Eric A. Cioppa represented by Vanessa Sullivan (ME); Mike Chaney represented by Chad Bridges (MS); Marlene Caride and Diana Sherman (NJ); Glen Mulready represented by Joel Sander (OK); Raymond G. Farmer represented by Lee Hill (SC); James A. Dodrill represented by Jamie Taylor (WV); and Jeff Rude represented by Linda Johnson (WY).

1. Adopted its 2020 Proposed Charges

Commissioner Altmaier stated that proposed charges had previously been shared and now incorporate final charges from task forces reporting to the Committee.

Mr. Kaumann made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Caride, to adopt its 2020 proposed charges ([Attachment?](#)). The motion passed unanimously.

2. Adopted a Request for NAIC Model Law Development

Commissioner Altmaier discussed that the Group Capital Calculation (E) Working Group recently adopted a Request for NAIC Model Law Development that requests the authority to make changes to the *Insurance Holding Company System Regulatory Act* (#440) and the *Insurance Holding Company System Model Regulation with Reporting Forms and Instructions* (#450) to add important confidentiality requirements to a group capital calculation (GCC) filing. He emphasized that the request seeks authority only to require such filing and hold it confidential but does not include any level of regulatory intervention as a result of the filing. He noted that technical changes would be contemplated as the confidentiality language is developed, but first it must seek the approval of the Committee and the Executive (EX) Committee. He noted that the Working Group will work with the Group Solvency Issues (E) Working Group to complete the task if approved.

Mr. Slape made a motion, seconded by Ms. Berry, to adopt the Request for NAIC Model Law Development ([Attachment?](#)). The motion passed unanimously.

3. Adopted a Guideline for Stay on Termination of Netting Agreements and QFCs

Mr. Kennedy said that the Receivership and Insolvency (E) Task Force drafted amendments to the NAIC's *Guideline for Stay on Termination of Netting Agreements and Qualified Financial Contracts* (#1556). He stated that Guideline #1556 was originally adopted in 2013 to provide a temporary stay on qualified financial contracts (QFCs). He stated that currently Section 711 of the *Insurer Receivership Model Act* (#555) does not allow any type of a stay when a company is placed into receivership. He stated that in 2017, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Federal Reserve), the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) each adopted final rules regarding financial contracts, including a definition of a master netting agreement. This definition recognizes the stay under federal rules but does not recognize stays under state receivership laws. This created a conflict with the current guideline. On Dec. 2, 2017, the Receivership and Insolvency (E) Task Force received a referral from the Financial Stability (EX) Task Force to evaluate whether there are any current misalignments between federal and state laws that could be an obstacle to achieving effective and orderly recovery and resolutions for U.S. insurance groups. To address the conflict with the federal rule, the drafting group proposed amendments to the drafting note of Guideline #1556 explaining the issue.

Mr. Kennedy made a motion, seconded by Mr. Rehagen, to adopt the revised Guideline #1556 ([Attachment?](#)). The motion passed unanimously.

Having no further business, the Financial Condition (E) Committee adjourned.

Draft: 9/3/19

Financial Condition (E) Committee
Conference Call
August 29, 2019

The Financial Condition (E) Committee met via conference call Aug. 29, 2019. The following Committee members participated: David Altmaier, Chair (FL); Kent Sullivan, Vice Chair, represented by Jamie Walker (TX); Ricardo Lara represented by Susan Bernard and Kim Hudson (CA); Robert H. Muriel and Kevin Fry (IL); Chlora Lindley-Myers represented by Debbie Doggett (MO); Matthew Rosendale represented by Steve Matthews (MT); Marlene Caride represented by Steve Kerner and John Sirovetz (NJ); Glen Mulready and Joel Sander (OK); Raymond G. Farmer represented by Daniel Morris (SC); James A. Dodrill represented by Jamie Walker (WV); and Jeff Rude represented by Linda Johnson (WY). Also participating was: Rich Piazza (LA).

1. Adopted the Report of the Accounting Practices and Procedures (E) Task Force

Commissioner Altmaier asked that upon receiving the report of the Accounting Practices and Procedures (E) Task Force, that any motion to adopt exclude both 2019-20BWG and the 2020 proposed charges. He stated that excluding the charges was appropriate as they will be considered with other task force and working group charges in a conference call that takes place in October.

Ms. Walker provided the report of the Accounting Practices and Procedures (E) Task Force, which met Aug. 22. During this meeting, the Task Force adopted its 2020 proposed charges, including deletion of two completed charges and deletion of one charge proposed to be disposed as unnecessary. All the deleted charges of the Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group related to variable annuities. She stated the report also included adoption of the Aug. 20 report of the Blanks (E) Working Group, with one minor modification to agenda item 2019-20BWG. The Task Force also adopted the July 2 and June 24 minutes of the Blanks (E) Working Group. The two blanks proposals adopted are: 1) 2019-18BWG, which adds an NAIC designation modifier to accommodate the NAIC designation category granularity framework adopted by the Valuation of Securities (E) Task Force, with an annual 2020 effective date; and 2) 2019-20BWG, which will be considered separately, but in summary it adds a “Qualification Documentation” to the property/casualty (P/C) Statement of Actuarial Opinion instructions, as requested by the Casualty Actuarial and Statistical (C) Task Force and the Executive (EX) Committee, requiring the appointed actuary to maintain workpapers explaining how the actuary meets the definition of “qualified actuary.” The minor Accounting Practices and Procedures (E) Task Force modification to the proposal changed the name of the term in the proposal from “NAIC Accepted Actuarial Designation” to “Accepted Actuarial Designation.” The proposal was adopted by the Task Force, with two no votes. Finally, Ms. Walker noted that blanks proposal 2019-19BWG on unaffiliated certificates of deposit was withdrawn to allow for further work, and the Blanks (E) Working Group also: 1) deferred revisions to its procedures to allow for further discussion; 2) exposed three proposals for a public comment period ending Oct. 8; and 3) adopted the editorial listing.

Mr. Sirovetz Kerner made a motion, seconded by Ms. Walker, to adopt the Task Force’s report, except for its 2020 proposed charges and blanks proposal 2019-20BWG. The motion passed unanimously,
, with Missouri voting no.

2. Adopted Blanks Proposal 2019-20BWG

Commissioner Altmaier asked Mr. Piazza to summarize the proposal. Mr. Piazza noted that he was the chief actuary in Louisiana. He said over the past 10 years, he served as chair of the Casualty Actuarial and Statistical (C) Task Force for seven years and as vice chair for three years. He stated that the proposal concerns the qualification definition of the appointed actuary contained in the *Property/Casualty Annual Statement Instructions*. He described the role of the appointed actuary and how it may be the most important role actuaries serve in the state insurance regulator’s eyes. He indicated that state insurance regulators that review reserve adequacy for company solvency in order to protect the interests of their state’s consumers rely heavily upon the accuracy of the appointed actuary’s reserve assessment and information contained in the appointed actuary’s Statement of Actuarial Opinion. To be able to provide the Statement of Actuarial Opinion, an appointed actuary must meet the qualification requirements defined in the *Property/Casualty Annual Statement Instructions*.

Mr. Piazza stated that the proposal has a long history at the NAIC. It began about seven years ago, when the Task Force was asked to determine if the Society of Actuaries’ (SOA) new educational track met the NAIC’s basic education requirement for

the qualified actuary. After many open discussions, the Task Force realized this was a time-consuming project that needed help from an independent, unbiased education expert. So, the Task Force asked for outside help. This request went up to the Property and Casualty Insurance (C) Committee and then to the Executive (EX) Committee. The Executive (EX) Committee set out to develop an objective, principled-based definition for the qualified actuary and to determine if the SOA and Casualty Actuarial Society's (CAS) designations meet the basic education requirement of that definition. The Executive (EX) Committee hired a consultant, and with many months of hard work from more than 30 subject matter experts (SMEs), it completed a job analysis for the appointed actuary. The Executive (EX) Committee then, again with assistance from SMEs, established basic education standards for the qualified actuary and evaluated the examination syllabi of the actuarial organizations to see if they met those standards. These projects resulted in the proposal.

Mr. Piazza provided a summary of the highlights in the proposal. The proposal sets forth a workable, objective and principle-based definition of a property/casualty (P/C) qualified actuary and recognizes the SOA's general insurance track designation, along with the CAS designations, as meeting the minimum basic education requirement for a qualified actuary. He described how the proposal adds qualification documentation to the instructions, which effectively pulls together an actuary's resume and continuing education documentation as a work paper so state insurance regulators can view that information if they wish and companies can use it in their governance review of the appointed actuary. The proposal has an effective date coinciding with the 2019 annual statement. Mr. Piazza stated that the 2019 effective date was agreed to by all three actuarial organizations. He noted that the proposal has little impact to any actuary currently appointed. All former appointed actuaries remain "qualified" under the new definition, with the only impact being they must document their qualifications. During the Accounting Practices and Procedures (E) Task Force's conference call on Aug. 22, Texas offered a friendly amendment to original blanks proposal 2019-20BWG that removed "NAIC" from the label that is now called the "acceptable actuarial designations." Mr. Piazza noted that this proposal was not performed in a vacuum as the proposed instruction changes were vetted many times since the beginning of this project. He described how in the past year-and-a-half, there were four exposures and one hearing with input considered from interested parties, the Task Force and commissioners directly. He stated that like other large, multi-faceted NAIC projects, there was a bit of compromise in the development of the proposal, and not all participants in the development process were 100% satisfied with the result. Mr. Piazza closed by stating that the proposal clearly met the Executive (EX) Committee's objective at the start of its project by setting forth a workable, objective and principle-based "qualified actuary" definition that includes actuarial designations from both the SOA and the CAS that meet the minimum basic education standard in that definition. He asked the Committee to adopt the proposal without further revision.

