May 31, 2024

Tom Botsko  
Chair, Capital Adequacy (E) Task Force  
National Association of Insurance Commissioners  

Re: Risk-Based Capital Preamble Exposure

Dear Chair Botsko,

On behalf of the Prudential Regulation Committee (the committee) of the American Academy of Actuaries,1 I appreciate the opportunity to provide input to the Capital Adequacy Task Force (CADTF) on the exposed revisions to the Risk-Based Capital Preamble, 2024-16-CA. The Academy’s mission is to serve the public and the U.S. actuarial profession. As part of that mission, the Academy has historically closely collaborated with the NAIC and state regulators in updating components of the NAIC’s risk-based capital (RBC) framework to maintain it as an appropriate solvency monitoring tool. The committee has the following comments regarding the Exposure.

The Importance of RBC Transparency

We believe that maintaining public disclosure of the RBC level of individual insurance companies is beneficial to policyholders, consumers, and other external stakeholders. While recent discussion at the CADTF and the paragraphs added to the Preamble may point to the potential removal of RBC disclosures, we emphasize that a transparent basis of evaluating insurance company solvency is essential for an insurance regulatory regime. For example, maintaining public disclosure of available and required capital is aligned with the globally accepted framework for insurance supervision, as outlined in International Association of Insurance Supervisors (IAIS) Insurance Core Principle (ICP) 20.10. Disallowing such disclosures of the NAIC’s risk-based capital may imply a distancing from these principles for a sound supervisory regime.

We believe that RBC has served its purpose well in that it has assisted regulators in identifying weakly capitalized companies. It has also provided a general and consistent way for other stakeholders to obtain a high-level understanding of a company’s solvency position, which promotes public confidence. Removal of this important information may lead to the development of alternative metrics of solvency risk assessment and public reliance on those metrics, which would be detrimental to the public given the effectiveness of RBC.

The Uses of RBC Information

We appreciate the edits in the Exposure regarding certain misuses of RBC such as use for ranking individual companies or for detailed comparisons. While we recognize that there are instances in which

---

1 The American Academy of Actuaries is a 20,000-member professional association whose mission is to serve the public and the U.S. actuarial profession. For more than 50 years, the Academy has assisted public policymakers on all levels by providing leadership, objective expertise, and actuarial advice on risk and financial security issues. The Academy also sets qualification, practice, and professionalism standards for actuaries in the United States.
public data can be used for purposes that are not appropriate, if the data is valuable for its appropriate purposes eliminating it from the public domain may not be the best approach to solving the problem.

We also note that the Exposure may emphasize some of the misuses of RBC without fully highlighting the benefits that RBC has provided to companies, regulators, policyholders, and the industry in general for many years. The proposed changes to paragraphs 11 and 14 and the new section E may be interpreted by some readers as critical of RBC generally. While we understand the purpose of these paragraphs in terms of outlining RBC’s limitations, they may call into question the perceived validity and reliability of RBC when it has worked well for its purpose for many years. Therefore, we suggest the CADTF also consider potential revisions that reinforce the significant value that RBC has provided to date.

We agree with the additions made in section E about RBC being developed and calibrated for its primary use, the identification of potentially weakly capitalized companies. However, we disagree that any other use of RBC is inappropriate, including the use of RBC information outside of specific RBC action levels. For example, excess capital above the defined Authorized Control Level RBC provides useful information for company management and is regularly used by those focused on financial management and solvency risk, including actuaries. Part of sound risk management involves an assessment of Statutory-required and available capital levels in baseline and stressed conditions which can inform risk-based decision making. In addition, for some companies, RBC can be effective in capturing their risks, and these companies may reasonably use RBC as their primary capital management tool. We believe that the language in the exposure could better reflect these important company uses of RBC.

We also observe that RBC is utilized for other regulatory review tools such as ORSA and GCC, so the added language in Section E appears inconsistent with this practice of using RBC for broader purposes. For GCC specifically, the NAIC’s recent adoption of the excess relative ratio scaling approach indicates that capital levels above minimum requirements remain relevant, in this case, for understanding group solvency. As such, we believe the sole emphasis on identifying potentially weakly capitalized companies may not be appropriate and recommend tempering the language in Section E.

*****

If you have any questions or would like to discuss further, please contact Will Behnke, the Academy’s Risk Management and Financial Reporting policy analyst, at behnke@actuary.org.

Sincerely,

Tricia Matson, MAAA, FSA
Chairperson, Prudential Regulation Committee
American Academy of Actuaries