



Draft date: 11/2/22

*2022 Fall National Meeting  
Tampa, Florida*

**EXAMINATION OVERSIGHT (E) TASK FORCE**

Wednesday, December 14, 2022

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. ET

JW Marriott—HB Plant Ballroom E & F—Level 2

**ROLL CALL**

Indiana, Chair	Idaho	Montana	South Dakota
District of Columbia, Vice Chair	Iowa	Nebraska	Tennessee
Alabama	Kansas	New Hampshire	Texas
Alaska	Kentucky	New Jersey	Virginia
Arkansas	Louisiana	North Dakota	Washington
California	Massachusetts	Ohio	Wisconsin
Colorado	Michigan	Oklahoma	Wyoming
Connecticut	Minnesota	Rhode Island	
Delaware	Missouri	South Carolina	

NAIC Support Staff: Bailey Henning

**AGENDA**

1. Consider Adoption of its Sept. 30 and Summer National Meeting Minutes Attachment One  
—*Commissioner Amy L. Beard (IN)*
2. Consider Adoption of its Working Group Reports Attachment Two  
—*Commissioner Amy L. Beard (IN)*
  - A. Electronic Workpaper (E) Working Group—*Susan Bernard (CA)*
  - B. Financial Analysis Solvency Tools (E) Working Group—*Judy Weaver (MI)*
  - C. Financial Examiners Coordination (E) Working Group  
—*Cindy Andersen (IL)*
  - D. Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group—*Susan Bernard (CA)*
  - E. Information Technology (IT) Examination (E) Working Group  
—*Jerry Ehlers (IN)*
3. Discuss Any Other Matters Brought Before the Task Force  
—*Commissioner Amy L. Beard (IN)*
4. Adjournment

Draft: 10/6/22

Examination Oversight (E) Task Force  
E-Vote  
September 30, 2022

The Examination Oversight (E) Task Force conducted an e-vote that concluded Sept. 30, 2022. The following Task Force members participated: Amy L. Beard represented by Roy Eft (IN); Karima M. Woods represented by N. Kevin Brown (DC); Mark Fowler represented by Sheila Travis (AL); Ricardo Lara represented by Susan Bernard (CA); Andrew N. Mais represented by William Arfanis (CT); Trinidad Navarro represented by Rylynn Brown (DE); Doug Ommen represented by Daniel Mathis (IA); Dean L. Cameron represented by Jessie Adamson (ID); Vicki Schmidt represented by Levi Nwasoria (KS); Sharon P. Clark (KY); James J. Donelon represented by Stewart Guerin (LA); Gary D. Anderson represented by John Turchi (MA); Anita G. Fox represented by Judy Weaver (MI); Grace Arnold represented by Kathleen Orth (MN); Chlora Lindley-Myers represented by Shannon Schmoeger (MO); Jon Godfread represented by Matt Fischer (ND); Chris Nicolopoulos represented by Pat Gosselin (NH); Judith L. French represented by Dwight Radel (OH); Glen Mulready represented by Eli Snowbarger (OK); Cassie Brown represented by Shawn Frederick (TX); Mike Kreidler represented by John Jacobson (WA); Nathan Houdek represented by Amy Malm (WI); and Jeff Rude (WY).

1. Adopted its 2023 Proposed Charges

The Task Force conducted an e-vote to consider adoption of its 2023 proposed charges (*see NAIC Proceedings – Fall 2022, Financial Condition (E) Committee, Attachment XX*).

The Information Technology (IT) Examination (E) Working Group revised its existing charges to encourage coordination with the Cybersecurity (H) Working Group to monitor cybersecurity trends and develop guidance as necessary.

The motion passed unanimously.

Having no further business, the Examination Oversight (E) Task Force adjourned.