Ms. Bernard made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mulready, to adopt proposal 2019-20BWG. The motion passed, with Missouri voting no.

Having no further business, the Financial Condition (E) Committee adjourned.

W:\National Meetings\2019\Fall\Cmte\E\8-29 E Minutes.docx

Draft Pending Adoption

Draft: 8/6/19

Financial Condition (E) Committee
New York, New York
August 5, 2019

The Financial Condition (E) Committee met in New York, NY, Aug. 5, 2019. The following Committee members participated: David Altmaier, Chair (FL); Kent Sullivan, Vice Chair, Doug Slape and Jamie Walker (TX); Ricardo Lara and Susan Bernard (CA); Michael Conway represented by Rolf Kaumann (CO); Robert H. Muriel and Kevin Fry (IL); Eric A. Cioppa, Vanessa Sullivan and Robert Wake (ME); Steve Kelley represented by Kathleen Orth (MN); Chlora Lindley-Myers and John Rehagen (MO); Matthew Rosendale represented by Steve Matthews (MT); Marlene Caride, John Sirovetz and Diana Sherman (NJ); Glen Mulready and Joel Sander (OK); Raymond G. Farmer (SC); and Jeff Rude (WY).

1. Adopted its May 28 and Spring National Meeting Minutes

The Committee met May 28 and April 8. During its May 28 meeting, the Committee adopted the revised *Credit for Reinsurance Model Law* (#785) and *Credit for Reinsurance Model Regulation* (#786), which incorporate the relevant provisions of the “Bilateral Agreement Between the United States of America and the European Union on Prudential Measures Regarding Insurance and Reinsurance” (EU Covered Agreement) and the “Bilateral Agreement Between the United States of America and the United Kingdom on Prudential Measures Regarding Insurance and Reinsurance” (UK Covered Agreement).

Commissioner Sullivan made a motion, seconded by Ms. Bernard, to adopt the Committee’s May 28 (Attachment One) and April 8 (*see NAIC Proceedings – Fall 2018, Financial Condition (E) Committee*) minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Adopted the Reports of its Task Forces and Working Groups

Commissioner Altmaier stated that items adopted within the Committee’s task force and working group reports that are considered technical, noncontroversial and not significant by NAIC standards—i.e., they do not include model laws, model regulations, model guidelines or items considered to be controversial—will be considered for adoption by the Executive (EX) Committee and Plenary through the Financial Condition (E) Committee’s technical changes report process. Pursuant to this process, which was adopted by the NAIC in 2009, a listing of the various technical changes will be sent to NAIC members shortly after completion of the Summer National Meeting, and the members will have 10 days to comment with respect to those items. If no objections are received with respect to an item, the technical changes will be considered adopted by the NAIC membership and effective immediately.

Commissioner Altmaier stated that included in the report of the Receivership and Insolvency (E) Task Force were proposed changes to the NAIC *Guideline for Stay on Termination of Netting Agreements and Qualified Financial Contracts* (#1556), which would be considered separately.

Commissioner Caride made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lindley-Myers, to adopt the following task force and working group reports: Accounting Practices and Procedures (E) Task Force; Capital Adequacy (E) Task Force; Examination Oversight (E) Task Force; Long-Term Care Insurance (E/B) Task Force; Receivership and Insolvency (E) Task Force; Reinsurance (E) Task Force; Risk Retention (E) Task Force; Valuation of Securities (E) Task Force; Group Capital Calculation (E) Working Group (Attachment Two); National Treatment and Coordination (E) Working Group (Attachment Three); NAIC/AICPA (E) Working Group (Attachment Four); Restructuring Mechanisms (E) Working Group (Attachment Five); and Group Solvency Issues (E) Working Group (Attachment Six). The motion passed unanimously.

The Financial Analysis (E) Working Group met July 10, June 19, May 15–16 and April 23–24 in regulator-to-regulator session, pursuant to paragraph 3 (specific companies, entities or individuals) of the NAIC Policy Statement on Open Meetings, to: 1) discuss letter responses related to first-quarter 2019 financial results; and 2) discuss year-end 2018 letter responses. Additionally, the Valuation Analysis (E) Working Group met July 22, July 1, June 3 and May 8 in regulator-to-regulator session, pursuant to paragraph 3 (specific companies, entities or individuals) of the NAIC Policy Statement on Open Meetings, to: 1) discuss questions regarding the economic scenario generator prescribed in the Valuation Manual and variable annuity risks; and 2) discuss the review approach for the 2018 Principle-Based Reserving (PBR) Actuarial Reports.

Draft Pending Adoption**3. Discussed a Preliminary *Financial Condition Examiners Handbook* Salary Update Recommendation**

Commissioner Altmaier summarized a memorandum from NAIC staff that provides an average recommended increase to the examiner salary recommendations in the *Financial Condition Examiners Handbook* based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the year ending July 31. He noted that because the July CPI will not be finalized for a month, the memorandum is only a preliminary indicator. He stated that the number is not expected to change significantly once the figures are finalized and asked that state insurance regulators review the memorandum and let NAIC staff know if they have any concerns. He said that a final version will be distributed for consideration at the Fall National Meeting.

4. Discussed Proposed Changes to the Restructuring Mechanisms (E) Working Group's 2020 Proposed Charges

Commissioner Altmaier said that when the Restructuring Mechanisms (E) Working Group and the Restructuring Mechanisms (E) Subgroup were established in February, the Committee asked that more specific deliverables be developed and reported back to the Committee at the Summer National Meeting. He noted that the memorandum (Attachment Seven) from the Working Group provides such information, including the expectation that a white paper will be completed by the 2020 Summer National Meeting, and in the process consider the guaranty fund coverage issues as well as protected cell requirements issue. He discussed how the Subgroup appears to now be focused on developing best practices for the different types of transactions, which ultimately can be considered as possible accreditation requirements. Commissioner Altmaier stated he believes the proposed changes to the charges were reasonable and suggested they be incorporated into the 2020 proposed charges that the Committee considers on a separate conference call after the Summer National Meeting.

5. Adopted a Request for Extension from the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance (E) Working Group

Commissioner Altmaier discussed the work of the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance (E) Working Group and specifically recognized the leadership of Steve Junior (WI) for chairing the Working group for several years, as well as Kevin Conley (NC), who will be chairing the Working Group going forward. Commissioner Altmaier discussed how the Working Group was updating an NAIC model law but that it was recently focused on the development of a capital model, which appears to be close to be completed. He stated that it was his understanding that there still are some related details to be taken care of both in the model, as well as work outside of the model, and that the Working Group was requesting an extension (Attachment Eight) until the 2020 Spring National Meeting.

Commissioner Lara made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lindley-Myers, to adopt the request. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Considered Guideline #1556

Commissioner Altmaier stated this item was pulled from the Receivership and Insolvency (E) Task Force report and would be considered separately. He asked that the issue be discussed and considered on an interim conference call. There were no objections.

Having no further business, the Financial Condition (E) Committee adjourned.

W:\National Meetings\2019\Summer\Cmte\E\4-8 E Minutes.docx



MEMORANDUM

TO: Financial Condition (E) Committee

FROM: NAIC Staff

DATE: November 15, 2019

RE: Examiners' Suggested Salary

For its work in 2020, the Risk-Focused Surveillance (E) Working Group received the following charges from the Financial Condition (E) Committee:

Continually maintain and update standardized job descriptions/requirements and salary range recommendations for common solvency monitoring positions to assist insurance departments in attracting and maintaining suitable staff.

In 2019, the Working Group developed and referred Handbook revisions that would provide clearer compensation suggestions to both the Financial Analysis Solvency Tools (E) Working Group and the Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group. Both groups adopted their revisions earlier this year and will therefore include related guidance in 2020 editions of their respective Handbooks. The Working Group has also sent a referral to the Financial Regulation Standards and Accreditation (F) Committee to enhance consideration of Department compensation during the Accreditation review process. Those revisions were also adopted in 2019.

To avoid negatively impacting states that base compensation on the current Salary and Per Diem Guidelines, NAIC staff have continued to maintain the existing Handbook guidance on compensation which is being updated via this memorandum. NAIC staff also recommend that the Risk-Focused Surveillance (E) Working Group assume the responsibility to oversee development of updates to all compensation related guidance pursuant to the charge outlined above.

The Consumer Price Index (CPI), as defined by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), is a measure of the average change in prices of goods and services purchased by households over time. The CPI is based on prices of food, clothing, shelter, fuels, transportation fares, charges for doctors' and dentists' services, drugs, and other goods and services purchased for day-to-day living. In 2008, it was decided that because the CPI takes into consideration most costs incurred by the average household, it is reasonable that an increase in salary should be within the same parameters as the increase in the cost of living. It was therefore proposed, and that proposal accepted, that the CPI be used as a basis for examiner salary increases. In years in which the CPI does not accurately reflect market conditions, additional work—including surveys and salary studies—may be completed to ensure proper salary suggestions. Consistent with past years, inflation has continued to show modest increases in prices and appears appropriate as a metric on which to base a suggested compensation increase.

