

Financial regulation – Stability versus Uniformity

Session 3: Potential for systemic risk in the Insurance sector?

Sandrine LEMERY
First Deputy Secretary General

Why a ‘?’ when speaking about potential for insurers’ systemic risk?

- When functioning properly, insurance actually contributes to financial stability
 - Insurers are valuable providers of **stable long term funding**
 - They offer services which benefit the real economy by allowing the **transfer and efficient management of risks**
- However, under some circumstances, insurers can be sources or amplifiers of systemic risk
 - They finance large parts of the non financial sectors (sovereign) and financial sectors (banks) and could transmit a large default as investors
 - They insure crucial parts of the economy and the failure of a large provider of insurance services may impair sectorial activity (ex: marine insurance)
 - The reinsurance network potentially increases interconnectedness
 - Non traditional non insurance activities proved specifically risky for insurers
 - The IAIS identified **9 systemic insurers** with a methodology adapted from the FSB filter (Size, Complexity, Interconnectedness → Size, Global Activity, Interconnectedness, NTNI activities, Substitutability)

Recent developments for global insurance regulation

- The list should be updated in Autumn 2015
 - For insurers only

- Some remaining issues still to be tackled
 - **The inclusion of the reinsurers in the list**
 - For level playing field purpose
 - As groups often run both insurance and reinsurance businesses

 - **Transparency on data**, as for the banking sector
 - Transparency on the method used to designate G-SIIs
 - Public disclosure on the data used in this methodology/ of the results on which the designation is based

 - **The definition of NTNI**
 - To include all possibly procyclical products (e.g. trade credit insurance, indexed products)

 - **The measurement of interconnectedness**
 - The extension to systemic insurers of current banking data collection

Recent developments for global insurance regulation

- The identified insurers are subject to specific measures, especially in terms of **resolution**
 - Enhanced group-wide supervision
 - Through cross-border agreements between supervision authorities
 - Supervision powers on the holding for the lead resolution authority
 - Establishment of a Crisis Management Group
 - Done by July 2014
 - Development of a Systemic risk management plan
 - Development of Recovery and Resolution Plans, including
 - A resolvability assessment
 - And a Liquidity risk management plan

Recent developments for global insurance regulation

- The identified insurers are subject to specific measures, especially in terms of capital requirements - **HLA** (higher loss absorbency, based on the BCR).
 - Concept validated
 - Ongoing negotiation on the calibration of the HLA and on the assets eligible to meet this requirement
 - HLA shall be related to the degree of systemic importance of each G-SIIs
 - Strict timeframe imposed by the FSB:
 - Agreement on the formulas by 2015
 - Confidential calculation of BCR/HLA during three years (2016-2018)
 - Full implementation of BCR/HLA starting in 2019
 - BCR is not very risk sensitive → it is a first step.

Beyond the identified G-SIIs

■ Other potential for systemic risk : poor visibility on differences between regulatory frameworks

- Need for an harmonization of the regulations to:
 - Enhance the comparability between markets, then ensure a better level playing field : “same risks, same rules”
 - Decrease the risk of regulatory arbitrage
 - Taking into account national products and markets specificities and including if necessary transitional periods

- Initiatives at the international level
 - Publication of the Insurance Core Principles, basis for the countries assessment by the IMF
 - Development of a Common framework (ComFrame) for the supervision of the internationally active insurance groups (IAIGs), including an International Capital Standard (ICS) aiming at replacing the BCR
 - Discussion on IORP 2: an opportunity to increase transparency for pension funds towards members, beneficiaries and employers and to harmonize governance rule

- Experience from the European negotiations of Solvency II and Omnibus II
 - The design of harmonized rules is a very long process
 - Need to take into account the on-going developments of the financial market and of the regulation

Beyond the identified G-SIIs

- Potential for pro-cyclical behavior which can amplify financial markets or real economy cycles
 - Amplified with a regulation based on market valuation
 - In Solvency II, the so-called Long term Guarantee package has been adopted to smooth the effect,
 - but then we get a distorted view of the market valuation and this biases the level-playing field as some measures are country-specific or undertaking-specific
 - Yet only can market valuation properly catch specific risks such as market risk
 - SCR followed at the sub-module level

Financial conglomerates and systemic risks

- Can insurers become systemic by their belonging to a banking group (financial conglomerate)?
 - In Europe, conglomerates mostly have a banking head.
 - The insurance subsidiary of a bank conglomerate adds to its market footprint
 - The crisis provided some evidence of intragroup contagion from banks to insurers
- The directive on Financial Conglomerates addresses the specificities of this type of entities at the micro-prudential level
 - Implementation of a supplementary supervision, and a strong collaboration between supervisors
 - In order to prevent double or multiple gearing
 - Not operational worldwide to take into account insurance subsidiary in pillar I for macro-prudential purposes