SharePoint/NAIC Support Staff Hub/Member Meetings/E Cmte/EOTF/1 – EOTF E-Vote Minutes 9-30-22

## Draft Pending Adoption

Draft: 8/24/22

Examination Oversight (E) Task Force  
Portland, Oregon  
August 11, 2022

The Examination Oversight (E) Task Force met in Portland, OR, Aug. 11, 2022. The following Task Force members participated: Amy L. Beard, Chair, represented by Roy Eft (IN); Karima M. Woods, Vice Chair, represented by Rebecca Davis (DC); Mark Fowler represented by Sheila Travis (AL); Lori K. Wing-Heier represented by David Pfifer (AK); Alan McClain represented by Leo Liu (AR); Ricardo Lara represented by Susan Bernard (CA); Michael Conway represented by Rolf Kaumann (CO); Andrew N. Mais represented by William Arfanis (CT); Trinidad Navarro represented by Rylynn Brown (DE); Doug Ommen represented by Daniel Mathis (IA); Dean L. Cameron represented by Jessie Adamson (ID); Gary D. Anderson represented by John Turchi (MA); Anita G. Fox represented by Judy Weaver (MI); Chlora Lindley-Myers represented by Debbie Doggett (MO); Troy Downing represented by Kari Leonard (MT); Jon Godfread represented by Matt Fischer (ND); Eric Dunning represented by Lindsay Crawford (NE); Marlene Caride represented by John Sirovetz (NJ); Judith L. French represented by Dwight Radel (OH); Glen Mulready represented by Diane Carter (OK); Larry D. Deiter represented by Johanna Nickelson (SD); Carter Lawrence represented by Joy Little (TN); Cassie Brown represented by Jamie Walker (TX); Scott A. White represented by Greg Chew and David Smith (VA); Nathan Houdek represented by Amy Malm (WI); and Jeff Rude represented by Doug Melvin (WY).

### 1. Adopted its 2021 Fall National Meeting Minutes

Ms. Bernard made a motion, seconded by Mr. Radel, to adopt the Task Force's Dec. 1, 2022, minutes (*see NAIC Proceedings – Fall 2022, Examination Oversight (E) Task Force*). The motion passed unanimously.

### 2. Adopted the Reports of its Working Groups

#### A. Financial Examiners Coordination (E) Working Group

Mr. Eft provided the report of the Financial Examiners Coordination (E) Working Group. He stated that the Working Group met April 14 in regulator-to-regulator session, pursuant to paragraph 3 of the NAIC Policy Statement on Open Meetings, to continue work on its goals.

#### B. Financial Analysis Solvency Tools (E) Working Group

Mr. Eft provided the report of the Financial Analysis Solvency Tools (E) Working Group. He stated that the Working Group met Aug. 1 and June 13, in regulator-to-regulator session, pursuant to paragraph 6 (consultations with NAIC staff members related to NAIC technical guidance) of the NAIC Policy Statement on Open Meetings, to continue work on its goals.

#### C. Electronic Workpaper (E) Working Group

Ms. Bernard provided the report of the Electronic Workpaper (E) Working Group. She stated that the Working Group met July 20, May 23, April 18, Feb. 24, and Jan. 24 in regulator-to-regulator session, pursuant to paragraph 4 (internal or administrative matters of the NAIC or any NAIC member) of the NAIC Policy Statement on Open Meetings. She said that the Working Group continues its work on the TeamMate+ Transition project.

Ms. Bernard provided an overview of the status of the TeamMate+ Transition project. She stated that state insurance regulators have completed sandbox testing and that pilot testing is underway. Results of this testing

## Draft Pending Adoption

will be discussed with the vendor, and configuration updates will be made, as appropriate. She stated that legal representatives from the NAIC and the vendor are negotiating special terms for software licensing and cloud hosting, with an expectation that the contract will be finalized by the end of September. Ms. Bernard stated that training content is being developed, and she expects that specific training will begin rolling out later this early and early next year to help state insurance regulators prepare for the transition. Finally, Ms. Bernard stated that state-specific databases are expected to be available by January 2023 and that those databases may be installed in TeamCloud as states sign and execute the NAIC rider incorporating the finalized vendor contract.

### D. Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group

Ms. Bernard provided the report of the Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group. She stated that the Technical Group met April 18 discuss its 2022 project list, which includes possible updates to: 1) Exhibit G – Fraud Considerations; and 2) the Capital and Surplus Examination Repository.

Ms. Bernard gave an overview of work being led by other NAIC groups that are expected to eventually be referred to the Technical Group to consider. These include: 1) a referral from the Financial Analysis (E) Working Group requesting the Technical Group to consider additional guidance related to terrorism insurance, uncollected premiums and agent balances, and monitoring startup insurers; 2) a future referral from the Group Solvency Issues (E) Working Group related to its work to incorporate guidance for examining internationally active insurance groups (IAIGs); 3) a future referral from the Climate and Resiliency (EX) Task Force to incorporate guidance to ensure climate-related risks are considered as part of a financial condition exam; and 4) a future referral from the Risk-Focused Surveillance (E) Working Group to incorporate guidance to assist examiners in evaluating affiliated service agreements.