The following data table shows the average annual salary increases adopted in the previous five years as compared to the CPI, as well as the proposed increase for the following year. The information "as published by BLS" compares the CPI as of July of each year, consistent with the analysis performed in past years.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE • 444 North Capitol Street NW, Suite 700 • Washington, DC 20001-1509

p | 202 471 3990 f | 816 460 7493

CENTRAL OFFICE • 1100 Walnut Street, Suite 1500 • Kansas City, MO 64106-2197

p | 816 842 3600 f | 816 783 8175

CAPITAL MARKETS & INVESTMENT ANALYSIS OFFICE • One New York Plaza, Suite 4210 • New York, NY 10004

p | 212 398 9000 f | 212 382 4207

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
As Published in <i>Financial Condition Examiners Handbook</i>	2.25%	2.00%	2.75%	3.00%	3.00%	*2.00%
As Published by BLS	2.26%	0.17%	0.83%	1.73%	2.95%	1.81%
Difference	0.01%	0.83%	1.92%	1.27%	0.05%	0.19%

* - Suggested change

As shown above, in recent years, the rates suggested by the NAIC were consistently comparable to those published by the BLS, regardless of the method used.

Based upon the current CPI data available (July 2018–July 2019), the estimated annual change in CPI is approximately 1.81%. As such, if the Committee intends to base salary increases on changes in the CPI, we would recommend a 2% increase in all classification categories as shown below.

Classification	2018 Daily Rates	Suggested Increase	2019 Daily Rates
Insurance Company Examiner, AFE*	329	2%	\$ 336
Automated Examination Specialist, AFE (no AES)**	403	2%	\$ 411
Senior Insurance Examiner, CFE***	403	2%	\$ 411
Automated Examination Specialist, AES	453	2%	\$ 462
Automated Examination Specialist, CFE (no AES)	453	2%	\$ 462
Insurance Examiner In-Charge, CFE	485	2%	\$ 495
Supervising or Administrative Examiner	515	2%	\$ 525

* Accredited Financial Examiner

** Automated Examination Specialist

*** Certified Financial Examiner

W:\National Meetings\2019\Fall\Cmte\E\Materials\Preliminary Materials\Attachment 14-Examiners Sugg Comp - 2019.docx



Adopted by the Reinsurance (E) Task Force October 22, 2019

Process for ~~Developing and Maintaining~~ ~~the NAIC List of~~Evaluating Qualified and Reciprocal Jurisdictions

Table of Contents

I. Preamble

II. Principles for Evaluation of Non-U.S. Jurisdictions

III. Procedure for Evaluation of Non-U.S. Jurisdictions

1. Initiation of Evaluation of the Reinsurance Supervisory System of an Individual Jurisdiction
2. Evaluation of Jurisdiction
3. NAIC Review of Evaluation Materials
4. Discretionary On-site Review
5. Standard of Review
6. Additional Information to be Considered as Part of Evaluation
7. Preliminary Evaluation Report
8. Review of Preliminary Evaluation Report
9. Opportunity to Respond to Preliminary Evaluation Report
10. NAIC Determination Regarding List of Qualified Jurisdictions
11. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
12. Process for Periodic Evaluation
- 12.13. Review of Qualified Jurisdictions as Reciprocal Jurisdictions

IV. Evaluation Methodology

- Section A: Laws and Regulations
- Section B: Regulatory Practices and Procedures
- Section C: Jurisdiction's Requirements Applicable to U.S.-Domiciled Reinsurers
- Section D: Regulatory Cooperation and Information Sharing
- Section E: History of Performance of Domestic Reinsurers
- Section F: Enforcement of Final U.S. Judgments
- Section G: Solvent Schemes of Arrangement

V. Appendices: Specific Guidance with Respect to Section A and Section B

- Appendix A: Laws and Regulations
- Appendix B: Regulatory Practices and Procedures

I. Preamble

Purpose

The revised *Credit for Reinsurance Model Law* (#785) and *Credit for Reinsurance Model Regulation* (#786) (collectively, the Credit for Reinsurance Models) require an assuming insurer to be licensed and domiciled in a “Qualified Jurisdiction” in order to be eligible for certification by a state as a certified reinsurer for reinsurance collateral reduction purposes. In 2012, the NAIC Reinsurance (E) Task Force was charged to develop an NAIC process to evaluate the reinsurance supervisory systems of non-U.S. jurisdictions, for the purposes of developing and maintaining a list of jurisdictions recommended for recognition by the states as Qualified Jurisdictions. This charge was extended in 2019 to encompass the recognition of Reciprocal Jurisdictions in accordance with the 2019 amendments to the Credit for Reinsurance Models, including the maintenance of a list of recommended Reciprocal Jurisdictions. The purpose of the *Process for Developing and Maintaining the NAIC List of Evaluating Qualified and Reciprocal Jurisdictions* is to provide a documented evaluation process for creating and maintaining thesethis NAIC lists.

Background

On November 6, 2011, the NAIC Executive (EX) Committee and Plenary adopted revisions to the Credit for Reinsurance Models. These revisions serve to reduce reinsurance collateral requirements for certified reinsurers that are licensed and domiciled in Qualified Jurisdictions. Under the previous version of the Credit for Reinsurance Models, in order for U.S. ceding insurers to receive reinsurance credit, the reinsurance was required to be ceded to U.S.-licensed reinsurers or secured by collateral representing 100% of U.S. liabilities for which the credit is recorded. When considering revisions to the Credit for Reinsurance Models, the Reinsurance (E) Task Force contemplated establishing an accreditation-like process, modeled on the current NAIC Financial Regulation Standards and Accreditation Program, to review the reinsurance supervisory systems of non-U.S. jurisdictions. Under the revised Credit for Reinsurance Models, the approval of Qualified Jurisdictions is left to the authority of the states; however, the models provide that a list of Qualified Jurisdictions will be created through the NAIC committee process, and that individual states must consider this list when approving jurisdictions.

The enactment in 2010 of the federal Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-Frank Act) created the Federal Insurance Office (FIO), which has the following authority: (1) coordinate federal efforts and develop federal policy on prudential aspects of international insurance matters; (2) assist the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Treasury in negotiating covered agreements (as defined in the Dodd-Frank Act); (3) determine whether the states’ insurance measures are preempted by covered agreements; and (4) consult with the states (including state insurance regulators) regarding insurance matters of national importance and prudential insurance matters of international importance. Further, the Dodd-Frank Act authorizes the U.S. Treasury Secretary and the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), jointly, to negotiate and enter into covered agreements on behalf of the United States. It is the NAIC’s intention to communicate and coordinate with the FIO and related federal authorities as appropriate with respect to the evaluation of the reinsurance supervisory systems of non-U.S. jurisdictions.

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.

Reciprocal Jurisdictions

On June 25, 2019, the NAIC Executive (EX) Committee and Plenary adopted revisions to the Credit for Reinsurance Models. These revisions were intended to conform the Models to the relevant provisions of the Covered Agreements. The Covered Agreements would eliminate reinsurance collateral requirements for EU and UK reinsurers that maintain a minimum amount of own funds equivalent to \$250 million and a solvency capital requirement (SCR) of 100% under Solvency II, among other conditions. Conversely, U.S. reinsurers that maintain capital and surplus equivalent to 226 million euros with a risk-based capital (RBC) of 300% of authorized control level would not be required to maintain a local presence in order to do business in the EU or UK or post reinsurance collateral. Under the revised Credit for Reinsurance Models, jurisdictions that are subject to in-force Covered Agreements are considered to be Reciprocal Jurisdictions, and reinsurers that have their head office or are domiciled in a Reciprocal Jurisdiction are not required to post reinsurance collateral if they meet all of the requirements of the Credit for Reinsurance Models.

Under the revised Credit for Reinsurance Models, not only are jurisdictions that are subject to Covered Agreements treated as Reciprocal Jurisdictions for reinsurance collateral purposes, but any other Qualified Jurisdictions can also qualify for collateral elimination as Reciprocal Jurisdictions. States that meet the requirements of the NAIC Financial Standards and Accreditation Program are also considered to be Reciprocal Jurisdictions.

The NAIC has updated and revised this *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.

