INSTITUT DER WIRTSCHAFTSPRÜFER

Institut der Wirtschaftsprüfer
in Deutschland e. V.

Wirtschaftsprüferhaus
Tersteegenstraße 14
40474 Düsseldorf
Postfach 32 05 80
40420 Düsseldorf

TELEFONZENTRALE:
+49 (0) 211 / 45 61 - 0

FAX GESCHÄFTSLEITUNG:
+49 (0) 211 / 4 54 10 97

INTERNET:
www.idw.de

E-MAIL:
info@idw.de

BANKVERBINDUNG:
Deutsche Bank AG Düsseldorf
IBAN: DE53 3007 0010 0748 0213 00
BIC: DEUTDEDDXXX
USt-ID Nummer: DE119353203

Mr Jean-Paul Gauzès
EFRAG Board President
35 Square de Meeûs
B-1000 Brussels
Belgium

28 January 2021
567

Dear Mr Gauzès

Re.: EFRAG's Invitation to comment on EFRAG's assessment on IFRS 17 Insurance Contracts as amended in June 2020

The IDW appreciates the opportunity to contribute to EFRAG's invitation to comment on EFRAG's assessment on IFRS 17 Insurance Contracts as amended in June 2020.

We welcome the introduction of the IFRS 17 accounting standard. Compared to IFRS 4, the new accounting model for insurance contracts proposed under IFRS 17 will improve transparency and comparability between financial statements.

We recommend the EFRAG Board provide a positive endorsement advice to the European Commission regarding IFRS 17, including the annual cohorts requirements. We consider it important that all parties involved in the endorsement process do whatever is necessary to ensure a timely endorsement, so that insurers planning early adoption are in a position to apply IFRS 17 for the first time in 2022.

The application of the IFRS as published by the IASB ensures that EU listed entities report their consolidated financial statements under uniform international financial reporting standards. In our view, this should continue in the EU as well as in a growing number of jurisdictions around the world. Therefore, we strongly oppose any consideration to modify the financial reporting rules for entities in the EU required to apply IFRS in a way that they differ from the IFRS as published by the IASB.

We would be pleased to answer any questions that you may have or discuss any aspect of this letter.

Yours sincerely

Bernd Stibi
Technical Director Accounting

Daniel Groove
Technical Manager

INVITATION TO COMMENT ON EFRAG'S ASSESSMENTS ON IFRS 17 INSURANCE CONTRACTS AS AMENDED IN JUNE 2020

Once filled in, this form should be submitted by 29 January 2021 using the 'Comment publication link' available at the bottom of the respective news item. All open consultations can be found on EFRAG's web site: [Open consultations: express your views](#).

EFRAG has been asked by the European Commission to provide it with advice and supporting material on IFRS 17 *Insurance Contracts* as amended in June 2020 ('IFRS 17' or 'the Standard'). In order to do so, EFRAG has been carrying out an assessment of IFRS 17 against the technical criteria for endorsement set out in Regulation (EC) No 1606/2002 and has also been assessing the costs and benefits that would arise from its implementation in the European Union (the EU) and European Economic Area.

A summary of IFRS 17 is set out in Appendix I.

Before finalising its assessment, EFRAG would welcome your views on the issues set out below. Please note that all responses received will be placed on the public record, unless the respondent requests confidentiality. In the interests of transparency, EFRAG will wish to discuss the responses it receives in a public meeting, so it is preferable that all responses can be published.

In order to facilitate the EFRAG process, it is strongly recommended to use the structure below in your responses.

EFRAG's initial assessments, summarised in this questionnaire, will be updated for comments received from constituents when EFRAG is in the process of finalising its *Letter to the European Commission* regarding endorsement IFRS 17.

Your details

1 Please provide the following details:

(a) Your name or, if you are responding on behalf of an organisation or company, its name:

Institut der Wirtschaftsprüfer in Deutschland (IDW) e.V.

(b) Are you a:

☐ Preparer ☐ User ☒ Other (please specify)

Professional Organisation of German Public Auditors

(c) Please provide a short description of your activity:

The Institut der Wirtschaftsprüfer in Deutschland e.V. [Institute of Public Auditors in Germany, Incorporated Association] (IDW) is a privately run organisation established to serve the interests of its members who comprise both individual Wirtschaftsprüfer [German Public Auditors] and Wirtschaftsprüfungsgesellschaften [German Public Audit firms].

