



FINANCIAL  
STABILITY  
BOARD

# Key Attributes Assessment Methodology for the Insurance Sector

Methodology for Assessing the Implementation of the Key Attributes of Effective Resolution Regimes for Financial Institutions in the Insurance Sector (Revised version)



29 April 2026

*Explanatory note regarding other FSB Guidance concerning the definition of a “critical function” for insurers added to the 25 August 2020 Methodology.*

The Financial Stability Board (FSB) coordinates at the international level the work of national financial authorities and international standard-setting bodies in order to develop and promote the implementation of effective regulatory, supervisory and other financial sector policies. Its mandate is set out in the FSB Charter, which governs the policymaking and related activities of the FSB. These activities, including any decisions reached in their context, shall not be binding or give rise to any legal rights or obligations.

---

Contact the Financial Stability Board

Sign up for e-mail alerts: [www.fsb.org/emailalert](http://www.fsb.org/emailalert)

Follow the FSB on Twitter: [@FinStbBoard](https://twitter.com/FinStbBoard)

E-mail the FSB at: [fsb@fsb.org](mailto:fsb@fsb.org)

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations.....	1
Introduction.....	3
I. Definitions of key terms used in the methodology for the insurance sector.....	4
II. Purpose and use of the methodology.....	8
III. Conduct of compliance assessment.....	9
A. Essential criteria.....	9
B. Explanatory notes .....	10
C. Four-grade assessment scale .....	10
D. Grading taking into account proportionality .....	11
E. Need for access to a range of information and stakeholders .....	12
F. Assessors' Recommendations and Action Plan .....	12
IV. Application and assessments of recovery and resolution planning requirements .....	14
V. Preconditions for effective resolution regimes .....	16
VI. Assessment methodology .....	19
KA 1 Scope .....	19
Essential criteria for KA 1 .....	19
Explanatory notes for KA 1.....	20
KA 2 Resolution Authority.....	22
Essential criteria for KA 2 .....	22
Explanatory notes for KA 2.....	23
KA 3 Resolution powers .....	27
Essential criteria for KA 3 .....	29
Explanatory notes for KA 3.....	32
KA 4 Set-off, netting, collateralisation, segregation of client assets.....	41
Essential criteria for KA 4 .....	41
Explanatory notes for KA 4.....	42
KA 5 Safeguards .....	44
Essential criteria for KA 5 .....	44
Explanatory notes for KA 5.....	45
KA 6 Funding of firms in resolution .....	47
Essential criteria for KA 6 .....	47
Explanatory notes for KA 6.....	48

KA 7	Legal framework conditions for cross-border cooperation .....	50
	Essential criteria for KA 7 .....	51
	Explanatory notes for KA 7 .....	52
KA 8	Crisis Management Groups (CMGs) .....	56
	Essential criteria for KA 8 .....	56
	Explanatory notes for KA 8 .....	56
KA 9	Institution-specific cross-border cooperation agreements .....	58
	Essential criteria for KA 9 .....	58
	Explanatory notes for KA 9 .....	59
KA 10	Resolvability assessments .....	60
	Essential criteria for KA 10 .....	60
	Explanatory notes for KA 10 .....	61
KA 11	Recovery and resolution planning .....	62
	Essential criteria for KA 11 .....	63
	Explanatory notes for KA 11 .....	65
KA 12	Access to information and information sharing .....	67
	Essential criteria for KA 12 .....	67
	Explanatory notes for KA 12 .....	68

## Abbreviations

CCP	Central Counterparty
CMG	Crisis Management Group
COAG	Institution-specific Cooperation Agreement
EC	Essential Criterion
EN	Explanatory Note
EU	European Union
FMI	Financial Market Infrastructure
FSAP	Financial Sector Assessment Program
FSB	Financial Stability Board
G-SII	Global Systemically Important Insurer
G-SIFI	Global Systemically Important Financial Institution
IAIS	International Association of Insurance Supervisors
IMF	International Monetary Fund
KA	Key Attribute
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
PFMI	CPSS-IOSCO Principles for Financial Market Infrastructure
PPS	Policyholder Protection Scheme
RAP	Resolvability Assessment Process
ROSC	Report on the Observance of Standards and Codes
RRP	Recovery and Resolution Plan
SIFI	Systemically Important Financial Institution
WB	World Bank