II. Principles for the Evaluation of Non-U.S. Jurisdictions

1. The NAIC model revisions applicable to certified reinsurers are intended to facilitate cross-border reinsurance transactions and enhance competition within the U.S. market, while ensuring that U.S. insurers and policyholders are adequately protected against the risk of insolvency. To be eligible for certification, a reinsurer must be domiciled and licensed in a Qualified Jurisdiction as determined by the domestic regulator of the ceding insurer. A Qualified Jurisdiction not subject to an in-force Covered Agreement under the Dodd-Frank Act may also be determined to be a Reciprocal Jurisdiction, and reinsurers that have their head office or are domiciled in any such Reciprocal Jurisdiction will not be required to post reinsurance collateral, provided they meet the minimum capital and financial strength requirements and comply with the other requirements of the Credit for Reinsurance Models.
2. The evaluation of non-U.S. jurisdictions as Qualified Jurisdictions and Reciprocal Jurisdictions will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Credit for Reinsurance Models and any other relevant guidance developed by the NAIC.
3. The evaluation of non-U.S. jurisdictions as Qualified Jurisdictions is intended as an outcomes-based comparison to financial solvency regulation under the NAIC Financial Regulation Standards and Accreditation Program (Accreditation Program), adherence to international supervisory standards, and relevant international guidance for recognition of reinsurance supervision. It is not intended as a prescriptive comparison to the NAIC Accreditation Program. In order for a Qualified Jurisdiction that is not subject to an in-force Covered Agreement to be evaluated as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction, that Qualified Jurisdiction must agree to recognize the states' approach to group supervision, including group capital, and other such requirements as provided under the Credit for Reinsurance Models.
4. The states shall evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of the reinsurance supervisory system within the Qualified Jurisdiction, both initially and on an ongoing basis, and consider the rights, benefits and the extent of reciprocal recognition afforded by the jurisdiction to reinsurers licensed and domiciled in the U.S. The determination of Qualified Jurisdiction status is based on the effectiveness of the entire reinsurance supervisory system within the jurisdiction.
5. Each state may evaluate a non-U.S. jurisdiction to determine if it is a Qualified Jurisdiction. A list of Qualified Jurisdictions will be published through the NAIC committee process. A state must consider this list in its determination of Qualified Jurisdictions, 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 Qualified Jurisdictions contained in the Credit for Reinsurance Models. The creation of this list does not constitute a delegation of regulatory authority to the NAIC. The regulatory authority to recognize a Qualified Jurisdiction resides solely in each state and the NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions is not binding on the states.
6. 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
7. In order to facilitate multi-state recognition of assuming insurers and to encourage uniformity among the states, the NAIC has initiated a process called “passporting” under which the commissioner has the discretion to defer to another state’s determination that a jurisdiction is a Qualified or Reciprocal Jurisdiction. Passporting is based

upon individual state regulatory authority, and states are encouraged to act in a uniform manner in order to facilitate the passporting process. States are also encouraged to utilize the passporting process to reduce the amount of documentation filed with the states and reduce duplicate filings. The NAIC Lists of Qualified and Reciprocal Jurisdictions are intended to facilitate the passporting process.

6.8. BothA Qualified Jurisdictions and Reciprocal Jurisdictions must agree to share information and cooperate with the state with respect to all certifiedapplicable reinsurers domiciled within that jurisdiction. Critical factors in the evaluation process include but are not limited to the history of performance by assuming insurers in the applicant jurisdiction and any documented evidence of substantial problems with the enforcement of final U.S. judgments in the applicant jurisdiction. A jurisdiction will not be a Qualified Jurisdiction if the commissioner has determined that it does not adequately and promptly enforce final U.S. judgments or arbitration awards.

7.9. The determination of Qualified Jurisdiction status can only be made with respect to the reinsurance supervisory system in existence and applied by a non-U.S. jurisdiction at the time of the evaluation.

8.10. The NAIC and the states will communicate and coordinate with the FIO, USTR and other relevant federal authorities as appropriate with respect to the evaluation of the reinsurance supervisory systems of non-U.S. jurisdictions.

III. Procedure for Evaluation of Non-U.S. Jurisdictions

1. Initiation of Evaluation of the Reinsurance Supervisory System of an Individual Jurisdiction.

- a. ~~The NAIC will initially evaluate and expedite the review of those jurisdictions that were approved by the states of Florida and New York prior to the adoption of the revised Credit for Reinsurance Models (i.e., Bermuda, Germany, Switzerland and the United Kingdom). The NAIC may also consider expediting the review of additional jurisdictions, as outlined in paragraph 1(d) below. While the same evaluation procedure and methodology will be applicable to any jurisdiction under review, U.S. state insurance regulators' familiarity with these particular jurisdictions may lead to a more expeditious review. Subsequent priority will be on the basis of objective factors including but not limited to ceded premium volume and reinsurance capacity issues raised by the states. Priority will also be given to requests from the states and from those jurisdictions specifically requesting an evaluation by the NAIC.~~
- b. Formal notification of the NAIC's intent to initiate the evaluation process will be sent by the NAIC to the reinsurance supervisory authority in the jurisdiction selected, with copies to the FIO and other relevant federal authorities as appropriate. The NAIC will issue public notice on the NAIC website upon confirmation that the jurisdiction is willing to participate in the evaluation process. The NAIC will at this time request public comments with respect to consideration of the jurisdiction as a Qualified Jurisdiction. The process of evaluation and all related documentation are private and confidential matters between the NAIC and the applicant jurisdiction, unless otherwise provided in this document, subject to a preliminary confidentiality and information sharing agreement between the NAIC, relevant states and the applicant jurisdiction.
- c. Relevant U.S. state and federal authorities will be notified of the NAIC's decision to evaluate a jurisdiction.
- d. ~~Expedited Review Procedure. Based on the prior review and approval by Florida and New York of reinsurers domiciled in Bermuda, Germany, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, the NAIC will apply an expedited review procedure with respect to these jurisdictions. The NAIC may also consider extending this expedited review procedure to other jurisdictions approved by a state as a Qualified Jurisdiction, provided that:~~
 - i. ~~The state provides a report to the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group confirming that it has completed a full review of the jurisdiction in accordance with that set forth in Part IV: Evaluation Methodology. If current information as outlined in paragraph 1(e)(i) (i.e., FSAP Report and ROSC) is not available to the state, it must demonstrate that it has obtained and reviewed information consistent with Appendix A and Appendix B.~~
 - ii. ~~The state completes the full review and lists the jurisdiction as a Qualified Jurisdiction within 60 days of the NAIC's adoption of the *Process for Developing and Maintaining the NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions*.~~

~~This procedure is not intended to eliminate or reduce any element provided under Part IV: Evaluation Methodology, but is intended to allow for a designation of Conditional Qualified Jurisdiction of these jurisdictions in order to facilitate the certification of reinsurers domiciled therein. Final qualification of each jurisdiction will be contingent upon completion of the full, outcomes-based evaluation procedure.~~

- e. Upon confirmation that a jurisdiction is willing to be considered for designation as a Conditional Qualified Jurisdiction, the following expedited review procedure will apply:
- i. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will perform an initial review of the jurisdiction's most recent Detailed Assessment of Observance on Insurance Core Principles under the International Monetary Fund (IMF)/World Bank Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP Report), Report on Observance for Standards and Codes (ROSC), and any other publicly available information regarding the laws, regulations, practices and procedures applicable to the reinsurance supervisory system in conjunction with the information provided under Section C through Section G of the Evaluation Methodology. The NAIC will invite each jurisdiction (or its designee) to provide information relative to Section C through Section G of the Evaluation Methodology in order to complete or supplement publicly available information. The NAIC may designate the jurisdiction as a Conditional Qualified Jurisdiction, to be effective immediately, upon: (1) receipt of all necessary initial information requested in this section; (2) opportunity for comment by interested parties; and (3) conclusion of any appropriate communication with the FIO, USTR and other relevant federal authorities.
 - ii. During this period as a Conditional Qualified Jurisdiction, the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will complete its full analysis of the information provided by the jurisdiction, in addition to any specific information that is subsequently requested by the NAIC, in order to evaluate the jurisdiction's laws, regulations, practices and procedures from an outcomes based perspective in accordance with the guidance provided under Appendix A and Appendix B of the Evaluation Methodology. Upon satisfactory completion of the outcomes based review of this information, the NAIC may upgrade the jurisdiction's designation to Qualified Jurisdiction. The NAIC may also address any issues identified within the review or revoke the designation of Conditional Qualified Jurisdiction.
 - iii. A jurisdiction may be permitted to maintain the designation of Conditional Qualified Jurisdiction for one year, unless: (1) an extension is granted by the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group; or (2) a determination is made that the jurisdiction is not a Qualified Jurisdiction.

2. Evaluation of Jurisdiction

- a. Evaluation Materials. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will initiate evaluation of a jurisdiction's regulatory system by using the information identified in Section A through Section G of the Evaluation Methodology (Evaluation Materials). The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will begin by undertaking a review of the most recent Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP) Report prepared by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), including the Technical Note on Insurance Sector Supervision, ROSC and any other publicly available information regarding the laws, regulations, practices and procedures applicable to the reinsurance supervisory system. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will also invite each jurisdiction or its designee to provide information relative to Section A through Section G of the Evaluation Methodology in order to update, complete or supplement publicly available information. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group may also request or accept relevant information from reinsurers domiciled in the jurisdiction under review.
- b. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will notify the jurisdiction of any information upon which the Working Group is relying that was not otherwise provided by the jurisdiction. In that communication, the NAIC will invite the supervisory authority to compare the materials identified by the NAIC to the materials described in Appendix A and Appendix B, and provide information required to update the identified public information or supplement the public information, as required, to address the topics identified in Section A

through Section G of the Evaluation Methodology. The use of publicly available information (e.g., the FSAP Report and/or the [ROSC Insurance Sector Technical Note](#)) is intended to lessen the burden on applicant jurisdictions by requiring the production of information that is readily available, while still addressing substantive areas of inquiry detailed in the Evaluation Methodology. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group's review at this stage will be focused on how the jurisdiction's laws, regulations, administrative practices and procedures, and regulatory authorities regulate the financial solvency of its domestic reinsurers in comparison to key principles underlying the U.S. financial solvency framework¹ and other factors set forth in the Evaluation Methodology.