The IDW is a full and founding member of Accountancy Europe, a full and founding member of the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC).

(d) Country where you are located:

Germany

(e) Contact details, including e-mail address:

Institut der Wirtschaftsprüfer in Deutschland e.V. (IDW)
Tersteegenstraße 14
40474 Düsseldorf
Germany

Tel.: +49 (0)211/4561-0

E-Mail: groove@idw.de

Part I: EFRAG's initial assessment with respect to the technical criteria for endorsement

Note to the respondents: *Appendix II presents EFRAG's reasoning with reference to all requirements in IFRS 17 apart from the application of the annual cohorts requirement to some contracts specified in paragraph 6 of Annex A within Annex 1 (those contracts are conventionally referred to in this questionnaire, in the Cover Letter, in its Appendices and Annex as 'contracts with intergenerationally mutualisation and cash-flow matched contracts'[1], or 'intergenerationally mutualised and cash flow matched contracts'. Annex 1 presents content of this requirement that contribute positively or negatively to the technical criteria on this matter.*

2 EFRAG's initial assessment of IFRS 17 is that:

- The EFRAG Board has concluded on a consensus basis that, apart from the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally-mutualised and cash-flow matched contracts, as explained in the attached Cover Letter, on balance, all the other requirements of IFRS 17 meet the qualitative characteristics of relevance, reliability, comparability and understandability required to support 'economic decisions and the assessment of stewardship and raise no issues regarding prudent accounting. EFRAG has concluded that all the other requirements of IFRS 17 are not contrary to the true and fair view principle.
- EFRAG Board members were split into two groups about whether the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally mutualised and cash-flow matched contracts meet the qualitative characteristics described above.
  (i) Nine EFRAG Board members consider that overcoming in a timely manner the issues of IFRS 4 brings sufficient benefits despite the concerns on annual cohorts. They believe that, in the absence of an alternative principles-based approach to grouping of contracts, on balance the annual cohorts requirement provides an acceptable

[1] For a description of the affected contracts please refer to paragraphs 8 to 28 of Annex A to Annex 1 of the endorsement package relating to IFRS 17.

conventional approach that enables to meet the reporting objectives of the level of aggregation of IFRS 17.

(ii) Seven EFRAG Board members consider that in many cases in Europe the requirement to apply annual cohorts for insurance contracts with intergenerational mutualisation and cash-flow matched contracts will result in information that is neither relevant nor reliable. This is because the requirement does not depict an entity's rights and obligations and results in information that represents neither the economic characteristics of these contracts nor the entity's underlying business model. These EFRAG Board members also consider that this requirement is not conducive to the European public good because it (i) adds complexity and cost and does not bring benefits in terms of the resulting information, (ii) may lead to unintended incentives to change the way insurers cover insurance risks and (iii) may produce pro-cyclical reporting effects.

EFRAG's reasoning and observations are set out in Appendix II, Annex 1 and the Cover Letter regarding endorsement of IFRS 17.

(a) Do you agree with this assessment for all the other requirements of IFRS 17 apart from the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally mutualised and cash-flow matched contracts?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and what you believe the implications of this could be for EFRAG's endorsement advice.

(b) Having considered the technical arguments for those that support and those that oppose the application of annual cohorts to intergenerationally-mutualised contracts, as described in Annex 1, and having considered the two views from the EFRAG Board above does the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally-mutualised contracts (within the context of paragraphs B67-B71 of IFRS 17) meet the qualitative characteristics described above? Please explain your technical reasons for supporting your view.

☒ Yes ☐ No

The arguments have well been exchanged and are reflected in the relevant IASB publications, most recently in a webarticle *IFRS 17 – Insurance Contracts – Why annual cohorts?* by the IASB Chair, Hans Hoogervoorst. In situations not covered by BC 138 (full mutualisation, where all risk is borne by policyholders), we believe, that in order to reflect an insurer's performance and allocate the creation of shareholder value appropriately to the reporting periods, annual cohorts are an appropriate measure. We recognise that the allocation of cash flows from policyholder participation to annual cohorts in particular may require a significant degree of judgment whereby the related costs may raise the question of cost-benefit in certain situations and regulatory environments. However, this may be overcome by using reasonable approximations. We do not believe that the use of approximations does impair the reliability of an accounting model that is largely based on estimates anyway, if they are consistently applied on a reasonable basis.

