

**Letter of comment on FRED 30 from Royal & Sun Alliance**

31 October 2002

Accounting Standards Board  
Holborn Hall  
100 Gray's Inn Road  
London WC1X8AL

Dear Sirs

**FINANCIAL REPORTING EXPOSURE DRAFT NUMBER 30- FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS:  
DISCLOSURE AND PRESENTATION, RECOGNITION AND MEASUREMENT**

We welcome the opportunity to comment upon the Board's proposals to adopt amended versions of [draft] IAS 32 and [draft] IAS 39 into UK GAAP.

Before commenting on the content of the exposure draft we would like to take the opportunity to reiterate our concerns expressed in our letter of 27 September relating to the adoption of new accounting standards into the UK prior to the adoption of IAS in 2005. There will be particular concerns about the potential for a transitional adoption of parts of IAS 32/39 in 2004 followed by a full adoption of these standards in 2005. These concerns are exacerbated for insurers due to the uncertainty surrounding the accounting for insurance contracts under IAS at 2005 and in particular scope and basis of valuation for those contracts that fall outside the scope of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the insurance contracts project.

In conclusion we are totally opposed to the introduction of the contents of FRED 30 into UK GAAP prior to 2005.

Turning now to the contents of FRED 30 we do not propose to address the detailed questions on which comments were invited. We have participated in the drafting of the response by the Association of British Insurers on these issues and endorse their answers to the questions therein.

We would however like to take the opportunity to add our concerns to those expressed elsewhere about the specific issues that are relevant to our business and that have not been fully addressed in either the IASs or in the proposed changes. These are the specific concerns that we have as a European insurer in applying the proposed standards for the first time in 2005.

These comments are copied from our response to the IASB.

The IASB has already recognised the particular issues relating to insurance companies and has dedicated a great deal of resource into the project seeking to provide a coherent methodology for accounting for insurance contracts. The project has already included a high level of debate on the most fundamental question of defining an insurance contract and subsequent questions on the measurement basis. Our view of the former subject is that the definition currently included in the Draft Statement of Principles ("DSOP") represents a considerable improvement to that contained in IAS 32. We do however have doubts as to whether the adoption of the revised definition will resolve the issues surrounding many of the contracts that are written by insurers; in particular the long term insurance contracts that fail to meet the definition of an insurance contract.

The major issues to be resolved are addressed in the DSOP and are relevant to contracts that will fall either side of any divide of contracts written by insurers. We are fully supportive of the IASB's efforts

to resolve the financial reporting issues relating to insurance contracts. We are concerned that the same issues may need to be resolved within an accelerated timeframe in seeking to account for those contracts falling outside the scope of the insurance contract project and hence into the scope of IAS 39

The principal issues that we have identified are as follows: -

- Accounting for “investment contracts” which share features of profit participation with contracts falling within the scope of the insurance contract project,
- The treatment of renewal rights attaching to long term contracts written by insurance companies,
- Accounting for acquisition costs,
- The treatment of unallocated surpluses, and
- Accounting for embedded derivatives within insurance contracts.

We shall now deal with each of these issues in turn.

### **Profit Participation Contracts**

We have heard it often said that the categorisation of contracts written by insurance companies that fail to meet the definition of an insurance contract, will in many instances cause them to fall within the scope of IAS39 and hence into a treatment consistent with investment contracts written by other financial institutions:

The absence of any detailed guidance for the treatment of such contracts (other than the option to account for such contracts either at amortised cost or at fair value) suggests that there are features of such contracts that are characteristic of a more specific class of financial instrument. In the UK, there are likely to be contracts written by insurers that will be classified as insurance contracts and as investment contracts that share most important features, in particular profit participation characteristics. It would be unfortunate if the accounting treatment for those falling either side of the divide were ultimately accounted for in a different manner.

This may prompt calls for the bifurcation of such contracts into their component parts but we would argue that such a treatment would be inconsistent with the manner in which the writer of such contracts manages the business. In addition, a vital linkage between the components could be lost under such an approach. The insurance contract element often has a direct relationship with the investment contract by providing indemnity (in case of insurance claim) against a shortfall of a real (or notional) investment balance. Conversely, in the UK, there may also be a linkage between the investment contracts (including those with no insurance element) and the insurance contracts in that the investment contracts may participate in the results of the insurance contract portfolio as well as in the investment performance of the entity. We are not convinced that it will be feasible to determine a basis of accounting for either component of this mixed portfolio in isolation.