- c. After reviewing the Evaluation Materials, the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group may request that the applicant jurisdiction submit supplemental information as necessary to determine whether the jurisdiction has sufficient authority to regulate the solvency of its reinsurers in an effective manner. The Working Group will address specific questions directly with the jurisdiction related to items detailed in the Evaluation Methodology that are not otherwise addressed in the Evaluation Materials.
- d. The NAIC will request that all responses from the jurisdiction being evaluated be provided in English. Any responses submitted with respect to a jurisdiction's laws and regulations should be provided by a person qualified in that jurisdiction to provide such analyses and, in the case of statutory analysis, qualified to provide such legal interpretations, to ensure that the jurisdiction is providing an accurate description.
- e. The NAIC does not intend to review confidential company-specific information in this process, and has focused the procedure on reviewing publicly available information. No confidential company-specific information shall be disclosed or disseminated during the course of the jurisdiction's evaluation unless specifically requested, subject to appropriate confidentiality safeguards addressed in a preliminary confidentiality and information-sharing agreement. If no such agreement is executed or the jurisdiction is unable to enter into such an agreement under its regulatory authority, the NAIC will not accept any confidential company-specific information.

3. NAIC Review of Evaluation Materials

- a. NAIC staff and/or outside consultants with the appropriate knowledge, experience and expertise will review the jurisdiction's Evaluation Materials.
- b. Expenses with respect to the evaluations will be absorbed within the NAIC budget. This will be periodically reviewed.
- c. Timeline for review. A project management approach will be developed with respect to the overall timeline applicable to each evaluation.
- d. Upon completing its review of the Evaluation Materials, the internal reviewer(s) will report initial findings to the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group, including any significant issues or concerns identified. This report will be included as part of the official documentation of the evaluation. Copies of the initial findings may also be made available to FIO and other relevant federal authorities subject to appropriate confidentiality and information-sharing agreements being in place.

¹ The U.S. financial solvency framework is understood to refer to the key elements provided in the NAIC Financial Regulation Standards and Accreditation Program. Appendix A and Appendix B are derived from this framework.

4. Discretionary On-site Review

- a. The NAIC may ~~request of ask~~ the jurisdiction under consideration for the opportunity to perform an on-site review of the jurisdiction's reinsurance supervisory system. Factors that the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will consider in determining whether an on-site review is appropriate include the completeness of the information provided by the jurisdiction under review, the general familiarity of the jurisdiction by the NAIC staff or other state regulators participating in the review based on prior conduct or dealings with the jurisdiction, and the results of other evaluations performed by other regulatory or supervisory organizations. If the review is performed, it will be coordinated through the NAIC, utilizing personnel with the appropriate knowledge, experience and expertise. Individual states may also request that representatives from their state be added to the review team.
- b. The review team will communicate with the supervisory authority in advance of the on-site visit to clearly identify the objectives, expectations and procedures with respect to the review, as well as any significant issues or concerns identified within the review of the Evaluation Materials. Information to be considered during the on-site review includes, but is not limited to, the following:
 - i. Interviews with supervisory authority personnel.
 - ii. Review of organizational and personnel practices.
 - iii. Any additional information beneficial to gaining an understanding of document and communication flows.
- c. Upon completing the on-site review, the reviewer(s) will report initial findings to the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group, including any significant issues or concerns identified. This report will be included as part of the official documentation of the evaluation.

5. Standard of Review

The evaluation is intended as an outcomes-based comparison to financial solvency regulation under the NAIC Accreditation Program, adherence to international supervisory standards and relevant international guidance for recognition of reinsurance supervision. The standard for qualification of a jurisdiction is that the NAIC must reasonably conclude that the jurisdiction's reinsurance supervisory system achieves a level of effectiveness in financial solvency regulation that is deemed acceptable for purposes of reinsurance collateral reduction, that the jurisdiction's demonstrated practices and procedures with respect to reinsurance supervision are consistent with its reinsurance supervisory system, and that the jurisdiction's laws and practices satisfy the criteria required of Qualified Jurisdictions as set forth in the Credit for Reinsurance Models.

6. Additional Information to be Considered as Part of Evaluation

The NAIC may also consider information from sources other than the jurisdiction under review. This information includes:

- a. Documents, reports and information from appropriate international, U.S. federal and U.S. state authorities.
- b. Public comments from interested parties.
- c. Rating agency information.
- d. Any other relevant information.

7. Preliminary Evaluation Report

- a. NAIC staff and/or outside consultants will prepare a Preliminary Evaluation Report for review by the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group. This preliminary report will be private and confidential (i.e., may only be reviewed by Working Group members, designated NAIC staff, consultants, the states, the FIO and other relevant federal authorities that specifically request to be kept apprised of this information, provided that such entities have entered into a preliminary confidentiality and information-sharing agreement with the foreign jurisdiction. Any outside consultants retained by the NAIC will be required to enter into a confidentiality and nondisclosure agreement.).
- b. The report will be prepared in a consistent style and format to be developed by NAIC staff. It will contain detailed advisory information and recommendations with respect to the evaluation of the jurisdiction's reinsurance supervisory system and the documented practices and procedures thereunder. The report will contain a recommendation as to whether the NAIC should recognize the jurisdiction as a Qualified Jurisdiction.
- c. All workpapers and reports, including supporting documentation and data, produced as part of the evaluation process are the property of the NAIC and shall be maintained at the NAIC Central Office. In the event that the NAIC shall come into possession of any confidential information, the information shall be held subject to a confidentiality and information-sharing agreement, which will outline the appropriate actions necessary to protect the confidentiality of such information.

8. Review of Preliminary Evaluation Report

- a. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group's review of the Preliminary Evaluation Report will be held in regulator-to-regulator session in accordance with the NAIC Policy Statement on Open Meetings.
- b. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will make a preliminary determination as to whether the jurisdiction under consideration satisfies the Standard of Review and is deemed acceptable to be included on the NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions. If the preliminary determination is that the jurisdiction should not be included on the NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions, the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will set forth its specific findings and identify those areas of concern with respect to this determination.
- c. The results of the Preliminary Evaluation Report will be immediately communicated in written form to the supervisory authority of the jurisdiction under review.

9. Opportunity to Respond to Preliminary Evaluation Report

- a. Upon receipt of the Preliminary Evaluation Report, the supervisory authority will have an opportunity to respond to the initial findings and determination. This is not intended to be a formal appeals process that would initiate U.S. state administrative due process requirements.
- b. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will consider any response, and will proceed to prepare its Final Evaluation Report. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will consider the Final Evaluation Report for approval in regulator-to-regulator session in accordance with the NAIC Policy Statement on Open Meetings. This report will be approved upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the members in attendance at this meeting.

- c. Upon approval of the Final Evaluation Report, the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will issue a public statement and a summary of its findings with respect to its determination. At this time, the Working Group will release the summary for public comment. The detailed report will be a confidential, regulator-only document. The report may be shared with any state indicating that it is considering relying on the NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions and has entered into a preliminary confidentiality and information-sharing agreement with the foreign jurisdiction.

10. NAIC Determination regarding List of Qualified Jurisdictions

- a. Once the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group has adopted its Final Evaluation Report, it will submit the summary of its findings and its recommendation to the Reinsurance (E) Task Force at an open meeting. Upon approval by the Reinsurance (E) Task Force, the summary and recommendation will be submitted to the Executive (EX) Committee and Plenary, as well as to the FIO, USTR and other relevant federal authorities for consultation purposes. Upon approval as a Qualified Jurisdiction by the Executive (EX) Committee and Plenary, the jurisdiction will be added to the NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions. The NAIC will maintain the List of Qualified Jurisdictions on its public website and in other appropriate NAIC publications.
- b. In the event that a jurisdiction is not approved as a Qualified Jurisdiction, the supervisory authority will be eligible for reapplication at the discretion of the NAIC.
- c. Upon final adoption of the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group's determination with respect to a jurisdiction, the Final Evaluation Report will be made available to individual U.S. state insurance regulators upon request and confirmation that the information contained therein will remain confidential.

11. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

- a. A Qualified Jurisdiction must agree to share information and cooperate on a confidential basis with the U.S. state insurance regulatory authority with respect to all certified reinsurers domiciled within that jurisdiction.
- b. The International Association of Insurance Supervisors (IAIS) Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding (MMoU) is the recommended method under which a Qualified Jurisdiction will agree to share information and cooperate with U.S. state insurance regulatory authorities. However, until such time as a state has been approved as a signatory to the MMoU by the IAIS, the such-state may rely on an MOU entered into by a "Lead State" designated by the NAIC. This Lead State will act as a conduit for information between the Qualified Jurisdiction and other states that have certified a reinsurer domiciled and licensed in that jurisdiction, and will share information with these states consistent with the terms governing the further sharing of information included in the applicable IAIS MMoU or bilateral MOU between the Lead State and the Qualified Jurisdiction and pursuant to the NAIC Master Information Sharing and Confidentiality Agreement. The jurisdiction must also confirm in writing that it is willing to permit this Lead State to act as the contact for purposes of obtaining information concerning its certified reinsurers, provided the Lead State share that information with the other states requesting the information consistent with the terms governing the further sharing of information included in the applicable IAIS MMoU or bilateral MOU between the Lead State and the Qualified Jurisdiction.
- c. If a Qualified Jurisdiction has not been approved by the IAIS for use of the MMoU, it must enter into an MOU with a Lead State. The MOU will also provide for appropriate confidentiality safeguards with respect to the information shared between the jurisdictions.