### E. Information Technology (IT) Examination (E) Working Group

Mr. Ehlers provided the report of the IT Examination (E) Working Group. He stated that the Working Group met May 2 to discuss its 2022 project list, which includes the following topics: 1) possible guidance for monitoring small to mid-size companies that heavily outsource IT functions; and 2) possible guidance for addressing prospective IT risks. Mr. Ehlers stated that a drafting group has been formed to develop guidance related to these topics and that proposed revisions will be brought before the Working Group for consideration later this year.

Ms. Bernard made a motion, seconded by Mr. Kaumann, to adopt reports of the Electronic Workpaper (E) Working Group, the Financial Analysis Solvency Tools (E) Working Group, the Financial Examiners Coordination (E) Working Group, the Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group (Attachment One), and the IT Examination (E) Working Group (Attachment Two). The motion passed unanimously.

Having no further business, the Examination Oversight (E) Task Force adjourned.

SharePoint/NAIC Support Staff Hub/Member Meetings/E CMTE/EOTF/EOTF Summer NM Minutes Draft.docx



## NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS

### *Virtual Meeting*

#### **Financial Analysis Solvency Tools (E) Working Group**

December 6, 2022

#### **Summary Report**

The Financial Analysis Solvency Tools (E) Working Group met December 6, 2022. During this meeting, the Working Group:

1. Adopted its October 20 meeting minutes, which included the following action:
  - A. Adopted revisions to various sections of the *Financial Analysis Handbook* (Handbook) related to the International Association of Insurance Supervisors' Common Framework for the Supervision of Internationally Active Insurance Groups.
  - B. Exposed revisions to the Handbook in response to referrals and recommendations received from the Financial Analysis (E) Working Group, the Ad Hoc (E/F) Subgroup, the Risk-Focused Surveillance (E) Working Group, and NAIC staff.
  - C. Received a referral from the Climate and Resiliency (EX) Task Force to consider enhancements to the Handbook on climate solvency-related topics.
2. Adopted revisions of the Handbook related to various topics, including terrorism risk, agents balances and premium trust accounts, monitoring startup insurers, redomestication communication, intercompany pooling arrangements, Form F and Corporate Governance Annual Disclosure, investments involving related parties, branded risk assessment, health plan star ratings, Actuarial Guideline 53, prioritization framework for priority 4 insurers, and quarterly quantitative assessment of non-troubled insurers.

Draft: 11/22/22

Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group  
E-Vote  
November 15, 2022

The Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group of the Examination Oversight (E) Task Force conducted an e-vote that concluded Nov. 15, 2022. The following Technical Group members participated: John Litweiler, Vice Chair (WI); William Arfanis (CT); N. Kevin Brown (DC); Cindy Andersen (IL); Shannon Schmoeger (MO); Colin Wilkins (NH); Nancy Lee Chice (NJ); Tracy Snow (OH); Eli Snowbarger (OK); Matt Milford (PA); and John Jacobson (WA).

1. Adopted its Proposed Revisions to the Financial Condition Examiners Handbook

The Technical Group conducted an e-vote to consider adoption of the following revisions to the *Financial Condition Examiners Handbook*: 1) Business Continuity; 2) Examination Repository – Underwriting; 3) Examination Repository – Capital and Surplus; 4) Exhibit E – Audit Review Procedures; 5) Examination Repository – Investments; and 6) Examination Repository - Reserves/Claims Handling (Life) (Attachment 1). The motion passed unanimously.

Having no further business, the Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group adjourned.

SharePoint/NAIC Support Staff Hub/Member Meetings/E Cmte/2022-3-Fall/EOTF/FEHTG 11-15-22 E-Vote Minutes

Draft: 10/31/2022

Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group  
Virtual Meeting  
October 5, 2022

The Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group of the Examination Oversight (E) Task Force met Oct. 5, 2022. The following Technical Group members participated: Susan Bernard, Chair (CA); John Litweiler, Vice Chair (WI); Blase Abreo (AL); William Arfanis (CT); N. Kevin Brown (DC); Cindy Anderson (IL); Shannon Schmoeger (MO); Andrea Johnson (NE); Doug Bartlett (NH); Nancy Lee Chice (NJ); Tracy Snow (OH); Eli Snowbarger (OK); Matt Milford (PA); and John Jacobson (WA).