With respect to the costs of annual cohorts, we would like to point out, that an assessment would need to focus on the *additional* costs resulting from a segregation of annual cohorts compared to segregations that would be required anyway, without the annual cohort requirements (portfolios and onerousness).

We note that in the meantime many users with a certain level of sophistication, are expressing support for the annual cohort requirement, which should be factored into any cost-benefit analysis.

(c) Having considered the technical arguments for those that support and those that oppose the application of annual cohorts to cash-flow matched contracts, as described in Annex 1, and having considered the two views from the EFRAG Board above does the requirement to apply annual cohorts to cash-flow matched contracts meet the qualitative characteristics described above? Please explain your technical reasons for supporting your view.

☒ Yes ☐ No

We refer to our comment on (b)

(d) Are there any issues that are not mentioned in Appendix II, Annex 1 and the Cover Letter regarding the endorsement of IFRS 17 that you believe EFRAG should take into account in its technical evaluation of IFRS 17? If there are, what are those issues and why do you believe they are relevant to the evaluation?

N/A

Part II: The European public good

Note to the respondents: *EFRAG's reasoning and conclusions with reference to all the other requirements of IFRS 17 is presented in Appendix III, apart from the observations on the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally mutualised and cash flow matched contracts, which are presented in Annex 1 (refer to the section titled Appendix III in Annex 1).*

3 In its assessment of the impact of IFRS 17 on the European public good, EFRAG has considered a number of issues that are addressed in Appendix III and Annex 1 regarding the endorsement of IFRS 17.

- The EFRAG Board has on a consensus basis assessed that, apart from the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally-mutualised and cash-flow matched contracts, all the other requirements of IFRS 17 would improve financial reporting and would reach an acceptable cost-benefit trade-off. EFRAG has not identified any other requirements of IFRS 17 that could have major adverse effect on the European economy, including financial stability and economic growth. Accordingly, EFRAG assesses that all the other requirements in IFRS 17 are, on balance, conducive to the European public good.

(a) Do you agree with this assessment for all the other requirements apart from the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally mutualised and cash-flow matched contracts?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and what you believe the implications of this could be for EFRAG's endorsement advice.

- EFRAG Board members were split between two groups, as described in the Cover Letter and above, with reference to the requirement to apply annual cohorts for contracts with intergenerational mutualisation and cash-flow matched contracts.

(b) Having considered the technical arguments for those that support and those that oppose the application of annual cohorts to intergenerationally-mutualised contracts, as described in Annex 1, and having considered the two views from the EFRAG Board above, is the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally-mutualised contracts (within the context of paragraphs B67-B71 of IFRS 17) conducive to the European public good? Please explain your technical reasons for supporting your view.

☒ Yes ☐ No

We are not aware of any micro- or macroeconomic side effects of reporting, that could be caused by the annual cohort requirement for financial reporting. We see no evidence that the reporting requirements would contradict the underlying economics in a way that any business reaction to the accounting change could be attributed to the accounting model and not to the underlying economics.

As already noted above, many users with a certain level of sophistication, are expressing support for the annual cohort requirement, which, as well as the possibility to work with approximations to a certain degree, needs to be factored into any cost-benefit analysis.

(c) Having considered the technical arguments for those that support and those that oppose the application of annual cohorts to cash-flow matched contracts, as described in Annex 1, and having considered the two views from the EFRAG Board above, is the requirement to apply annual cohorts to cash-flow matched contracts conducive to the European public good? Please explain your technical reasons for supporting your view.

☒ Yes ☐ No

We refer to our comment on (b)

Part III: The questions in Part III relate to all the other requirements in IFRS 17 apart from the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally mutualised and cash-flow matched contracts

Notes to the respondents: *In this Part, "IFRS 17" or "requirements in IFRS 17" or "the Standard" is intended to be referred to all the other requirements in IFRS 17 apart from the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally mutualised and cash-flow matched contracts (your views on the latter requirement are to be covered in Part IV).*

The European Commission and the European Parliament asked EFRAG to provide its views on a number of specific matters, that are presented below.