- d. The NAIC and the states will communicate and coordinate with the FIO, USTR and other relevant federal authorities as appropriate with respect to this process.

12. Process for Periodic Evaluation after Initial Approval

- a. The process for determining whether a non-U.S. jurisdiction is a Qualified Jurisdiction is ongoing and subject to periodic review. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will perform a yearly review of Qualified Jurisdictions to determine whether there have been any significant changes over the prior year that might affect their status as Qualified Jurisdictions. This yearly review shall follow such abbreviated process as may be determined by the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group to be appropriate.
- b. Qualified Jurisdictions must provide the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group with notice of any material change in the applicable reinsurance supervisory system that may affect the status of the Qualified Jurisdiction. A U.S. jurisdiction should also notify the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group if it receives notice of any material change in the applicable reinsurance supervisory system, or any adverse developments with respect to enforcement of final U.S. judgments, that may affect the status of the Qualified Jurisdiction. Upon receipt of any such notice, the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will consider whether it is necessary to re-evaluate the status of the Qualified Jurisdiction.
- c. Once approved, a Qualified Jurisdiction is subject to a re evaluation every five years. The Periodic Evaluation may follow a similar process as that set forth above, or such abbreviated process as the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group may deem appropriate.
- d.c. If the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group finds the jurisdiction to be out of compliance at any time with the requirements to be a Qualified Jurisdiction, the specific reasons will be documented in a report to the jurisdiction under review, and the status as a Qualified Jurisdiction may be placed on probation, suspended or revoked.
- e.d. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will monitor those jurisdictions that have been approved as Qualified Jurisdictions by individual states, but are not included on the NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions.

13. Review of Qualified Jurisdictions as Reciprocal Jurisdictions

- a. In undertaking the evaluation of a Qualified Jurisdiction as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction, the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group shall utilize such processes and procedures as outlined in the immediately preceding paragraphs 1 – 12 of Section III. Procedure for Evaluation of Non-U.S. Jurisdictions such as the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group deems is appropriate. Specifically, the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will use processes and procedures outlined in paragraph 1 (Initiation of Evaluation of the Reinsurance Supervisory System of an Individual Jurisdiction), paragraph 3 (NAIC Review of Evaluation Materials), paragraph 7 (Preliminary Evaluation Report), paragraph 8 (Review of Preliminary Evaluation Report), paragraph 9 (Opportunity to Respond to Preliminary Evaluation Report), paragraph 10 (NAIC Determination regarding List of Qualified Jurisdictions), paragraph 11 (Memorandum of Understanding) and paragraph 12 (Process for Evaluation after Initial Approval), as modified for use with Reciprocal Jurisdictions.
- b. A Qualified Jurisdiction may not be reviewed for inclusion on the NAIC List of Reciprocal Jurisdictions, unless it has undergone the Evaluation Methodology outlined in Section IV, and remains in good standing with the NAIC as a Qualified Jurisdiction. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group may, if it determines an extended review period to be appropriate after its initial approval of a new Qualified Jurisdiction, defer

consideration of that jurisdiction as a possible Reciprocal Jurisdiction until there has been sufficient United States experience with that jurisdiction and its Certified Reinsurers that the Working Group believes it is appropriate to progress from collateral reduction to collateral elimination. Nothing in this process requires a finding that a Qualified Jurisdiction meets the standards for recognition as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction, and the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group may base such recommendation on factors not specifically included in this process.

- c. 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 NAIC List of Reciprocal Jurisdictions. 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:
 - i. 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;
 - ii. 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;
 - iii. 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;
 - iv. 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
 - v. 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 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.

- d. In order to satisfy the requirements of subsection (c) above, the chief insurance supervisor of the Qualified Jurisdiction being evaluated as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction may provide the NAIC with a written letter confirming, as follows:

[Jurisdiction] is a Qualified Jurisdiction under the NAIC Credit for Reinsurance Model Law (#785) and Credit for Reinsurance Model Regulation (#786), and is currently in good standing on the NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions. As the lead insurance regulatory supervisor for [Jurisdiction], I hereby confirm to the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) and the chief insurance regulators of the 50 states, the District of Columbia and five U.S. territories the following:

- An insurer which has its head office or is domiciled in [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 [Jurisdiction] is received by United States ceding insurers. [Jurisdiction] 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 [Jurisdiction] or as a condition to allow the ceding insurer to recognize credit for such reinsurance.
- [Jurisdiction] recognizes the U.S. state regulatory approach to group supervision and group capital, and confirms that insurance groups that are domiciled or maintain their worldwide headquarters in jurisdictions 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 [Jurisdiction].
- [Jurisdiction] confirms 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 [Jurisdiction].
- [Jurisdiction] will annually provide to the states confirmation that applicable assuming insurers domiciled in [Jurisdiction] maintain minimum capital and surplus of no less than \$250,000,000, and maintain on an ongoing basis the required minimum solvency or capital ratio, as applicable.
- Finally, I confirm that [Jurisdiction] will immediately notify the NAIC upon any changes to the assurances provided in this letter.

- e. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will perform 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, and will prepare for the review by the Reinsurance Task Force a Summary of Findings and Determination recommending that the Qualified Jurisdiction be recognized as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction.

Upon approval by the Task Force, the Summary of Findings and Determination must be adopted by a vote of the NAIC Executive (EX) Committee and Plenary for inclusion on the List of Reciprocal Jurisdictions.

- f. 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.
- g. Except for Reciprocal Jurisdictions entitled to automatic recognition, a jurisdiction's status as a Reciprocal Jurisdiction may be placed on probation, suspended or revoked for good cause in the same manner as provided for Qualified Jurisdictions under paragraph 12. If cause is found to question the fitness of a Reciprocal Jurisdiction that is subject to an in-force covered agreement, or its compliance with applicable requirements of the covered agreement, the Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group would report any concerns to its parent Task Force for further discussion and communication with appropriate federal and/or international authorities.

IV. Evaluation Methodology

The Evaluation Methodology was developed to be consistent with the provisions of the NAIC Credit for Reinsurance Models. It is intended to provide an outcomes-based comparison to financial solvency regulation under the NAIC Accreditation Program, adherence to international supervisory standards and relevant international guidance for recognition of reinsurance supervision. Although the methodology includes a comparison of the jurisdiction's supervisory system to a number of key elements from the NAIC Accreditation Program, it is not intended as a prescriptive assessment under the NAIC Accreditation Program. Rather, the NAIC Accreditation Program simply provide the framework for the outcomes-based analysis. The NAIC will evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of the reinsurance supervisory system within the jurisdiction and consider the rights, benefits and the extent of reciprocal recognition afforded by the jurisdiction to reinsurers licensed and domiciled in the U.S. The determination of a Qualified Jurisdiction is based on the effectiveness of the entire reinsurance supervisory system within the jurisdiction.

The Evaluation Methodology consists of the following:

- Section A: Laws and Regulations
- Section B: Regulatory Practices and Procedures
- Section C: Jurisdiction's Requirements Applicable to U.S.-Domiciled Reinsurers
- Section D: Regulatory Cooperation and Information Sharing
- Section E: History of Performance of Domestic Reinsurers
- Section F: Enforcement of Final U.S. Judgments
- Section G: Solvent Schemes of Arrangement

This information will be the basis for the Final Evaluation Report and the determination of whether the jurisdiction will be included on the NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions.

Section A: Laws and Regulations

The NAIC will review publicly available information, as well as information provided by an applicant jurisdiction with respect to its laws and regulations, in an effort to evaluate whether the jurisdiction has sufficient authority to regulate the solvency of its reinsurers in an effective manner. This will include a review of elements believed to be basic building blocks for sound insurance/reinsurance regulation.² A jurisdiction's effectiveness under Section A may be demonstrated through law, regulation or established practice that implements the general authority granted to the jurisdiction, or any combination of laws, regulations or practices that meet the objective.

The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will initiate evaluation of a jurisdiction's regulatory system by gathering and undertaking a review of the most recent FSAP Report, ROSC and any other publicly available information regarding the laws, regulations, practices and procedures applicable to the reinsurance supervisory system. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will simultaneously invite each jurisdiction (or its designee) to provide information relative to Section A (and other sections, as relevant) to assist the NAIC in evaluating its laws and regulations. The NAIC will review this information in conjunction with Appendix A, which provides more detailed guidance with respect to elements the NAIC intends to consider on an outcomes basis in the evaluation under this section. Appendix A is not intended as a prescriptive checklist of requirements a jurisdiction must meet in order to be a Qualified Jurisdiction. Rather, it is provided in an effort to facilitate an outcomes-based comparison to financial solvency regulation under the NAIC Accreditation Program. An applicant jurisdiction is requested to address the following information, which the NAIC will consider, at a minimum, in determining whether the outcomes achieved by the jurisdiction's laws and regulations meet an acceptable level of effectiveness for the jurisdiction to be included on the NAIC List of Qualified Jurisdictions:

1. Confirmation of the jurisdiction's most recent FSAP Report, including relevant updates with respect to descriptions or elements of the FSAP Report in which changes have occurred since the assessment or where information might otherwise be outdated.
2. Confirmation of the jurisdiction's ROSC, including relevant updates with respect to descriptions or elements of the ROSC in which changes have occurred since the report was completed or where information might otherwise be outdated.
3. If materials responsive to the topics under review have been provided in response to information exchanges between the jurisdiction under review and the NAIC, such prior responses may be cross-referenced provided updates are submitted, if required to address changes in laws or procedures.
4. Any other information, descriptions or responses the jurisdiction believes would be beneficial to the NAIC's evaluation process in order to address, on an outcomes basis, the key elements described within Appendix A.