1. Adopted Handbook Guidance

Litweiler introduced guidance related to incorporating elements from the International Association of Insurance Supervisors' (IAIS') Common Framework for the Supervision of Internationally Active Insurance Groups (ComFrame) into the *Financial Condition Examiners Handbook* (Handbook). He noted that the Group Solvency Issues (E) Working Group, which is responsible for monitoring the IAIS' group-related activities, led the project to ensure consistency between financial analysis, financial examination, and Own Risk and Solvency Assessment (ORSA)-related processes. The Working Group previously exposed the revisions for a public comment period and approved them at the Summer National Meeting.

Arfanis made a motion, seconded by Bartlett, to adopt the guidance related to ComFrame. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Exposed Handbook Guidance

a. Financial Analysis (E) Working Group Referral

Litweiler said that the first set of revisions to consider for exposure relate to a referral received from the Financial Analysis (E) Working Group. The referral enhances regulatory guidance in three separate areas: 1) terrorism reinsurance; 2) uncollected premium and agent balances; and 3) the monitoring of startup insurers.

Elise Klebba (NAIC) noted that the first set of changes made were related to terrorism reinsurance guidance. She said that this guidance was recently removed from the Solvency Monitoring Risk Alert as it is no longer considered urgent or emerging. As such, the guidance from the risk alert was included within the Handbook. Klebba mentioned this guidance includes the background of the federal Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) and refers to procedures within the Capital and Surplus repository to help examiners consider the impact of terrorism exposures on an insurer's solvency. She stated that there was also an addition to an existing control within the Underwriting Repository, which suggests that an examiner track exposure limits at a more granular level for certain exposures, such as terrorism.

Klebba said the next set of changes were related to uncollected premiums and agent balances. This originated with troubled companies that had a large amount of affiliated agent balances that were mostly in premium trust accounts, which were subject to misappropriation. She noted that a control, two tests of controls, and three tests of details were added to the Underwriting Repository to help address this risk.

The last set of updates made in response to the Financial Analysis (E) Working Group referral related to monitoring of startup insurers. Klebba mentioned that there is an emerging trend of startup insurers that grow quickly, but

they also have high underwriting and net losses. While these losses are offset by parent contributions, the concern is how long the startup insurer will take to become profitable and whether the parent company will be able to sustain capital contributions until that point. She said that a control, test of control, and test of details were added to the Capital and Surplus Repository to help examiners evaluate the insurer's plan and projections, focusing on how long it will take them to become profitable.

b. Capital Model Review Procedures

Litweiler introduced the next set of proposed revisions related to Capital Model Review Procedures. He mentioned that NAIC staff, alongside a small group of regulators that had previously used the updated ORSA guidance, developed revisions to the Capital and Surplus Repository to integrate the procedures more directly into the seven-phase exam process.

Bailey Henning (NAIC) said the proposed risks included in the repository help to link to the additional ORSA procedures that were added into the TeamStores at the end of 2020. She noted that the revisions were made in the Capital and Surplus Repository specifically to connect them to the Section 3 review of the ORSA. She said that the first new risk and associated procedures relate to the capital model or the metrics that the company is using and whether those are appropriate given the company's risk profile. The second new risk is focused on how the model is being used by the insurer to influence decision making (i.e., using the model outputs to set their risk appetite, risk tolerances, and limits). Henning noted that both risks are focused on a company with a capital model and how they are using and validating that model. She also mentioned a disclaimer along with the added risks to note that these procedures are intended for insurers with a more complex modeling framework (i.e., an internal capital model or if the insurer is relying heavily on a capital model) and will not necessarily be applicable for every exam. Additionally, she mentioned that if the exam was of an internationally active insurance group (IAIG), risks identified with the dagger symbol may need to be considered at a different level within the organizational structure.

c. Macroprudential (E) Working Group Referral

Litweiler stated that the next set of updates was in response to a referral received from the Macroprudential (E) Working Group. He noted that these updates provide additional guidance to help examiners evaluate related party investment holdings and asset adequacy of complex investments.