## Explanatory note (April 2026)

Following the original publication of this assessment methodology, the FSB published Scope of Insurers Subject to the Recovery and Resolution Planning Requirements in the FSB Key Attributes: Final Report. That guidance revises the definition of a critical function to have the following three elements:

- (1) The function is provided by the insurer to third parties not affiliated with the insurer;
- (2) The sudden failure to provide the function would be likely to have a material impact on the financial system **and/or** the real economy; and
- (3) The function cannot be substituted within a reasonable period of time and at a reasonable cost.

## Introduction

The FSB *Key Attributes of Effective Resolution Regimes for Financial Institutions* (Key Attributes) were adopted in October 2011 and endorsed as a new international standard for resolution regimes by the G20 Leaders at the Cannes Summit. The original Key Attributes were supplemented in October 2014 with new Annexes containing sector-specific guidance that sets out how the Key Attributes should be applied for insurers, FMIs and the protection of client assets in resolution and implementation guidance that elaborates on specific Key Attributes (KAs) relating to information sharing for resolution purposes.<sup>1</sup>

The Key Attributes apply to resolution regimes for any type of financial institution that could be systemically significant or critical if it fails. Financial institutions include banks, insurers, investment and securities firms and FMIs. The Key Attributes also cover the resolution of financial groups and conglomerates and therefore extend to both holding companies of and non-regulated operational entities within a financial group or conglomerate.

The Key Attributes constitute an ‘umbrella’ standard for resolution regimes for all types of financial institutions. However, not all attributes are equally relevant for all sectors. Some KAs require adaptation and sector-specific interpretation of individual KAs. This document sets out a methodology to guide the assessment of a jurisdiction’s compliance with the Key Attributes **with respect to the insurance sector**.

---

<sup>1</sup> See [http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r\\_141015.pdf](http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r_141015.pdf).

## I. Definitions of key terms used in the methodology for the insurance sector

**“Action Plan”** – a formal plan that recommends and prioritises improvements of a general or sector-specific nature to a jurisdiction’s resolution regime that is developed by the jurisdiction following an assessment using this methodology and designed to achieve the regime’s compliance with the Key Attributes.

**“Administrator”** includes receivers, trustees, conservators, liquidators or other officers appointed by a resolution authority or court to manage and carry out the resolution of an insurer.

**“Agents of a resolution authority”** include any person, other than an employee, who carries out actions on behalf of the resolution authority in the ordinary course of its agency agreement or under a contract for services.

**“Bail-in”** – restructuring mechanisms (howsoever labelled) that enable loss absorption and the recapitalisation of an insurer in resolution or the effective capitalisation of a bridge institution through the cancellation, write-down or termination of equity, debt instruments and other senior or subordinated unsecured liabilities of the insurer in resolution, and the conversion or exchange of all or part of such instruments or liabilities (or claims on the insurer) into or for equity in or other ownership instruments issued by that insurer, a successor (including a bridge institution) or a parent company of that insurer.

**“Bail-out”** – any transfer of funds from public sources to a failed insurer or a commitment by a public authority to provide funds with a view to sustaining a failed insurer (for example, by way of guarantees) that results in benefit to its shareholders or unsecured creditors, or the assumption of risks by the public authority that would otherwise be borne by the insurer itself, where the value of the funds transferred is not recouped from the insurer, its shareholders or unsecured creditors or, if necessary, the financial system more widely, or where the public authority is not fully compensated for the risks assumed.

**“Bridge institution”** – an entity that is established to temporarily take over and maintain certain assets, liabilities and operations of a failed insurer as part of the resolution process.

**“Creditors”** includes policyholders unless otherwise specified, in relation to liabilities under insurance contracts, irrespective of whether those claims are currently due and payable or contingent and unquantified.

