

This paper has been prepared by the EFRAG Secretariat for discussion at a public meeting of EFRAG TEG. The paper forms part of an early stage of the development of a potential EFRAG position. Consequently, the paper does not represent the official views of EFRAG or any individual member of the EFRAG Board or EFRAG TEG. The paper is made available to enable the public to follow the discussions in the meeting. Tentative decisions are made in public and reported in the EFRAG Update. EFRAG positions, as approved by the EFRAG Board, are published as comment letters, discussion or position papers, or in any other form considered appropriate in the circumstances.

## **Mutual entities in the IFRS 17 Draft Endorsement Advice - Issues Paper**

### **Objective**

- 1 The objective of this session is to receive comments on the wording to be included in the DEA on mutual entities based on previous discussions. The proposed wording below will be slotted in where appropriate in Appendix II of the DEA.

### **Background**

- 2 The European Commission and the European Parliament did not ask any specific comments on mutual entities but asked EFRAG to analyse whether 'the different accounting methods properly reflect the different business models. The Parliament 'called on ... EFRAG to consider concerns relating to the level of aggregation, including requirements on how the business is run in practice' and 'to consider, furthermore, concerns relating to the level of aggregation insofar as the disaggregation of a portfolio on profitability criteria and annual cohorts may not reflect how the business is run'.
- 3 The EFRAG Secretariat however considered it important to assess the specific characteristics related to mutual entities in the context of this request.
- 4 Please consider that discussing the topic of annual cohorts is not the purpose of this session nor of this paper and the reference to the level of aggregation has to be referred to the assessment of the implications for the mutual entities.

### **Appendix II - relevance**

#### *Mutual entities*

##### *Introduction*

- 5 Mutual entities exist in different forms in Europe and not all use IFRSs.<sup>1</sup> There is no definition of a mutual entity in European law.<sup>2</sup> Van Hulle describes them, referring to a definition of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors, as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> The scope of mutual entities (and other insurers) having to apply IFRS is currently changing in Sweden where the national regulator and supervisor announced, in late December 2019, that they will propose changes in the group accounting regulation for unlisted insurance companies. This would no longer require the application of IFRS for consolidated accounts in the insurance sector but become optional. EFRAG has been informed that a main reason for this change related to the absence of equity and total comprehensive income, described in paragraphs 9 to 12 of this paper. Mutual entities with listed debt have to apply IFRS.

<sup>2</sup> Directive 2009-138/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 on the taking-up and pursuit of the business of Insurance and Reinsurance (Solvency II) provides, in Annex III, a list of the legal forms of undertakings under the scope of this Directive, that includes Mutuals.

“Mutual insurance undertakings have the specific characteristics that they are collectively and indivisibly owned by their member-policyholders.”<sup>3</sup>

6 AMICE/ICMIF stated that “the fundamental distinguishing feature of mutual and cooperative insurers, setting them apart from listed insurance companies, is that they operate for the benefit of their members/policyholders rather than for the benefit of external investors.”<sup>4</sup>

7 Therefore, a fundamental difference between mutual entities and other corporate insurers is the absence of shareholders. Mutual entities may also have differences with respect to the contractual relationship between the policyholders/owners and the entity, as well as the role and set-up of collective buffer funds, and bonus allocation.

8 However, the legal form of the entity is not determinative of the types of contracts it issues, and a mutual entity may issue the same contracts as those by corporates<sup>5</sup>. These may include the following insurance contracts:

(a) Features meaning that the residual interest of the entity is *due* to policyholders (currently or in the future); or

(b) Features that do not give any policyholders any rights to the residual interest.

In the latter case, there are also situations where any residual will not accrue to policyholders but other parties, for instance charitable institutions.<sup>6</sup>

*Technical endorsement criterion - Relevance<sup>7</sup>*

9 A specific concern around relevance of IFRS 17 reporting for mutual entities relates to the fact that some of these entities will have no or less equity compared to the position under either IFRS 4 or Solvency II.

10 Under IFRS 4, contracts with discretionary participating features could give rise to an equity component to reflect the discretionary disbursements under these contracts. Under IFRS 17, the fulfilment cash flows include the expected discretionary payments based on estimates as at inception or period end. If the estimate of discretionary payment is changed, it will adjust the CSM.

11 Where the entity is contractually required to distribute profits to current and/or future policyholders, this forms part of the fulfilment cash flows at inception of the contract. This could mean that for these contracts there would be no CSM for the year as these are all subsumed into the fulfilment cash flows. This would mean that revenue and profit would differ from other insurers with contracts that produce CSM.

