IAIS Consultations

Print view of your comments on "Draft Application Paper on Recovery Planning" - Date: 07.01.2019, Time: 13:14

Organisation	Institute and Faculty of Actuaries
Jurisdiction	United Kingdom
Role	Other (not IAIS Member)
Email	Steven.Graham@actuaries.org.uk
Phone	
Treat my comments as confidential	No

	Question
	Q1 General comments on the draft Application Paper
Answer	The Institute and Faculty of Actuaries (IFoA) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the IAIS's consultation paper on Recovery Planning. Members of our Recovery & Resolution Members' Interest Group, and Life and General Insurance Boards have been involved in the drafting of this response.
	Q2 General comments on Section 1: Introduction
Answer	
	Q3 Comment on Paragraph 1
Answer	
	Q4 Comment on Paragraph 2
Answer	
	Q5 Comment on Paragraph 3
Answer	In 3 (iii) as well as being 'timely', we would suggest it is important that the recovery options are also 'effective'.
	Q6 Comment on Paragraph 4
Answer	
F	Q7 Comment on Paragraph 5
Answer	
	Q8 Comment on Paragraph 6
Answer	
	Q9 Comment on Paragraph 7

Answer	
	Q10 Comment on Paragraph 8
Answer	
	Q11 Comment on Paragraph 9
Answer	
	Q12 Comment on Paragraph 10
Answer	
	Q13 Comment on Paragraph 11
Answer	
	Q14 General comments on Section 2: Objectives and concepts of recovery planning
Answer	
	Q15 Comment on Paragraph 12
Answer	'Viability' can mean different things to different organisations. Firms should determine what viability means for them as otherwise it is difficult to assess whether the recovery plan (RP) is adequate. This will also drive what financial resources they need to support this, although the minimum from a supervisory perspective is probably meeting their Prescribed Capital Requirement (PCR). We would expect that this would be consistent with any such consideration in a firm's ORSA and may vary from meeting the SCR to being able to maintain a profitable level of new business. It will likely vary from company to company with, inter alia, the products an insurer writes and their distribution channels.
	Q16 Comment on Paragraph 13
Answer	We would expect that the recovery plan required following a breach of a firm's PCR would use similar tools to those being considered in other situations.
	Q17 Comment on Paragraph 14
Answer	We would also add that one benefit of developing a recovery plan ex ante is that issues may be identified that result in actions being taken which may reduce the likelihood of entering resolution through, for example, making the trigger framework more effective.
	Q18 Comment on Paragraph 15
Answer	
	Q19 Comment on Paragraph 16
Answer	
	Q20 Comment on Paragraph 17

Answer	We disagree with the view that 'the ORSA is to prevent an insurer from coming under severe stress'. The ORSA cannot do this, but it can identify the impact of stresses on the business over the business planning period and identify what mitigating actions might then be taken; this could be viewed as being a milder form of recovery plan.
	Q21 General comments on Section 3: Scope of application and proportionality
Answer	
	Q22 Comment on Paragraph 18
Answer	
	Q23 General comments on Section 3.1 Proportional application of requirements
Answer	
	Q24 Comment on Paragraph 19
Answer	
	Q25 Comment on Paragraph 20
Answer	The need for a recovery plan may also be driven by the undertaking of what the supervisor views as a critical economic function for that country. We also believe that the point in the last sentence regarding small less complex insurers should be less of an issue as they are not likely to need a detailed recovery plan (if at all), particularly in countries whose approach is not a 'zero tolerance of failure'.
	Q26 Comment on Paragraph 21
Answer	it is not clear what is meant by the withdrawal of an insurer impacting policyholders - is this a reference to a situation where this a lack of continuity of cover due to it not being possible to transfer liabilities to another firm, and a protection scheme not paying out liabilities in full?
	Q27 Comment on Paragraph 22
Answer	
	Q28 Comment on Paragraph 23
Answer	We welcome the application of the proportionality principle to the requirement for, but also the detail required within, a recovery plan.
	Q29 Comment on Paragraph 24
Answer	Similarly, we welcome the provision for a planned and phased development of recovery plans.
	Q30 Comment on Paragraph 25
Answer	
	Q31 General comments on Section 3.2 Matters specific to insurance groups
Answer	