**“Critical functions”** – activities performed by an insurer for third parties that cannot be substituted within a reasonable time and at a reasonable cost, and where the failure to perform the activities would be likely to have a material impact on the financial system or the real economy (for example, by giving rise to systemic disruption or by undermining general confidence in the provision of insurance).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See FSB’s guidance on “Developing Effective Resolution Strategies and Plans for Systemically Important Insurers” (<http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/Final-guidance-on-insurance-resolution-strategies.pdf>), which sets out guidance on the identification of critical functions including considerations for assessing criticality and substitutability of functions.

**“Early termination rights”** – contractual acceleration, termination or other close-out rights (for example, under financial contracts), including cross-default rights, held by counterparties of an insurer that may be triggered on the occurrence of an enforcement or credit event set out in the contract.<sup>3</sup>

**“Essential services”** – services that are necessary to support continuity of critical functions including but not limited to critical shared services<sup>4</sup> (for example, treasury-related services or information technology services).

**“Financial conglomerate”** – any financial group that conducts material financial activities in at least two of the regulated banking, securities or insurance sectors.<sup>5</sup>

**“Financial contract”** – any contract that is explicitly identified under the legal framework of the jurisdiction as subject to defined treatment in resolution and insolvency for the purposes of termination and netting. Typically, financial contracts include contracts for the purchase or sale of securities; derivatives contracts; commodities contracts; repurchase agreements; and similar contracts or agreements.

**“Financial group”** – a parent company (which may be a holding company) and its direct and indirect subsidiaries, both domestic and foreign, the primary activities of which are financial in nature. For the purposes of this assessment methodology, a financial group is relevant only if it includes an insurance company (whether or not it includes other financial institutions).<sup>6</sup>

**“Financial institution”** – any entity the principal business of which is the provision of financial services or the conduct of financial activities.

**“Financial market infrastructure (FMI)”** – a multilateral system among participating financial institutions, including the operator of the system, used for the purposes of, clearing, settling or recording payments, securities, derivatives or other financial transactions. It includes payment systems, central securities depositories, securities settlement systems, CCPs and trade repositories.<sup>7</sup>

**“G-SII”** – an insurer identified by the FSB, in consultation with the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (IAIS) and national authorities, as globally systemically important.

**“G-SIFI”** – a financial institution (i.e. bank or insurer) designated by the FSB as globally systemically important.

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, see §§ 5(a) (vii) and 6 of 2002 ISDA Master Agreement; section 10 of Global Master Repurchase Agreement 2000.

<sup>4</sup> See FSB’s “Guidance on Identification of Critical Functions and Critical Shared Services” ([http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r\\_130716a.pdf](http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r_130716a.pdf)), July 2013 and FSB’s “Developing Effective Resolution Strategies and Plans for Systemically Important Insurers” (<http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/Final-guidance-on-insurance-resolution-strategies.pdf>), June 2016.

<sup>5</sup> As defined in the Joint Forum’s “Principles for the supervision of financial conglomerates” (<http://www.bis.org/publ/joint29.pdf>), September 2012. The definition also covers ‘financial conglomerates’, including insurance-led financial conglomerates’ as understood in the IAIS Insurance Core Principles of October 2011 (as updated in November 2017 (<https://www.iaisweb.org/page/supervisory-material/insurance-core-principles//file/70028/all-adopted-icps-updated-november-2017>)).

<sup>6</sup> The definition also covers ‘insurance groups’ as understood in the IAIS Insurance Core Principles of October 2011 (as updated in November 2017 (<https://www.iaisweb.org/page/supervisory-material/insurance-core-principles//file/70028/all-adopted-icps-updated-november-2017>)).

<sup>7</sup> As defined in the PFMI (<http://www.bis.org/cpmi/publ/d101a.pdf>), April 2012.

**“Holding company”** – a legal entity that owns and controls one or more insurance companies. This concept covers direct, intermediate and ultimate control.<sup>8</sup>

**“Home jurisdiction”** – the jurisdiction where the operations of an insurer or financial group or conglomerate are supervised on a consolidated basis.

**“Insurance company”** – means any legal entity (including its branches) that assumes insurance risks in exchange for a premium payment and is licensed under a jurisdiction’s legal framework as an insurance company for any type of insurance product (for example, reinsurance, life insurance, non-life insurance, etc.).