12 EFRAG acknowledges that an accounting change that results in little or no equity may cause disruption and uncertainty while the market adjusts to the new requirements. Many co-operatives and similar entities experienced the same on the adoption of IFRS and specifically the requirements under IAS 32 which in many cases resulted in less equity than they were accustomed to previously. In this

---

<sup>3</sup> Karel van Hulle, Solvency Requirements for EU Insurers - Solvency II is good for you, 2019.

<sup>4</sup> AMICE/ICMIF, Facts and figures: Mutual and cooperative insurance in Europe Vol 2, May 2018.

<sup>5</sup> In this instance referring to entities with owners who may or may not also be clients of the entity.

<sup>6</sup> EFRAG notes that the IASB education material and IFRS 17 before any amendments are not helpful in distinguishing and acknowledging these varying structures and contracts but recognises that the proposed amendment to the basis for conclusions would be useful.

<sup>7</sup> Information is relevant when it influences the economic decisions of users by helping them evaluate past, present or future events or by confirming or correcting their past evaluations.

regard, the disclosures in IAS 1 may provide useful information for users and regulators.

- 13 However, EFRAG notes that the issue of entities not having equity under IFRSs is not new nor due to IFRS 17 specifically. EFRAG considers the requirements in IFRS 17 appropriate in providing relevant information about the best estimate of the amount to be paid under the insurance contract. EFRAG does acknowledge that where a mutual entity has negative equity due to the related assets not being carried at fair value, this may be very hard to explain and may impair relevance and understandability.

#### IAS 1

- 14 IAS 1 requires disclosures on objectives, policies and processes to manage its capital. This includes a description of what the entity considers to be its capital, quantitative information about such amounts as well as information about any externally imposed capital requirements. Many entities provide information about its capital under such requirements and how this compares with the equity under IFRS.
- 15 IAS 1 also requires an entity to present additional line items, headings and subtotals in the statement of financial position (IAS 1 paragraph 55) and in the statement(s) presenting profit or loss and other comprehensive income (IAS 1 paragraph 85) when such presentation is relevant to an understanding of the entity's financial position or financial performance. Furthermore, similar to the requirements in IAS 1, IFRS 17 paragraph 117 specifically requires insurers (including mutual entities) to disclose the significant judgements and changes in judgement in applying this standard, including changes in estimates of (expected) future cash flows arising from the exercise of discretion.
- 16 Based on the above, EFRAG concludes that the conditions to meet the relevance criterion do not fundamentally differ between mutual entities and other insurers.

#### *Reliability<sup>8</sup>*

- 17 There are no specific concerns around reliability that is required to be covered by the DEA.

#### *Comparability<sup>9</sup>*

- 18 Under IFRS 17, the legal form of the insurer is not a determinant factor and all entities in the scope of this standard have to measure and report their fulfilment cash flow (expected payments to existing and future policyholders) in a similar way. This means that the criterion with respect to mutual entities is met in general.
- 19 However, the interaction between the constitution of some of these entities and IFRS 17 may impact revenue, CSM, and the profit recognised on some contracts as discussed in paragraph 11 above. However, EFRAG considers that this reflects the different contractual relationship between the policyholder and the mutual entity when compared to those where the insurer earns a variable fee.

---

<sup>8</sup> Information has the quality of reliability when it is free from material error and bias and can be depended on by users to represent faithfully what is either purports to represent or could reasonably be expected to represent, and is complete within the bounds of materiality and cost.

<sup>9</sup> The notion of comparability requires that like items and events are accounted for in a consistent way through time and by different entities, and that unlike items and events should be accounted for differently.

*Understandability*<sup>10</sup>

- 20 Some are concerned that the results under IFRS 17 for some mutual entities (refer to paragraph 11 above) would not be understandable to users or regulators. EFRAG acknowledges that the change will require education and clear communication as well as time to be embedded. However, as discussed in paragraphs 14 to 16, there are several required disclosures that would assist in this regard. Overall, EFRAG considers that the information under IFRS 17 will be understandable but acknowledges that negative equity may impair understandability for users.

*Prudence*<sup>11</sup>

- 21 There are no specific concerns around prudence that is required to be covered by the DEA.

**Comments received from EFRAG IAWG not incorporated in the text**

- 22 Some of the comments received have not yet been incorporated into the text of Appendix II of the DEA to first ask EFRAG TEG to conclude on the appropriateness of such changes.
- 23 These include:
- (a) Expansion to paragraph 11 to expand on enforceable and fully discretionary cash flows;
  - (b) Two requests to strengthen footnote 6 around the IASB education material and proposed amendments;
  - (c) A concern that onerous contracts would not be visible;
  - (d) A suggestion that the section on IAS 1 be deleted;
  - (e) Suggestions that the topic should be included under Appendix 3.