Improvement in financial reporting

4 EFRAG has identified that, in assessing whether the endorsement of IFRS 17 is conducive to the European public good, it should consider whether the Standard is

an improvement over current requirements across the areas which have been subject to changes (see paragraphs 15 to 27 of Appendix III). To summarise, for all the other requirements in IFRS 17 apart from the requirement to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally mutualised and cash-flow matched contracts, EFRAG considers that they provide better financial information than IFRS 4.

Do you agree with this assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Costs and benefits

5 EFRAG's initial assessment is that taking into account the evidence obtained from the various categories of stakeholders, the benefits of all the other IFRS 17 requirements in IFRS 17 exceeds the related costs.

Do you agree with this assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Other factors

Potential effects on financial stability

6 EFRAG has assessed the potential effects on financial stability based on the ten criteria set out in the framework developed by the European Central Bank "*Assessment of accounting standards from a financial stability perspective*" in December 2006. Based on this assessment, EFRAG is of the view that, on balance, IFRS 17 does not negatively affect financial stability (Appendix III paragraphs 428 to 482).

Do you agree with this assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Potential effects on competitiveness

(Appendix III paragraphs 227 to 286)

7 EFRAG has assessed how IFRS 17 could affect the competitiveness of European insurers taking into account the diversity in their business models vis-à-vis their major competitors outside Europe.

EFRAG concludes that the underlying economics and profitability will always be more decisive in taking up a business in a particular region or a particular insurance product than changes to the accounting that is used to report on it.

Do you agree with this assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Potential impact on the insurance market (including impact on social guarantees)

8 EFRAG has assessed the potential impact on the insurance market in Appendix III paragraphs 287 to 325.

EFRAG commissioned a study from an economic consultancy. This study ('Economic Study') stated that entities may re-consider both their pricing methodologies and product offers when applying IFRS 17 for the first time. The effect on pricing may be more significant than the effect on product offers. However, EFRAG does not have any quantification of the extent of changes in pricing or product design that would result from it.

As per the Economic Study, a majority of stakeholders interviewed (i.e. supervisory authorities, insurers and external investors) agreed that IFRS 17 alone would not impact the asset allocation of insurance undertakings, because this activity is more driven by risk management and/or asset/liability management.

Furthermore, EFRAG has considered how IFRS 17 could affect small and medium-sized entities (SMEs). EFRAG concludes that the number of small insurers that would be affected by IFRS 17 in producing their individual financial statements is very limited (between 27 and 35 depending on the option chosen based on the proposed[2] EIOPA quantitative thresholds).

(a) Do you agree with the assessment on pricing and product offerings?

☒ Yes ☐ No

(i) If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

(ii) Do you have any other observations that you think is relevant for EFRAG's endorsement assessment on this topic? Please explain.

The introduction of Solvency II – as an economic approach to capital requirements, mainly based on a market value balance sheet in 2016 – has had notable effects on product design, guaranties and pricing, asset allocation, reinsurance programs etc. We do not expect the application of IFRS 17 to have significant further impacts in these areas. The fact that Solvency II and IFRS 17 are based on similar building blocks may indeed help to align financial reporting und Solvency II reporting and enable a better understanding of changes in the financial positions of insurers over time.

(b) Do you agree with the assessment on asset allocation?

☒ Yes ☐ No

[2] Reference is made to EIOPA's publicly consulted Consultation Paper on the Opinion on the 2020 review of Solvency II to amend the thresholds for applying Solvency II.

(i) If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

(ii) Do you have any other observations that you think is relevant for EFRAG's endorsement assessment on this topic? Please explain.

We are aware of concerns that the prohibition of recycling for equity instruments accounted for at FVOCI under IFRS 9 may discourage insurers from investing in such instruments; nevertheless, we believe that these concerns should be analyzed and discussed separately from the endorsement.

(c) Do you agree with the assessment on SMEs?

☒ Yes ☐ No

(i) If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

(ii) Do you have any other observations that you think is relevant for EFRAG's endorsement assessment on this topic? Please explain.

Presentation of general insurance contracts

9 EFRAG is of the view the presentation requirements of IFRS 17 would provide relevant information. EFRAG also concludes that providing separate information for contracts that are in an asset, from those in a liability, position would provide useful information to users. (Appendix II paragraphs 118 to 125, 360 to 362).

