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:

ICAC

(b) Are you a:

☐ Preparer ☐ User ☐ Other (please specify)

Accounting Standard Setter

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

(d) Country where you are located:

Spain

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

presidencia@icac.mineco.es

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 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)

[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.

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.

Transition: We understand that the current regulation of the transition does not lead to relevant, reliable, comparable, and understandable information. We consider that it is complicated to support that, depending on the transition approach the entity applies, the interest rate and the equity situation are substantially different. This situation implies an important lack of comparability in the transition date and subsequently. Particularly, if an entity applies the fair value approach, that entity shall use the discount rate existing at the transition date. This discount rate will be materially different from the discount rate which would be used if the full retrospective approach or the modified retrospective approach could be applied.

In addition, if the entity chooses to assess their assets at fair value OCI, a mismatch between assets and liabilities will emerge. That implies that the equity situation would not reflect the real situation of the insurance undertaking.

(See question 3 a), question 12 b) and question 14)

(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

We consider that, if the requirement of annual cohorts is an issue for some contracts, that issue should be treated before the implementation of the standard. Otherwise, it would imply unnecessary costs and confusion.

(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 consider that, for cash flow matched contracts, annual cohorts will result in information that is neither relevant nor reliable.

Cash flow matched contracts are contracts that apply an asset liability management regulated by Spanish jurisdiction. These contracts, that are also regulated in Solvency II, are associated with a pool of assets. The assets that could be eligible are regulated and, in fact, they are mainly public debt. They are managed in a separated way from the rest of the company and the assets cannot be used to cover other losses. It means the cash flows generated by the entire portfolio of matched assets are used to settle the obligations arising from the insurance portfolio without considering when they were issued.

These contracts are used to promote the long-term savings of population in Spain in the form of life annuities, both immediate and deferred annuities. Spanish insurers mainly provide a long-term fixed guarantee on interest rate to policyholders that does not change over time even if the market interest rates change. This guaranteed interest rate credited to the policyholder is set by companies based on the observable market yield of the investment portfolio assigned for the expected duration of the benefits (life expectancy in life annuities) when the contract is underwritten. Only under exceptional circumstances, the policyholder will surrender. If this is the case, the amount of surrender will be closely linked with the market value of the underlying portfolio (i.e. insurance companies do not bear the underlying market risk in case of a surrender benefit payment).

Considering the above pricing methodology, most Spanish insurers earn an expected constant financial margin in these contracts that is the difference between the internal rate of return of financial assets and the guaranteed interest rate credited to the policyholder, while they are exposed to other non-financial risks (basically, deviation from the assumptions used in pricing in relation to longevity risk, to the risk margin or to operating expenses) that would determine the overall margin.

Under cash flow matching techniques, insurers group contracts issued more than one year apart. The groups are mainly defined considering the aggregation of homogenous insurance and financial risks. The optimization of the asset and liability management mechanism and the underlying cash flows require that the size of these groups of assets and policies be big enough. The objective of these techniques is to ensure that the expected cash flows to be paid to policyholders match the future cash flows arising from the financial assets held by insurers (mainly fixed-debt instruments), in terms of timing, amount and currency. Calculations are prescribed by regulation and require monitoring the matching of the cash flows in monthly buckets until the extinction of the in-force group of contracts. There are also compulsory quarterly reviews to ensure there is not a mismatch. By applying these techniques, there is an intergenerational risk sharing among policyholders, in particular longevity and financial risks, which is also the basis on which the pricing of these contracts is established and how are built the internal actuarial statistical models used to estimate expected cash flows.

For these reasons we consider that allocate a contractual service margin to annual cohorts is going to be artificial and it is not going to result in useful information. That is because the result for these contracts is an expected constant financial margin. The objective of providing useful information about cash flow matched contracts could be reached through other means. For instance, we could suggest including additional disclosures.

(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?

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.