Q32 Comment on Paragraph 26
We note that coordination of supervisors is not just an issue for groups, as in many countries prudential and conduct supervision may be undertaken by separate supervisors; recovery may also impact policyholders in a way that is of a concern to the conduct supervisor.
Q33 Comment on Paragraph 27
An additional consideration for groups is the extent to, and circumstances in, which recovery plans of subsidiaries call for group support at the same time. This means that the group plan needs to be developed in conjunction with those for the major subsidiaries.
Q34 Comment on Paragraph 28
Q35 Comment on Paragraph 29
Q36 Comment on Paragraph 30
Q37 General comments on Section 4 Governance around recovery planning
Q38 Comment on Paragraph 31
Q39 General comments on Section 4.1: Governance – development, approval, review & testing
Q40 Comment on Paragraph 32
We believe it is essential that the Board is involved in the RP development and signs it off. We do not believe it is essential for there to be complete independence between development and approval. Clearly one would expect that there is an appropriate level of separation between the team developing the plan and the risk function review and challenge.
Q41 Comment on Paragraph 33
See answer to Q40.
Q42 Comment on Paragraph 34
Q43 Comment on Paragraph 35

Answer	We do not believe it is possible for the plan to 'ensure' that it can be implemented in a timely manner - we suggest inserting the wording 'as far as reasonably possible'. Furthermore, it is not clear to us how the existing stress testing framework would test the credibility of the recovery plan; we believe further explanation is required on this.
	Q44 General comments on Section 4.2: Governance – monitoring, escalation and activation processes
Answer	
	Q45 Comment on Paragraph 36
Answer	
	Q46 Comment on Paragraph 37
Answer	It will be important for an Operational Resilience risk appetite to be developed as the timeliness of any recovery plans will be dependent on how the stressed conditions impact the viability of the business.
	Q47 Comment on Paragraph 38
Answer	It would be useful to expand on what is meant by 'increased level of monitoring' - presumably this is the Board needing greater levels of, and more frequent, management information.
	Q48 Comment on Paragraph 39
Answer	
	Q49 Comment on Paragraph 40
Answer	We believe it is also important for the reliance and role of any third parties to be considered.
	Q50 Comment on Paragraph 41
Answer	We believe both the senior management and the Board should evaluate the information, rather than it being either senior management or the Board.
	Q51 Comment on Paragraph 42
Answer	
	Q52 General comments on Section 5: Elements of a recovery plan
Answer	
	Q53 Comment on Paragraph 43
Answer	The RP should also include information on key dependencies and assumptions. There should also be information on the estimated impact of the principal options and how they interact (as described in paragraph 67).
	Q54 Comment on Paragraph 44

Answer	
	Q55 General comments on Section 5.1: Executive abstract of the recovery plan
Answer	
	Q56 Comment on Paragraph 45
Answer	
	Q57 Comment on Paragraph 46
Answer	
	Q58 Comment on Paragraph 47
Answer	
	Q59 Comment on Paragraph 48
Answer	
	Q60 General comments on Section 5.2: Description of the insurer or group
Answer	
	Q61 Comment on Paragraph 49
Answer	
	Q62 General comments on Section 5.3:Trigger framework
Answer	
	Q63 Comment on Paragraph 50
Answer	
	Q64 Comment on Paragraph 51
Answer	It is not clear what 'other contingency plans' are being referred to which would not be in the RP itself.
	Q65 Comment on Paragraph 52
Answer	We believe it is the foreseeable risks which help determine the trigger framework.
	Q66 Comment on Paragraph 53
Answer	
	Q67 Comment on Paragraph 54
Answer	
	Q68 Comment on Paragraph 55
Answer	