The NAIC will review the information provided by the applicant jurisdiction and determine whether it is adequate to reasonably conclude whether the jurisdiction has sufficient authority to regulate the solvency of its reinsurers in an effective manner. After reviewing the initial submission, the NAIC may request that the applicant jurisdiction submit supplemental information as necessary in order to make this determination. An applicant jurisdiction is strongly encouraged to provide thorough, detailed and current information in its initial submission in order to

² The basic considerations under this section are derived from Model #786, Section 8C(2), which include: (a) the framework under which the assuming reinsurer is regulated; (b) the structure and authority of the jurisdiction's reinsurance supervisory authority with regard to solvency regulation requirements and financial surveillance; (c) the substance of financial and operating standards for reinsurers domiciled in the jurisdiction; and (d) the form and substance of financial reports required to be filed or made publicly available by reinsurers domiciled in the jurisdiction and the accounting principles used.

minimize the number and extent of supplemental information requests from the NAIC with respect to Section A of this Evaluation Methodology. The NAIC will provide a complete description in the Final Evaluation Report of the information provided in the Evaluation Materials, and any updates or other information that have been provided by the applicant jurisdiction.

Section B: Regulatory Practices and Procedures

Section B is intended to facilitate an evaluation of whether the jurisdiction effectively employs baseline regulatory practices and procedures to supplement and support enforcement of the jurisdiction's financial solvency laws and regulations described in Section A. This evaluation methodology recognizes that variation may exist in practices and procedures across jurisdictions due to the unique situations each jurisdiction faces. Jurisdictions differ with respect to staff and technology resources that are available, as well as the characteristics of the domestic industry regulated. A determination of effectiveness may be achieved using various financial solvency oversight practices and procedures. This evaluation is not intended to be prescriptive in nature.

The NAIC will utilize the information provided by the jurisdiction as outlined under Section A in completing this section of the evaluation. The NAIC will review this information in conjunction with Appendix B, which provides more detailed guidance with respect to elements the NAIC intends to consider on an outcomes basis in the evaluation under this section. Appendix B is not intended as a prescriptive checklist of requirements a jurisdiction must meet in order to be a Qualified Jurisdiction. Rather, it is provided in an effort to facilitate an outcomes-based comparison to financial solvency regulation under the NAIC Accreditation Program. An applicant jurisdiction should also provide any other information, descriptions or responses the jurisdiction believes would be beneficial to the NAIC's evaluation process in order to address, on an outcomes basis, the key elements described within Appendix B.

Section C: Jurisdiction's Requirements Applicable to U.S. Domiciled Reinsurers

The jurisdiction is requested to describe and explain the rights, benefits and the extent of reciprocal recognition afforded by the non-U.S. supervisory authority to reinsurers licensed and domiciled in the U.S.

Section D: Regulatory Cooperation and Information-Sharing

The Credit for Reinsurance Models require the supervisory authority to share information and cooperate with the U.S. state insurance regulators with respect to all certified reinsurers domiciled within their jurisdiction. The jurisdiction is requested to provide an explanation of the supervisory authority's ability to cooperate, share information and enter into an MOU with U.S. state insurance regulators and confirm that they are willing to enter into an MOU. This should include information with respect to any existing MOU with U.S. state and/or federal authorities that pertain to reinsurance. Both the jurisdiction and the states may rely on the IAIS MMou to satisfy this requirement, and any states that have not yet been approved by the IAIS as a signatory to the MMou may rely on an MOU entered into by a Lead State with the jurisdiction until such time that the state has been approved as a signatory to the IAIS MMou. The NAIC and the states will communicate and coordinate with the FIO, USTR and other relevant federal authorities as appropriate with respect to this process.

Section E: History of Performance of Domestic Reinsurers

The jurisdiction is requested to provide a general description with respect to the historical performance of reinsurers domiciled in the jurisdiction. The NAIC does not intend to review confidential company-specific information under this section. Rather, it is intended that any information provided would be publicly available, unless specifically addressed with the jurisdiction under review. This discussion should address, at a minimum, the following information:

- a. Number of reinsurers domiciled in the jurisdiction, and a list of any reinsurers domiciled in the jurisdiction that have and maintain, on an ongoing basis, minimum capital and surplus, or its equivalent, of no less than \$250,000,000.
- b. Up to a 10-year history of any regulatory actions taken against specific reinsurers.
- c. Up to a 10-year history listing any reinsurers that have gone through insolvency proceedings, including the size of each insolvency and a description of the related outcomes (e.g., reinsurer rehabilitated or liquidated, payout percentage of claims to priority classes, payout percentage of claims to domestic and foreign claimants).
- d. Up to a 10-year history of any significant industry-wide fluctuations in capital or profitability with respect to domestic reinsurers.

Drafting Note: The NAIC will determine the appropriate time period for review on a case-by-case basis with respect to this information.

Section F: Enforcement of Final U.S. Judgments

The NAIC has previously collected information from a number of jurisdictions with respect to enforcement of final U.S. judgments. The jurisdiction is also requested to provide a current description or explanation of any restrictions with respect to the enforcement of final foreign judgments in the jurisdiction. Based on the foregoing information, the NAIC will make an assessment of the effectiveness of the ability to enforce final U.S. judgments in the jurisdiction. This will include a review of the status, interpretations, application and enforcement of various treaties, conventions and international agreements with respect to final judgments, arbitration and choice of law. The Qualified Jurisdiction Working Group will monitor the enforcement of final U.S. judgments and the Qualified Jurisdiction is requested to notify the NAIC of any developments in this area.

Section G: Solvent Schemes of Arrangement

The jurisdiction is requested to provide a description of any legal framework that allows reinsurers domiciled in the jurisdiction to propose or participate in any solvent scheme of arrangement or similar procedure. In addition, the jurisdiction is requested to provide a description of any solvent scheme of arrangement or similar procedure that a domestic reinsurer has proposed or participated in and the outcome of such procedure.

V. Appendices: Specific Guidance with Respect to Section A and Section B

It is important to note that Part IV, Section A: Laws and Regulations, and Part IV, Section B: Regulatory Practices and Procedures, are derived from the NAIC Financial Regulation Standards and Accreditation Program, which is intended to establish and maintain standards to promote sound insurance company financial solvency regulation among the U.S. states. As such, the NAIC Accreditation Program requires the states to employ laws, regulations and administrative policies and procedures substantially similar to the NAIC accreditation standards in order to be considered an accredited state.

However, it is not the intent of the Evaluation Methodology to require applicant jurisdictions to meet the standards required by the NAIC for accreditation. Instead, Section A and Section B (and their corresponding appendices) are intended to provide a framework to facilitate an outcomes-based evaluation by the NAIC and state insurance regulators of the effectiveness of the jurisdiction's supervisory authority. This framework consists of a description of the jurisdiction's laws, regulations, practices and procedures applicable to the supervision of its domestic reinsurers. The amount of detail provided within these appendices should not be interpreted as specific requirements that must be met by the applicant jurisdiction. Rather, the information is intended to provide direction to the applicant jurisdiction in an effort to facilitate a complete response and increase the efficiency and timeliness of the evaluation process.

Appendix A: Laws and Regulations

1. Examination Authority

Does the jurisdiction have the authority to examine its domestic reinsurers? This description should address the following:

- a. Frequency and timing of examinations and reports.
- b. Guidelines for examination.
- c. Whether the jurisdiction has the authority to examine reinsurers whenever it is deemed necessary.
- d. Whether the jurisdiction has the authority to have complete access to the reinsurer's books and records and, if necessary, the records of any affiliated company.
- e. Whether the jurisdiction has the authority to examine officers, employees and agents of the reinsurer when necessary with respect to transactions directly or indirectly related to the reinsurer under examination.
- f. Whether the jurisdiction has the authority to share confidential information with U.S. state insurance regulatory authorities, provided that the recipients are required, under their law, to maintain its confidentiality.

2. Capital and Surplus Requirement

Does the jurisdiction have the authority to require domestic reinsurers to maintain a minimum level of capital and surplus to transact business? This description should address the following:

- a. Whether the jurisdiction has the authority to require reinsurers to maintain minimum capital and surplus, including a description of such minimum amounts.
- b. Whether the jurisdiction has the authority to require additional capital and surplus based on the type, volume and nature of reinsurance business transacted.
- c. Capital requirements for reinsurers, including reports and a description of any specific levels of regulatory intervention.

3. Accounting Practices and Procedures

Does the jurisdiction have the authority to require domestic reinsurers to file appropriate financial statements and other financial information? This description should address the following:

- a. Description of the accounting and reporting practices and procedures.
- b. Description of any standard financial statement blank/reporting template, including description of content/disclosure requirements and corresponding instructions.

4. Corrective Action

Does the jurisdiction have the authority to order a reinsurer to take corrective action or cease and desist certain practices that, if not corrected or terminated, could place the reinsurer in a hazardous financial condition? This description should address the following:

- a. Identification of specific standards which may be considered to determine whether the continued operation of the reinsurer might be hazardous to the general public.
- b. Whether the jurisdiction has the authority to issue an order requiring the reinsurer to take corrective action when it has been determined to be in hazardous financial condition.