**“Insurance contract”** – a contract recognised as contract of insurance under a jurisdiction’s legal or regulatory framework, typically including any contract under which an insurance company agrees to make a payment or provide a benefit to the policyholder on the occurrence of a future event specified in the contract, the occurrence or timing of which is or may be uncertain.

**“Insurer”** refers to an insurance company or a holding company.

**“Insurer in resolution”** – an insurer in relation to which resolution powers are being exercised. Where resolution powers have been or are being exercised in relation to an insurer, that insurer is considered to be “in resolution” for as long as it remains subject to measures taken by or otherwise under the control of a resolution authority or remains in insolvency proceedings initiated in conjunction with the exercise of resolution powers.

**“Legal framework”** – the comprehensive legal system for a jurisdiction established by any combination of the following: a constitution; primary legislation enacted by a legislative body that has authority in respect of that jurisdiction; subsidiary legislation (including legally binding regulations or rules) adopted under the primary legislation of that jurisdiction; or legal precedent and legal procedures of that jurisdiction.

**“Legal gateways”** means provisions set out in statute or other instruments with the force of law that enable the disclosure of non-public information to specified recipients or for specified purposes. Legal gateways may be contingent on, or supported by, memoranda of understanding or other forms of agreement between the authorities providing the information and those receiving it.

**“Mandate”**, in relation to a resolution authority, means the assignment to it of responsibilities relating to resolution by the legal framework.

**“Policyholder”** means the person who is the legal holder of an insurance contract and/or any person to whom, under the contract, any sum may be payable or any other benefit may be provided (including beneficiaries and claimants).

---

<sup>8</sup> The definition also covers a ‘head of the group (or parent)’ as understood in the IAIS Insurance Core Principles of October 2011 (as updated in November 2017, see <https://www.iaisweb.org/page/supervisory-material/insurance-core-principles//file/70028/all-adopted-icps-updated-november-2017>). That is, the legal entity that is at the top of a group structure and could be a non-operating holding company or an insurance legal entity, among others.

**“Policyholder protection scheme (PPS)”** – any scheme or fund that protects policyholders from specified losses that they might otherwise incur as a result of the failure of an insurance company. Any entity or body that administers the PPS is referred to “PPS administrator”.

**“Public ownership”** – full or majority ownership of an entity by the State or an emanation of the State.

**“Resolution”** – the exercise of one or more resolution powers by a resolution authority over an insurer that meets the conditions for entry into resolution with the aim of achieving the statutory objectives of resolution set out in KA 2.3. The exercise of resolution powers may occur with or without private sector involvement. The exercise of resolution powers also covers the conduct of insolvency proceedings for example, to wind down parts of an insurer in resolution.

**“Resolution authority”** – a public authority that, either alone or together with other authorities, is responsible for planning and carrying out resolution of insurers established in its jurisdiction. References in this document to a “resolution authority” should be read as “resolution authorities” in appropriate cases.

**“Resolution powers”** – powers available to resolution authorities under the legal framework for the purposes of resolution. The powers are exercisable without the consent of shareholders, creditors, debtors or the insurer in resolution subject to constitutionally protected legal remedies and due process.

**“Resolution regime”** – the elements of the legal framework and the policies governing resolution planning and preparing for, carrying out and coordinating resolution, including the application of resolution powers.

**“Supervisor”** or “supervisory authority” – the authority responsible for the supervision or regulation of an insurer. References include, as relevant, prudential and business or market conduct supervisors.

**“Systemically significant or critical”** –A circumstance where a failure of an insurer could lead to a disruption of services critical for the functioning of the financial system or real economy.

## II. Purpose and use of the methodology

The purpose of the methodology is to guide the assessment of a jurisdiction's compliance with the Key Attributes and promote consistent assessments across jurisdictions.

The methodology is intended primarily for use in the following:

- (i) assessments performed by authorities of existing resolution regimes of their jurisdiction and of any reforms to those regimes that implement the Key Attributes;
- (ii) peer reviews of resolution regimes conducted within the FSB framework for implementation monitoring by member jurisdictions; and
- (iii) IMF and WB assessments of resolution regimes, for example in the context of FSAPs and ROSCs.