	Q69 Comment on Paragraph 56
Answer	Box 1. We note that where there is risk-based capital a deterioration in asset quality will trigger reduced capital resources, so the key trigger is available capital.
	Q70 Comment on Paragraph 57
Answer	We note that supervisors will need significant information from the insurer on how the triggers have been derived for them to undertake the analysis.
	Q71 Comment on Paragraph 58
Answer	
	Q72 Comment on Paragraph 59
Answer	
	Q73 Comment on Paragraph 60
Answer	
	Q74 General comments on Section 5.4: Governance
Answer	
	Q75 Comment on Paragraph 61
Answer	
	Q76 General comments on Section 5.5: Recovery options
Answer	
	Q77 Comment on Paragraph 62
Answer	
	Q78 Comment on Paragraph 63
Answer	
	Q79 Comment on Paragraph 64
Answer	Box 2. We would caution the use of repricing of insurance contracts as it is difficult to know how successful the thus will be, particularly in stressed conditions. Similarly, hedging may be difficult to achieve in stressed conditions and can be costly.
	Q80 Comment on Paragraph 65
Answer	Full information should be given on the key assumptions underlying the option and the basis for any expert judgments.
	Q81 Comment on Paragraph 66

	Q82 Comment on Paragraph 67
Answer	
	Q83 Comment on Paragraph 68
Answer	Supervisors should discuss with the insurer the extent the insurer needs to agree contractual arrangements with third parties.
	Q84 General comments on Section 5.6: Communication strategy
Answer	
	Q85 Comment on Paragraph 69
Answer	
	Q86 Comment on Paragraph 70
Answer	
	Q87 Comment on Paragraph 71
Answer	
r	Q88 Comment on Paragraph 72
Answer	
	Q89 Comment on Paragraph 73
Answer	
	Q90 Comment on Paragraph 74
Answer	
	Q91 Comment on Paragraph 75
Answer	
	Q92 Comment on Paragraph 76
Answer	
	Q93 General comments on Section 5.7: Stress scenarios
Answer	
	Q94 Comment on Paragraph 77
Answer	
	Q95 Comment on Paragraph 78
Answer	
	Q96 Comment on Paragraph 79
Answer	

	Q97 Comment on Paragraph 80
Answer	
	Q98 Comment on Paragraph 81
Answer	
	Q99 Comment on Paragraph 82
Answer	
	Q100 Comment on Paragraph 83
A	
Answer	
	0404 Canaral commente en Section 6: Supervisory considerations
	Q101 General comments on Section 6: Supervisory considerations
Answer	
Allswei	
	Q102 Comment on Paragraph 84
	Q 102 Comment of r aragiaph of
Answer	
Answei	
1	Q103 General comments on Section 6.1: Assessing recovery plans
Answer	
	Q104 Comment on Paragraph 85
Answer	We are unsure as to why the assessment of RPs is sufficiently onerous that it would mean
	that supervisors would not have the supervisory capacity for this work to warrant a specific
	resource review.
	Q105 Comment on Paragraph 86
Answer	
	0400 Commont on Deveryonth 07
	Q106 Comment on Paragraph 87
A	
Answer	
	Q107 Comment on Paragraph 88
	Gror Comment on ratagraph oo
Answer	
AIISWEI	
	Q108 Comment on Paragraph 89
Answer	
	Q109 Comment on Paragraph 90
Answer	
	Q110 General comments on Section 6.2 : Supervisory cooperation and coordination
Answer	
	Q111 Comment on Paragraph 90

Answer	
	Q112 Comment on Paragraph 91
Answer	
	Q113 Comment on Paragraph 92
Answer	
	Q114 Comment on Paragraph 93
Answer	
	Q115 Comment on Paragraph 94
Answer	
	Q116 Comment on Paragraph 95
Answer	
	Q117 Comment on Paragraph 96
Answer	