Henning added that these updates in response to the referral include two new risks on two different repositories. The first one, included in the Investments Repository, focuses on the investments originated and managed by an affiliate or related party. The procedures added are focused on gaining an understanding of the company's process for determining whether their asset manager or investment manager has the appropriate experience and expertise to manage these types of investments. The procedures also look at the guidelines that the insurer has developed for their investment/asset manager to follow, any fees and the appropriateness of those fees, and whether those investments are going to be marketed to third parties.

Henning noted that the second added risk is included on the Life Reserves Repository. She noted that a lot of the procedures included within the new risk come from the newly adopted actuarial guideline, *Actuarial Guideline LIII—Application of the Valuation Manual for Testing the Adequacy of Life Insurer Reserves* (AG 53), related to asset adequacy for complex investment holdings to ensure that the company is in compliance with the guideline and has the proper type of support for these investments.

d. NAIC/AICPA Referral

Litweiler added that the last set of updates was in response to a referral received from the NAIC/American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) (E) Working Group. He said updates within Exhibit E help to clarify expectations surrounding the Audit Awareness Letter and also reference the Guide to Compliance as an additional source of information.

As there were no objections, the Technical Group will expose the revisions for a 30-day public comment period ending Nov. 4, 2022.

### 3. Received a Referral from the Climate and Resiliency (EX) Task Force

The Technical Group received a referral from the Climate and Resiliency (EX) Task Force. Litweiler said that the Task Force designated a Solvency Workstream to explore potential enhancements to existing processes in this area. After a series of public panels on multiple climate solvency-related topics, the Solvency Workstream also solicited input on potential enhancements to the existing regulatory tools. The referral suggests considering enhancements to the following areas within the Handbook: 1) Exhibit B – Planning Exam Questionnaire, 2) Exhibit Y – Examination Interviews, 3) Investments Repository, 4) Underwriting Repository; and 5) Reinsurance Repositories (Assuming and Ceding). Additionally, he noted that the referral requests the Technical Group to determine a means for ensuring that climate-related risks are considered on every financial condition examination.

### 4. Received an Update on Other Working Groups

Litweiler said that the Information Technology (IT) Examination (E) Working Group is working on guidance related to outsourced IT functions and prospective IT risks. The Working Group has formed a drafting group for both issues and is in the process of creating and updating guidance in their respective areas.

Additionally, Litweiler added that the Risk-Focused Surveillance (E) Working Group is in the midst of considering additional procedures to assess the appropriateness of using a market-based expense structure within affiliated agreements. The Technical Group expects to receive a referral from the Risk-Focused Surveillance (E) Working Group to consider for adoption in the near future.

Having no further business, the Financial Examiners Handbook (E) Technical Group adjourned.

SharePoint/NAIC SupportStaff Hub/Member Meetings/E CMTE/EOTF/FEHTG 10-5-22 Meeting Minutes.docx

Draft: 12/2/22

Information Technology (IT) Examination (E) Working Group  
Virtual Meeting  
November 30, 2022

The IT Examination (E) Working Group of the Examination Oversight (E) Task Force met Nov. 30, 2022. The following Working Group members participated: Jerry Ehlers, Chair (IN); Ber Vang, Vice Chair (CA); Blase Abreo (AL); Mel Anderson (AR); William Arfanis and Ken Roulier (CT); Ginny Godek (IL); Shane Mead (KS); Dmitriy Valekha (MD); Kim Dobbs and Cynthia Amann (MO); Colton Schulz (ND); Gary Evans (NE); Eileen Fox (NY); Metty Nyangoro (OH); Eli Snowbarger (OK); and Melissa Greiner and Matt Milford (PA).

1. Adopted its Oct. 13 Minutes

Ehlers called the meeting to order and said the purpose of the meeting is to consider adopting the exposed guidance updates proposed by the drafting group.

Before having that discussion, Ehlers asked the Working Group to discuss and adopt the minutes from its Oct. 13 minutes. Mead said Kansas was present at the previous meeting and had been marked absent in the attendance log. The minutes were updated to mark Kansas as present at the previous meeting.

Schulz made a motion, seconded by Dobbs, to adopt the Working Group's Oct. 13 minutes (Attachment XX). The motion passed unanimously.