The methodology may also be a useful tool for a jurisdiction that is adopting new resolution regimes or reviewing, reforming or making improvements to its existing regimes. The primary audience for this methodology is assessors, resolution authorities and authorities responsible for developing legislation related to resolution regimes.

### III. Conduct of compliance assessment

The primary objective of an assessment is to evaluate compliance of a jurisdiction's resolution regime with the Key Attributes. The assessment report should include a short summary view of whether the resolution regime has the required scope and broadly reflects the attributes set out in the Key Attributes.

Where relevant, the assessment should also address practical implementation of the requirements of the Key Attributes to establish whether the jurisdiction achieves the intended outcome of the relevant KA or, in the absence of practical experience (or when implementation is in transition), whether there are reasonably foreseeable obstacles to its effective implementation. Implementation is deemed to be effective when the objective of a specific KA has been met or could reasonably be expected to be met. The assessment should not focus solely on deficiencies, but should also highlight specific achievements and provide concrete recommendations for addressing any weaknesses highlighted. In the assessment, the KAs that are directly linked to G-SIIs should be assessed if there is a G-SII domiciled in the jurisdiction, or if a jurisdiction has determined that the policy measures in the KAs applicable to G-SIIs are appropriate for application to firms otherwise designated as systemically important.

An assessment of a jurisdiction's resolution regime must recognise that the regime should be proportionate to the complexity and systemic importance of the insurers to which it applies. This principle should underpin the assessment of all KAs even if it is not explicit in the EC.

The assessment must be comprehensive enough to allow a judgment as to whether a KA is met in practice, not just in theory. Even in the absence of practical experience, a jurisdiction will be considered compliant with a KA if there are no reasonably foreseeable obstacles to effective implementation of the requirement of the KA. Potential obstacles include insufficient resources, insufficient independence, or inadequate governance.

The legal framework needs to be sufficient in scope and depth and be effectively complied with and enforced. Assessors should assess whether all powers exercisable by a public authority have a sufficient legal basis. Such powers should not be assessed solely by comparing the wording in the legal framework with that of the Key Attributes because legal terminology can differ across jurisdictions. Where those powers are not clearly set out in the legal framework, the onus is on the assessed jurisdiction to demonstrate that it has met the KA in theory and practice with a sufficient legal basis.

The assessment should assess a jurisdiction's resolution regime against the Key Attributes and recommend the measures that need to be taken in order to address any shortcomings identified. The key goal of the assessment is therefore not the assignment of the compliance grade (although this is a necessary part of the exercise), but rather to focus authorities' attention on areas that need improvement and to suggest the development of a specific Action Plan.

#### A. Essential criteria

The methodology proposes a set of essential criteria (ECs) that should be used to assess compliance with the relevant KA. The ECs are the only elements on which assessors should

assess and grade compliance with a KA. They should not be interpreted in a manner that is inconsistent with the KA on which they are based. The methodology does not include “additional criteria” (which are used in some assessment methodologies and are based on best practices that might go beyond the core elements required by the standards in question).

## B. Explanatory notes

The methodology includes explanatory notes (ENs) that provide examples, explanations and cross-references to other relevant KAs, and specific definitions not included in the Definitions of key terms (see Section I). The ENs do not contain assessment criteria, but are intended to guide the interpretation of the KAs and the ECs.

## C. Four-grade assessment scale

For assessments, the following four-grade scale will be used:

- **Compliant:** A jurisdiction will be considered compliant with a KA when all applicable ECs are met without any significant deficiencies.
- **Largely compliant:** A jurisdiction will be considered largely compliant with a KA when only limited shortcomings are observed which do not raise any concerns about the jurisdiction’s ability and clear intent to achieve full compliance with the KA within a prescribed period. The grade “largely compliant” can, in particular, be used when the regime does not meet all applicable ECs, but overall the regime is sufficiently robust and comprehensive and no material risks are left unaddressed.
- **Materially non-compliant:** A jurisdiction will be considered materially non-compliant with a KA when there are severe shortcomings in the jurisdiction’s compliance with the relevant KA, including in instances where formal rules, regulations and procedures exist but practical implementation of the KA has been weak. It is acknowledged that the gap between “largely compliant” and “materially non-compliant” is wide and that a choice between the two grades may be difficult, particularly in circumstances in which the implementation of a particular KA is ongoing. The intention is to require assessors to make a clear statement.
- **Non-compliant:** A jurisdiction will be considered non-compliant with a KA when there is no substantive implementation of the KA, several ECs are not complied with or the resolution regime is manifestly ineffective. If there is only one EC for a KA and the jurisdiction does not meet that criterion, then the jurisdiction will be considered non-compliant with respect to that KA.

