

EIOPA: Q&A (czerwiec 2020 r.)

Question ID: 2103

Question: The sentence below, taken from the 2019 update to the LOG files, is confusing for me: "If R0010/C0010 = 4 or 6, for Type 1 exposures, only R0100/C0080 shall be filed in for R0100". This is confusing as R0100 only has C0080 as reportable anyway (all other columns are crossed out for R0100) so it is not clear what the guidance is really advising. Perhaps the intention is to say that where option 4 or 6 is used in C0010 R0010 -> then there is no need to complete R0110 through R0200?

EIOPA's Answer: EIOPA confirms that in S.26.02 If R0010/C0010 = 4 or 6, for Type 1 exposures only C0080 should be reported while the other rows R0110-R0200 of Type 1 exposures are not to be reported. This will be further clarified in the next amendments.

Question ID: 2142

Question: According to the EIOPA-BoS-14/173 guidance (Guideline 27 – Re-aggregating the net losses to derive the SCR), if the dis-aggregation of gross losses is used to estimate the reinsurance recoveries to the more granular basis, undertakings should add up the net components to derive the SCR. Therefore the aggregation of net risk capital figures with the correlation matrices defined in the delegated act (art. 121) does not seem reasonable. Can you confirm our understanding? Do you consider any change in the formula of the validation ID BV914?

EIOPA's Answer: BV914 shall be deactivated and corrected in the next taxonomy release.

Question ID: 2152

Question: We would suggest to use TP without transitional measures on Technical Provision for calculation lapse/surrender rate volume in this QRT as it is difficult to allocate TMs into policy level. Can EIOPA confirm our understanding?

EIOPA Answer: This template is reported for Financial Stability purposes and on a best effort basis. We therefore agree with this approach.