5. Regulation and Valuation of Investments

What authority does the jurisdiction have with respect to regulation and valuation of investments? This description should address the following:

- a. Whether the jurisdiction has the authority to require a diversified investment portfolio for all domestic reinsurers as to type, issue and liquidity.
- b. Whether the jurisdiction has the authority to establish acceptable practices and procedures under which investments owned by reinsurers must be valued, including standards under which reinsurers are required to value securities/investments.

6. Holding Company Systems

Does the jurisdiction have laws or regulations with respect to supervision of the group holding company systems of reinsurers? This description should address the following:

- a. Whether the jurisdiction has access to information via the parent or other regulated group entities about activities or transactions within the group involving other regulated or non-regulated entities that could have a material impact on the operations of the reinsurer.
- b. Whether the jurisdiction has access to consolidated financial information of a reinsurer's ultimate controlling person.
- c. Whether the jurisdiction has the authority to review integrity and competency of management.
- d. Whether the jurisdiction has approval and intervention powers for material transactions and events involving reinsurers.
- e. Whether the jurisdiction has authority to monitor, or has prior approval authority over:
 - i. Change in control of domestic reinsurers.
 - ii. Dividends and other distributions to shareholders of the reinsurer.
 - iii. Material transactions with affiliates.

7. Risk Management

Does the jurisdiction have the authority to require its domestic reinsurers to maintain an effective risk-management function and practices? This description should address the following:

- a. Whether the jurisdiction has Own Risk and Solvency Assessment (ORSA) requirements and reporting.
- b. Any requirements regarding the maximum net amount of risk to be retained by a reinsurer for an individual risk based on the reinsurer's capital and surplus.
- c. Whether the jurisdiction has authority to monitor enterprise risk, including any activity, circumstance, event (or series of events) involving one or more affiliates of a reinsurer that, if not remedied promptly, is likely to have a material adverse effect on the financial condition or liquidity of the reinsurer or its insurance holding company system as a whole.
- d. Whether the jurisdiction has corporate governance requirements for reinsurers.

8. Liabilities and Reserves

Does the jurisdiction have standards for the establishment of liabilities and reserves (technical provisions) resulting from reinsurance contracts? This description should address the following:

- a. Liabilities incurred under reinsurance contracts for policy reserves, unearned premium, claims and losses unpaid, and incurred but not reported (IBNR) claims (including whether discounting is allowed for reserve calculation/reporting).
- b. Liabilities related to catastrophic occurrences.
- c. Whether the jurisdiction requires an opinion on reserves and loss and loss adjustment expense reserves by a qualified actuary or specialist for all domestic reinsurers, and the frequency of such reports.

9. Reinsurance Ceded

What are the jurisdiction's requirements with respect to the financial statement credit allowed for reinsurance retroceded by its domestic reinsurers? This description should address the following:

- a. Credit for reinsurance requirements applicable to reinsurance retroceded to domestic and non-domestic reinsurers.
- b. Collateral requirements applicable to reinsurance contracts.
- c. Whether the jurisdiction requires a reinsurance agreement to provide for insurance risk transfer (i.e., transfer of both underwriting and timing risk).
- d. Requirements applicable to special purpose reinsurance vehicles and insurance securitizations.
- e. Affiliated reinsurance transactions and concentration risk.
- f. Disclosure requirements specific to reinsurance transactions, agreements and counterparties, if such information is not provided under another item.

10. Independent Audits

Does the jurisdiction require annual audits of domestic reinsurers by independent certified public accountants or similar accounting/auditing professional recognized in the applicant jurisdiction? This description should address the following:

- a. Requirements for the filing of audited financial statements prepared in conformity with accounting practices prescribed or permitted by the supervisory authority.
- b. Contents of annual audited financial reports.
- c. Requirements for selection of auditor.
- d. Allowance of audited consolidated or combined financial statements.
- e. Notification of material misstatements of financial condition.
- f. Supervisor's access to auditor's workpapers.
- g. Audit committee requirements.
- h. Requirements for reporting of internal control-related matters.

11. Receivership

Does the jurisdiction have a receivership scheme for the administration of reinsurers found to be insolvent? This should include a description of any liquidation priority afforded to policyholders and the liquidation priority of reinsurance obligations to domestic and non-domestic ceding insurers in the context of an insolvency proceeding of a reinsurer.

12. Filings with Supervisory Authority

Does the jurisdiction require the filing of annual and interim financial statements with the supervisory authority? This description should address the following:

- a. The use of standardized financial reporting in the financial statements, and the frequency of relevant updates.
- b. The use of supplemental data to address concerns with specific companies or issues.
- c. Filing format (e.g., electronic data capture).
- d. The extent to which financial reports and information are public records.

13. Reinsurance Intermediaries

Does the jurisdiction have a regulatory framework for the regulation of reinsurance intermediaries?

14. Other Regulatory Requirements with respect to Reinsurers

Any other information necessary to adequately describe the effectiveness of the jurisdiction's laws and regulations with respect to its reinsurance supervisory system.

Appendix B: Regulatory Practices and Procedures

1. Financial Analysis

What are the jurisdiction's practices and procedures with respect to the financial analysis of its domestic reinsurers? Such description should address the following:

a. Qualified Staff and Resources

The resources employed to effectively review the financial condition of all domestic reinsurers, including a description of the educational and experience requirements for staff responsible for financial analysis.

b. Communication of Relevant Information to/from Financial Analysis Staff

The process under which relevant information and data received by the supervisory authority are provided to the financial analysis staff and the process under which the findings of the financial analysis staff are communicated to the appropriate person(s).

c. Supervisory Review

How the jurisdiction's internal financial analysis process provides for supervisory review and comment.

d. Priority-Based Analysis

How the jurisdiction's financial analysis procedures are prioritized in order to ensure that potential problem reinsurers are reviewed promptly.

e. Depth of Review

How the jurisdiction's financial analysis procedures ensure that domestic reinsurers receive an appropriate level or depth of review commensurate with their financial strength and position.

f. Analysis Procedures

How the jurisdiction has documented its financial analysis procedures and/or guidelines to provide for consistency and continuity in the process and to ensure that appropriate analysis procedures are being performed on each domestic reinsurer.

g. Reporting of Material Adverse Findings

The process for reporting material adverse indications, including the determination and implementation of appropriate regulatory action.

h. Early Warning System/Stress Testing

Whether the jurisdiction has an early warning system and/or stress testing methodology that is utilized with respect to its domestic reinsurers.

2. Financial Examinations

What are the jurisdiction's practices and procedures with respect to the financial examinations of its domestic reinsurers? Such description should address the following:

a. Qualified Staff and Resources

The resources employed to effectively examine all domestic reinsurers. This should include whether the jurisdiction prioritizes examination scheduling and resource allocation commensurate with the financial strength and position of each reinsurer, and a description of the educational and experience requirements for staff responsible for financial examinations.

b. Communication of Relevant Information to/from Examination Staff

The process under which relevant information and data received by the supervisory authority are provided to the examination staff and the process under which the findings of the examination staff are communicated to the appropriate person(s).

c. Use of Specialists

Whether the supervisory authority's examination staff includes specialists with appropriate training and/or experience or whether the supervisory authority otherwise has available qualified specialists that will permit the supervisory authority to effectively examine any reinsurer.

d. Supervisory Review

Whether the supervisory authority's procedures for examinations provide for supervisory review.

e. Examination Guidelines and Procedures

Description of the policies and procedures the supervisory authority employs for the conduct of examinations, including whether variations in methods and scope are commensurate with the financial strength and position of the reinsurer.

f. Risk-Focused Examinations

Does the supervisory authority perform and document risk-focused examinations and, if so, what guidance is utilized in conducting the examinations? Are variations in method and scope commensurate with the financial strength and position of the reinsurer?

g. Scheduling of Examinations

Whether the supervisory authority's procedures provide for the periodic examination of all domestic reinsurers, including how the system prioritizes reinsurers that exhibit adverse financial trends or otherwise demonstrate a need for examination.

h. Examination Reports

Description of the format in which the supervisory authority's reports of examinations are prepared, and how the reports are shared with other jurisdictions under information-sharing agreements.

i. Action on Material Adverse Findings

What are the jurisdiction's procedures regarding supervisory action in response to the reporting of any material adverse findings.

3. Information Sharing

Does the jurisdiction have a process for the sharing of otherwise confidential documents, materials, information, administrative or judicial orders, or other actions with U.S. state regulatory officials, provided that the recipients are required, under their law, to maintain its confidentiality?

4. Procedures for Troubled Reinsurers

What procedures does the jurisdiction follow with respect to troubled reinsurers?

5. Organization, Licensing and Change of Control of Reinsurers

What processes does the supervisory authority use to identify unlicensed or fraudulent activities? The description should address the following:

- a. Licensing Procedure
Whether the supervisory authority has documented licensing procedures that include a review and/or analysis of key pieces of information included in a primary licensure application.
- b. Staff and Resources
The educational and experience requirements for staff responsible for evaluating company licensing.
- c. Change in Control of a Domestic Reinsurer
Procedures for the review of key pieces of information included in filings with respect to a change in control of a domestic reinsurer.