Do you agree with this assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Interaction between IFRS 17 and Solvency II

10 EFRAG concludes that in implementing IFRS 17, there are possible synergies with Solvency II, but the extent of such synergies varies between insurers. In addition, no synergies are expected for building blocks that are specific to IFRS 17 such as the contractual service margin which is not an element of the measurement approach for insurance liabilities under Solvency II. Synergy potential is available in areas that have a high degree of commonality under the two frameworks, i.e. the building blocks for the measurement of the insurance liability needed to establish the cash flow projections, and actuarial systems to measure insurance liabilities. The potential depends, to an extent, on the differences in the starting position of insurers and the investments already made in the implementation of Solvency II. It also depends on the amount of effort to adapt existing actuarial systems, that were developed for the Solvency II environment, to the IFRS 17 reporting requirements. (Appendix III paragraphs 401 to 412).

Do you agree with this assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Impact of the new Standard on financial stability, long-term investment in the EU, procyclicality and volatility

11 On financial stability, refer to the conclusions in paragraph 6 of this Invitation to Comment.

On long-term investment in the EU, EFRAG's view is that asset allocation decisions are driven by a variety of factors, among which external financial reporting requirements might play some part but do not appear to be a key driver. There is no indication that IFRS 17 in isolation would lead to any significant changes in European insurers' decisions on asset allocation or holding periods (Appendix III paragraphs 96 to 123).

On procyclicality and volatility, EFRAG believes that IFRS 17 has mixed effects on procyclicality. IFRS 17 may result in more volatile financial performance measures because of the use of a current measurement. However, from the evidence collected, it is not likely that this volatility has the potential to play a specific role in producing pro-cyclical or anti-cyclical effects. EFRAG also assesses that IFRS 17 does not have the potential to reinforce economic cycles, such as overstating profits and thus allowing dividends and bonus distributions in good times, as there is no linkage between the accounting equity (cumulative retaining earnings) and amounts available for distributions, which are defined within the requirements of Solvency II or within the requirements at national level, independently from the IFRS accounting. Finally, EFRAG notes that the transparent nature of the IFRS 17 information has the benefit for investors to be able to react timely to any changes at hand, thereby avoiding cliff-effects. (Appendix III paragraphs 483 to 507).

(a) Do you agree with the assessment on long-term investment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

(i) If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

(ii) Do you have any other observations that you think is relevant for EFRAG's endorsement assessment on this topic? Please explain.

(b) Do you agree with the assessment on procyclicality and volatility?

☒ Yes ☐ No

(i) If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

(ii) Do you have any other observations that you think is relevant for EFRAG's endorsement assessment on this topic? Please explain.

In our experience, procyclical effects can have three main causes, which we do not see in the case of insurers:

- Companies may sell assets in order to avoid accounting losses; this is not the case for insurers with respect to their insurance contracts.

- Recognising losses in the financial statements may cause clients to surrender their insurance policies; if such a risk existed at all, it would primarily be due to solvency ratios.
- The carrying amount of an asset may be impacted by a company's ability to generate future earnings and to recognize losses; this is not the case for insurance contracts under IFRS 17, apart from insurance acquisition cash flows that are allocated to renewals.

IFRS 17 and IFRS 9

12 EFRAG is of the view that mismatches reported by preparers that contributed to EFRAG's assessment do not arise solely from the application of IFRS 17 and IFRS 9 but are mostly economic in nature. EFRAG considers that reporting the extent of the economic mismatches in profit or loss provides useful information.

In EFRAG's view, asset allocation decisions are driven by a variety of factors and disentangling the impact of accounting requirements from other factors is difficult. When defining the accounting for financial assets under IFRS 9, an insurer would not apply business models determined in isolation, but rather business models that are supportive of or complementary to their business model for managing insurance contracts. EFRAG notes that the interaction between each of an entity's internal policy decisions will determine the importance of any accounting mismatches remaining in the financial statements and this may differ largely from one insurer to another.

EFRAG has assessed the different tools that both standards offer to mitigate accounting mismatches. EFRAG assesses that:

(a) there is no conceptual barrier against the application of hedge accounting in the context of IFRS 17. However, given the lack of experience and systems by the industry, it would require significant investment both in time and systems development to achieve hedge accounting in this context (Appendix III, Annex 5);

(b) the treatment of OCI balances and risk mitigation at transition will not, on balance, negatively impact the usefulness of the resulting information.

(a) Do you agree with the assessment on the application of hedge accounting?

☒ Yes ☐ No

(i) If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

(ii) Do you have any other observations that you think is relevant for EFRAG's endorsement assessment on this topic? Please explain.