2. Discussed Comments Received and Adopted the Exposed Guidance

Ehlers asked Jacob Steilen (NAIC) to discuss comments received during the exposure period. Steilen said there was one comment received from Jeff Martin (UnitedHealthcare), which proposed additional guidance in Sections 1–3. Martin said the additional guidance was proposed so information technology (IT) findings and recommendations could be remediated during the examination period, and he explained a situation where he had tried to show an IT issue was remediated but was told that the IT portion of the examination was closed. Steilen asked if this was a pervasive issue. Martin said no, it was just an issue that came up on the most recent group exam.

Roulier said he is neutral on the proposed addition, but the wording is clunky, and if the Working Group decides to keep the language, he proposes moving it later in the paragraph so it would flow better. Schulz said if the Working Group decides to keep the language, it should be less prescriptive, and he suggested deleting the word "all" to provide the IT examiner more flexibility. Mead said in Kansas, the IT portion remains open throughout the exam, so Martin's proposed language would have no effect on Kansas' process. Fox said in New York, most IT examiners are contractors so they work a fixed number of hours, but the contracts normally state that the contracted IT examiners should remain available for questions after the completion of their work. Godek said IT examiners normally ask the company to provide the status of any remediation activity at the exit meeting so any update on those issues can be passed forward in the monitoring process. Ehlers asked Martin a question regarding whether he is looking to present remediation activities to the IT examiner or to the examination team. Martin said he does not have a preference, but he wants the opportunity to present remediations on findings and recommendations at some point during the examination so the IT portion does not act like a one-time shot to get everything correct, where it carries over to the next examination if you do not. Based on this, he said he wants someone with IT knowledge available at some point later in the examination period to look at remediations. Vang said in California, there is a process to determine which findings are key findings and come up with a remediation plan and timeline. Milford said if the Working Group decides to keep the proposed language, there should be some clarifying language to distinguish between current exam issues and issues brought forward from the prior

exam's corrective action plan. Steilen said clarifying language could be added if the Working Group so chooses. Schulz asked if industry is concerned that closed, verified recommendations are still being included in the management letter. Arfanis said significant issues, even if there is a remediation plan, should be included in the management letter. For less significant issues that are fully remediated in the exam period, that falls to the professional judgment of the exam team on whether to include those in the management letter. Arfanis asked Martin to discuss offline about which examiner is telling him the IT exam is closed because that does not seem right. Milford said examiners use contractors, and for bigger projects, there would be a cost to reengage their services. Based on the comments of the Working Group members, Martin said if this is not an issue on other group exams, he is okay with pulling his comment altogether and working directly with UHG's lead state. The Working Group agreed with this decision. Steilen said to Martin that if there is anything he could do to help in this unique situation, he should let him know after the call. Steilen guided the Working Group through the remainder of the changes. Mead asked if grammatical edits could still be sent in after the adoption of the guidance. Steilen said things like spelling or reference consistency are fine to edit, but if the changes are more substantial or change the context and intent of the guidance, then those would need to go through the Working Group adoption process. Tom Finnell (America's Health Insurance Plans—AHIP) said this discussion has been helpful and useful to his understanding of the group exam IT process. He said he is attending a different meeting later in the year, which may yield some future potential projects for the Working Group. Steilen said those could be sent to him for consideration on next year's project list.

Ehlers thanked everyone for their discussion on the topic. He said he would entertain a motion to adopt the proposed guidance into the 2023 *Financial Condition Examiners Handbook*, excluding the UnitedHealthcare proposed addition.

Schulz made a motion, seconded by Mead, to adopt the proposed guidance (Attachment XX). The motion passed unanimously.

Steilen said the final piece of the exposure was an addition to the optional Exhibit C mapping tool available on the Working Group's website. The addition maps Exhibit C to Service Organization Control (SOC) 2 processes. Steilen said there were no comments on this exposure, and he asked the Working Group for any final discussion. Hearing none, he asked the Working Group if there would be any opposition to posting the additional mapping to the Exhibit C mapping tool. There was no opposition. Steilen said the updated version would be posted on the Working Group's web page shortly after the call.

Ehlers asked the Working Group if there are any other matters to discuss. None were heard from the Working Group. Ehlers thanked everyone for their work during the year, and he said if anyone has any future projects they believe the Working Group should consider, they should email those to Steilen.

Having no further business, the IT Examination (E) Working Group adjourned.

SharePoint/NAIC Support Staff Hub/Member Meetings/E CMTE/EOTF