It could be that, when considering the accounting treatment of participating contracts in Phase 2 of the insurance contracts standard, the IASB may conclude that the treatment of all profit participation contracts will need to be brought into the scope of a consistent standard or guidance. As the IASB has not yet reached a conclusion on this section of the DSOP, we believe that it would be appropriate to include all the affected contracts within the scope of the Phase I solution.

The following three issues relate primarily to specific issues concerning participating contracts.

### **Renewal Rights**

A particular feature for some long term insurance contracts is the renewal rights of the policyholder. The writers of the DSOP spent a considerable amount of time considering the basis of recognition of cash flows arising from the exercise (or forfeiture) of such renewal rights. The DSOP considers the issues in the context of accounting for insurance contracts, but the same arguments will need to be considered when considering the basis of measurement of non-insurance contracts written by insurance companies. It would again seem to illogical to potentially adopt a different measurement system when accounting for renewal rights of insurance contracts and for renewal rights for contracts

falling just outside the definition of insurance contracts. We believe that guidance on this area needs to be provided by IASB in order to avoid the potential for diverse accounting treatments under IAS 39.

### **Acquisition costs**

Within the Phase I of the insurance contracts project it is proposed that existing practices of deferring acquisition costs are permitted to continue; at least until such time as the final standard is produced. There is continuing debate as to whether the deferral of such costs is permitted under the Framework with proponents giving examples of existing standards where similar treatment is permitted.

For those contracts scoped out of Phase 1 of the insurance contract standard, there will be a need for guidance as to whether the deferral of acquisition costs may be permitted to continue. If the practice is outlawed under guidance on the treatment under IAS 39 there is a danger that contracts that have been priced to provide an expected value to the provider, will show losses at the outset of contract. We are not convinced that this presentation is faithful to the principles set out in proposed amendments to paragraph 5 of IAS 8.

This issue is closely linked to the issue of recognition of cash flows associated with renewal options as noted above.

### **The treatment of unallocated surplus**

A particular feature of insurance accounting in the UK is the treatment of unallocated surplus. Under European law, insurance companies are permitted to recognise as a liability:

*“all funds the allocation of which either to policy holders or to shareholders has not been determined by the end of the financial year.”*

Such funds are recognised under the heading of the Fund for Future Appropriations (“FFA”). The accounting treatment for such items as currently fall under this category is being discussed in Phase I of the Insurance Contracts project. The use in the UK of this item is largely derived from the legal structure of Life Insurance Companies but a more general principle is of relevance here and will impact on entities in other territories. By way of example, European law also permits the use of a liability category of “Provision for bonuses and rebates” which is defined as:

*“amounts intended for policy holders or contract beneficiaries by way of bonuses and rebates to the extent that such amounts have not been credited to policy holders or contract beneficiaries ...”*

Additionally, similar issues may arise for companies in other jurisdictions currently carrying their investments at cost, when their investments are valued at fair value under IAS 39. This is in the context of constructive or legal restrictions upon the use to which any realised investment gains may be applied.

The DSOP seeks to address the treatment of the FFA (and to a lesser extent the related items identified above) in the context of the contingent obligations to current (and possibly future) generations of policyholder. These issues are currently unresolved.

The same issues arise in respect of obligations to holders of participating contracts that fall outside the scope of any definition of insurance contracts and into IAS 39.

### **Embedded Derivatives in Insurance Contracts**

We acknowledge the need to ensure that liabilities in respect of embedded derivatives are recognised but we are concerned about the practical issues of bifurcation of such items.

We note the recommendations within the DSOP that such liabilities are an integral part of the host Contract and as such that they should not be separately valued. If the IASB accepts the current proposals in the DSOP (Principle 1.6 - possibly by including an assumption that entity specific value equates for the purpose of paragraph 23(c) of [draft] IAS 39 to fair value) then there will no requirement to value such items separately. The issue may therefore only be relevant for the duration of Phase 1 of the Insurance Contract project.

We believe that the IASB should consider whether the current bases of valuing such insurance contracts takes into account the embedded derivative in calculating the overall liability of the hybrid contract. If the IASB is satisfied that this is the case, then we believe that in Phase I of the project insurers should not be required to apply paragraph 23 of [draft] IAS39.

I trust that you may find this response of assistance but should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Doug Logan  
Director, Group Technical Accounting