In our opinion this is not an issue of systems and experience, but rather concerns the requirements of IFRS 9 for hedge accounting; we look forward to the IASB undertaking further research to bring hedge accounting in line with risk management.

(b) Do you agree with the assessment on the treatment of OCI-balances and risk mitigation?

☒ Yes ☐ No

(i) If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

(ii) Do you have any other observations that you think is relevant for EFRAG's endorsement assessment on this topic? Please explain.

We do not see any issues in this regard that should affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Application of IFRS 15

13 In some instances, an entity (including insurers) may choose to apply IFRS 15 instead of IFRS 17 to contracts that meet the definition of an insurance contract but that have as their primary purpose the provision of services for a fixed fee. EFRAG concludes that this option would probably be made by those entities that do not operate in the insurance business. EFRAG concludes that for these entities accounting for these contracts in the same way as for other contracts would provide useful information and that applying IFRS 17 to these contracts would impose costs for no significant benefit (Appendix III paragraphs 68 to 76).

Do you agree with this assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Implications of transitional requirements

14 Considering the extent of the information available for each particular group of insurance contracts at transition, EFRAG assesses that the existence of three transition approaches does not result in a lack of relevant information. The alleviations granted under the modified retrospective approach are still leading to relevant information as they enable achieving the closest outcome to a full retrospective application without undue cost or effort. In addition, EFRAG acknowledges that the possible use of three different transition methods may affect comparability among entities and, for long-term contracts, over time. However, the practical benefits of the modified retrospective and fair value approach, which were introduced by the IASB to respond to operational concerns of the preparers, may justify the reduced comparability (Appendix II paragraphs 129 to 155, 228 to 237, 300 to 303, 372 to 374, 398 to 400).

Do you agree with this assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Impact on reinsurance

15 EFRAG concludes that the separate treatment under IFRS 17 of reinsurance contracts held and underlying direct contracts reflects the rights and obligations of different and separate contractual positions. Furthermore, EFRAG acknowledges that reinsurance contracts issued or held may meet the variable fee criteria even though IFRS 17 states that they cannot be insurance contracts with direct participation features. However, EFRAG assesses that the risk mitigation option would largely address the accounting mismatches, thereby balancing relevant information. In addition, for reinsurance contracts held that are used to recover losses from the underlying contracts, EFRAG considers that the Amendments provide

relevant information as they aim at reducing accounting mismatches which is present under the original version of the Standard (Appendix II paragraphs 63 to 74, 210 to 216, 274 to 275, 349 to 352, 395 to 397).

Do you agree with this assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Implementation timeline

16 Feedback from the Limited Update to the Case Studies shows that the delay to the effective date of IFRS 17 to 1 January 2023 results in higher one-off implementation costs for preparers. However, the delay is also helping preparers to adjust their project approaches to the operational difficulties of the Covid-19 crisis. EFRAG understands from preparers that they may choose to avoid these costs by revisiting solution designs or may make more use of internal (cheaper) resources. Furthermore, according to the Limited Update to the Case Studies and other feedback from insurance associations, most of the participants did not intend to early apply IFRS 17, whereas a small minority wanted to have this possibility. EFRAG is not aware of any European insurer having taken a firm commitment to early apply the Standard. Finally, EFRAG notes that IFRS 17 requires a presentation of restated comparative information when applying the Standard for the first time. However, IFRS 9 does not have similar requirements for financial assets and liabilities (Appendix III paragraphs and 609 to 613).

(a) Do you agree with the assessment relating to delay of IFRS 17 implementation till 2023?

☒ Yes ☐ No

(i) If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

(ii) Do you have any other observations that you think is relevant for EFRAG's endorsement assessment on this topic? Please explain.

We support the deferral to 2023. Where necessary, this gives preparers sufficient time to improve the quality of their systems and processes for applying IFRS 17.

(b) Do you agree with the assessment relating to early application?

☒ Yes ☐ No

(i) If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

(ii) Do you have any other observations that you think is relevant for EFRAG's endorsement assessment on this topic? Please explain.

We consider it important that all parties involved in the endorsement process do whatever is necessary to ensure a timely endorsement so that insurers planning early adoption are in a position to apply IFRS 17 for the first time in 2022. The endorsement process should not hinder a timely application, given that there have been more than 20 years of discussion on an IFRS for insurance contracts.