These are addressed in turn.

*Expansion of paragraph 11*

- 24 The suggested change to paragraph 11 was to add “*Cash flows that are not enforceable by policyholders are not ‘due’ to policyholders. Payments that only can be made after a decision of the general assembly of the mutual entity should never be considered enforceable because at the general meeting the policyholders act in their capacity as owners rather than as policyholders.*” Furthermore, that “*It should be added that fully discretionary cashflows are not part of the fulfilment cashflows*”.
- 25 The EFRAG Secretariat considers that the first part of the suggested expansion, while correct in the context of IAS 32 practice, is veering to interpretation which is outside the scope of the DEA. The EFRAG Secretariat also notes that per the principles of IFRS 17 expected discretionary cash flows do form part of the fulfilment cash flows (paragraph B65 (c)) with B65 stating “including cash flows for which the

---

<sup>10</sup> The notion of understandability requires that the financial information provided should be readily understandable by users with a reasonable knowledge of business and economic activity and accounting and the willingness to study the information with reasonable diligence.

<sup>11</sup> For the purpose of an endorsement advice, prudence is defined as caution in conditions of uncertainty. In some circumstances, prudence requires to have asymmetry in recognition such that assets or income are not overstated, and liabilities or expenses are not understated.

Prudence is different from and unrelated to prudential reporting. The former is a qualitative characteristic used in accounting standard setting and is applicable to the financial statements of all companies. The latter refers to the reporting by individual insurers to regulators to meet the regulator’s objectives (such as solvency).

entity has discretion over the amount or timing”. Therefore, the EFRAG Secretariat considers that the second proposed change should not be made.

*Footnote on IASB educational material*

- 26 There were two requests to expand the footnote including that it should be in the main document. The EFRAG Secretariat considers that the DEA is not appropriate for suggestions to the IASB in connection with its educational material. Furthermore, the amendment referred to in the footnote, will be confirmed when the new version of the standard has been finalised and may not be required by the time of publication of the DEA.
- 27 There was also a request to change the wording as follows which the EFRAG Secretariat believes would require the approval of EFRAG TEG and ultimately the EFRAG Board: *“EFRAG notes that the IASB educational material and IFRS 17 before any amendments are misleading because they do not distinguish and acknowledge these varying structures. It recognises that the proposed amendment to the basis for conclusions would go some way to remedying this defect, but it considers that the educational material should be either withdrawn by the IASB or substantially revised after due consultation with relevant stakeholders.”*

*Onerous contracts*

- 28 A concern was voiced that where the residual interest is contractually due to current and future policyholders, and there is no CSM, that onerous contract may not be visible. The EFRAG Secretariat notes that the description of onerous contracts in paragraph 47 of IFRS 17 does not refer to the CSM being below zero but defines a contract as onerous “if the fulfilment cash flows allocated to the contract, any previously recognised acquisition cash flows and any cash flows arising from the contract at the date of initial recognition in total are a net outflow.” Therefore, mutual entities would be required to reflect onerous contracts unless, like other entities, paragraphs B67 to B71 apply.

*Deletion of section referring to IAS 1*

- 29 The EFRAG Secretariat included the references to IAS 1 as there may be very important requirements in other standards that may lessen or fully resolve the concerns mentioned about IFRS 17. IFRS 17 does not operate in a vacuum and should not have to include all the other possible relevant requirements that are already captured in other standards and will provide users with relevant and important information. The EFRAG Secretariat considers that including complaints about lack of relevance or understandability of IFRS 17 requirements without referring to other relevant requirements would only tell half of the story. There was also at least one preparer in favour of inclusion of the IAS 1 section in the DEA.

*Inclusion in Appendix III*

- 30 One IAWG member suggested to include mutual entities in appendix III as those with listed bonds would be required to apply IFRS. Those members that commented seem to consider that the European public good related to mutual entities need to be addressed.
- 31 Another member indicated that IFRS Standards are designed to provide useful information primarily to shareholders and not necessarily to policyholders. This was countered by a user member who argued that policyholders are unable to compare accounting results across Europe (and globally) due to the current accounting and that IFRS should provide useful information also to policyholders.
- 32 Another IAWG member wanted to highlight the concern that many mutual entities may no longer use IFRS which constitute a large part of the industry in Sweden.

**Questions for EFRAG TEG**

- 33 Does EFRAG TEG have drafting suggestions to be included in the draft endorsement advice?
- 34 Should a section be included in Appendix III on this topic? Please explain your answer.