We consider that the existence of three approaches for the first application of IFRS 17 could lead to a lack of comparability. Particularly, because if fair value approach is applied, and sometimes also in the modified retrospective approach, the interest rate would be the discount rate in the date of first application. This interest rate would be really different from the interest rate that would be applied if the full retrospective approach could be used. (See question 2a, question 12 b) and question 14)

- 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 consider that the requirement of annual cohorts for some contracts could imply unnecessary costs and could add complexity. In addition, annual cohorts could disincentive some kind of life saving insurances.

(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

Cash flow matched contracts are used to promote the long-term savings of population in Spain in the form of life annuities, both immediate and deferred annuities. Spanish insurers mainly provide a long-term fixed guarantee on interest rate to policyholders that does not change over time even if the market interest rates change. This guaranteed interest rate credited to the policyholder is set by companies based on the observable market yield of the investment portfolio assigned for the expected duration of the benefits (life expectancy in life annuities) when the contract is underwritten.

Mandatory application of annual cohorts to these contracts, in conjunction with the persistent low interest rate environment, could lead to discouraging the sale of this type of insurance business in favour of unit-linked type of products where policyholders bear the investment risk. This is negative for the insured and for the European life savings insurance market.

Finally, the internal actuarial statistical models used to estimate expected cash flows are based in this asset liability management, so this requirement would increase significatively the implementation cost without increasing the quality of the information reported. Not only implementation cost will increase, but also ongoing cost, because of the duration of the contracts.

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.

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

☒ 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.

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

☒ 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.

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.

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.

(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 agree with the assessment on the treatment of OCI-balances at transition. The standard provides three approaches for implementing the transition. Each of them leading to different results. Specifically, in application of the fair value approach, as well as in some cases applying the modified retrospective approach, the interest rate on insurance obligations is set at the interest rate on the date of first application. This means that the amounts recognised in equity (OCI) arising from the insurance contract obligations become zero. However, under IFRS 9 the amounts recognised in equity arising from the assets are retained. This generates an asymmetry between assets and liabilities that does not reflect reality, i.e., it is not an economic mismatch but it is an accounting mismatch. In addition, the image given in the financial statements does not reflect the entity's equity situation.

This not only results in a distortion of the true and fair view at the time of first-time application but also subsequently. The assets will give rise to financial income by applying the interest rate at the time of purchase, which is much higher than at present, given the low interest rate environment. Liabilities, on the other hand, will be updated at the interest rate on the date of first application. Consequently, the financial income recognised in the years subsequent to the implementation date will not adequately reflect the reality of the operation. In this regard, we consider that it is more consistent that the interest rate on liabilities matches the interest rate on assets at the date of first application.

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.

We consider it is complicated to support that, depending on the transition approach the entity applies, the locked interest rate and the equity situation is substantially different. This situation implies an important lack of comparability in the transition date and subsequently. Particularly, if an entity applies the fair value approach, that entity shall use the discount rate existing at the transition date. This discount rate will be materially different from the discount rate which would be used if the full retrospective approach or the modified retrospective approach could be applied. This is even worse in an environment of low interest rates.

Finally, this situation is worse if we take in consideration the interaction between IFRS 17 and IFRS 9 in regard to the treatment of OCI at transition. (See question 12b).

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.

(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.

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.

In Spain, undertakings which are using the Matching Adjustment representing around 59% of the national market, in terms of technical provisions and around 65% of the life technical provisions. (In 2019).

(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.

In entities that apply matching adjustment the proportion of cash-flow matching contracts for which the requirement around annual cohorts is considered a significant issue is 88,8%%. In absolute terms it is 119.427.914.189,42 euros.

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

Entities will disaggregate insurance contracts that form part of the cash flow matched groups attending to the year they were issued. The problem is that this method does not reflect the way the entities manage their assets and liabilities. So, it is not going to reflect the economic characteristics of the asset liabilities management. The allocation of the contractual service margin would be artificial.

Part V: Questions to Constituents raised in Appendix III

As stated in paragraphs 532 to 534 of Appendix III:

(f) 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?

-

(g) 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.

-

(h) 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

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