17 Do you agree that there are no other factors to consider in assessing whether the endorsement of the Standard is conducive to the European public good?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you do not agree, please identify the factors, provide your views on these factors and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

Part IV: The questions in Part IV aim at collecting constituents' inputs (Questions to constituents in Annex 1) and views relating to the requirement in IFRS 17 to apply annual cohorts to intergenerationally mutualised and cash-flow matched contracts

Notes to the respondents: *Respondents are reminded that responses to this Invitation to Comment will be made public on EFRAG's website. EFRAG is also inviting respondents to share quantitative data and to allow confidentiality of this information, constituents are kindly invited to submit these data separately from the Invitation to Comment. Such quantitative data can be sent to ifrs17secretariat@efrag.org. Only aggregated resulting data will be made public in the subsequent steps of the due process and will be presented in an anonymous way.*

The intergenerationally-mutualised and cash-flow matched contracts are specified in paragraph 6 of Annex A within Annex 1.

18 As stated in paragraphs 5 to 9 of Annex 1:

(a) What is the portion of intergenerationally-mutualised contracts and cash-flow matched contracts of all life insurance liabilities and all insurance liabilities? Please report the results for these two types of contracts separately where relevant.

(b) Please indicate the proportion of contracts with intergenerational mutualisation (within the context of paragraphs B67-B71 of IFRS 17) for which the requirement around annual cohorts is considered a significant issue. Please specify the share that would qualify for VFA.

(c) Please describe the approach you envisage to implement the annual cohorts requirement to contracts with intergenerationally-mutualised contracts (within the context of paragraphs B67-B71 of IFRS 17).

(d) Please indicate the proportion of cash-flow matching contracts for which the requirement around annual cohorts is considered a significant issue. Please specify how the features of the contracts compare with the description provided in Annex A of Annex 1.

(e) Please describe the approach you envisage to implement the annual cohorts requirement to cash-flow matched contracts.

Part V: Questions to Constituents raised in Appendix III

19 As stated in paragraphs 532 to 534 of Appendix III:

(a) In your view, how will the Covid-19 pandemic affect the impacts of IFRS 17 on the insurance market (see a description of some expected impacts in paragraphs 518 to 527 in Appendix III) and indirectly, on the European economy as a whole?

(b) Is the Covid-19 pandemic affecting your implementation process for IFRS 17 and IFRS 9? Please explain in detail the impacts such as project ambitions, budget for implementation and ongoing costs, resources, speed of implementation. Please also explain whether this relates to the IT systems implementation, or rather the actuarial or accounting aspects of implementation.

(c) Are there other aspects around the implications of Covid-19, not yet addressed in the DEA that you want to expand on?

Part VI: EFRAG's overall advice to the European Commission

20 Do you have any other comment on, or suggestion for, the advice that EFRAG is proposing to give to the European Commission?

We strongly oppose any consideration to modify the financial reporting rules for entities in the EU required to apply IFRS in a way that they differ from the IFRS as published by the IASB.

In our view, the key question is: Is there a desire to have uniform international financial reporting standards (and in particular the IFRS as published by the IASB) or not? The advantages of the IFRS are well known: increased transparency and greater comparability between financial statements within and across industries and countries, lower costs of capital, lower costs of preparing financial statements for multinational companies etc. Moreover, the Commission itself has evidence of improved capital market outcomes, i.e. higher liquidity, increased cross-border transactions, easier access to capital at EU and global level, improved investor protection and maintenance of investor confidence (we refer to the final report 'Evaluation of the regulation (EC) No 1606/2002 of 19 July 2002 on the application of international accounting standards' from 18 June 2015).

However, if the EU Commission is committed to the IFRS, then suggestions and representations concerning specific requirements within the standards have to be addressed within the official standard setting process. Although there are several possibilities to influence the outcome of the standard setting process, inevitably sometimes, concerns expressed by the EU will not be addressed, e.g. if the IASB and/or other stakeholder outside Europe have an opposing view. Given the commitment to global IFRS, this situation has to be accepted. Furthermore, the EU's recent experiences have shown how difficult it is to develop cross-border accounting rules (we refer to the development of the European Accounting Directive).

Overall, and in conclusion, we believe, that IFRS 17, including the annual cohorts requirements, should be endorsed as published by the IASB.