Grading is not an exact science and the EC should not be used as a checklist: instead, assessors should apply a qualitative approach in their assessments. Depending upon the structure of the financial sector and the circumstances in a given jurisdiction, compliance with certain ECs for a specific KA may be more critical for the completeness or effectiveness of the resolution regime than compliance with others. Therefore, the number of individual EC complied with is not always an indication of the overall grading for any given KA.

## D. Grading taking into account proportionality

The overall assessment should take into account the structure and complexity of the financial sector, such as the presence of G-SIIs or other insurers that could be systemically significant or critical in failure, the relative systemic importance of different sectors and the market environment of the jurisdiction that is being assessed. An assessment must recognise that a jurisdiction's resolution regime should be proportionate, in scope and depth, to the size, structure and complexity of the jurisdiction's insurance system.

An individual KA or EC (or certain elements of a KA or an EC) may be considered "not applicable" when, in the assessors' view, the KA or EC (or relevant elements) does not apply to a jurisdiction because of structural, legal or institutional features of the insurance sector that are not likely to change in the foreseeable future. For example:

- if a KA applies only to a jurisdiction that is home to a G-SII, that KA should be "not applicable" with respect to a jurisdiction that is not home to a G-SII;
- if the KA or EC presupposes the existence of branches of foreign insurers in the jurisdiction under review and, by law, foreign insurers are prohibited from operating in the jurisdiction under review through branches, the KA or EC may be considered "not applicable"; and
- if a jurisdiction does not have insurance holding companies, or the insurers of such jurisdiction do not rely on financial group entities for critical shared services, criteria that apply to such entities may be considered "not applicable". Moreover, resolution powers would not be applicable to non-financial firms that are part of a financial group or financial conglomerates, if they do not provide services to financial firms in the group and their failure would not trigger or impede resolution.

An assessment may also need to accommodate the interdependence of particular ECs. In such cases, it is important to identify the unique elements of each of the interrelated ECs, and to assess these elements separately to avoid duplicative assessments. At the same time, a determination of "not applicable" may be necessary with respect to components of interdependent KAs. Specifically, this would be the case with respect to the relationship between KA 3 and the safeguards in KA 5, where certain ECs related to safeguards under KA 5 will be considered as not applicable if they assume the existence of the resolution powers under KA 3 and the jurisdiction under review has been assessed as non-compliant, or a "not applicable" assessment has been made, with respect to such powers.

The onus is on the assessed jurisdiction to demonstrate that certain KA or ECs are "not applicable"; however, the ultimate judgment rests with the assessors. If assessors determine that certain ECs are "not applicable", grading for the KA should be based on level of compliance with the applicable ECs only. If all ECs for a KA are determined to be "not applicable", then that KA will be considered "not applicable" for the purposes of the assessment of that jurisdiction. The ECs assessed must allow for a determination of whether the resolution regime can achieve the ultimate objectives of the KA, and a "not applicable" determination should not be used if it would impede such a judgment.

The use of a “not applicable” should be strictly limited, and the reasoning for or determining a particular KA or EC (or certain elements of a KA or EC) is “not applicable”, must be documented and clearly explained to allow a future review to reconsider the grading if the situation changes. In making such determinations, assessors should bear in mind that features of the insurance sector that render a KA or an EC not applicable at the time of the assessment may evolve, and that these criteria may become relevant in future.

## E. Need for access to a range of information and stakeholders

The assessors must have access to a range of information, individuals and organisations in order to evaluate fully a jurisdiction’s compliance with the *Key Attributes*. These may include the resolution and supervisory authorities, the market regulator, the central bank, relevant PPS administrators, relevant government ministries and other authorities, financial institutions and industry associations, auditors, insolvency practitioners and other financial sector participants.

Some of the information required will already be public, such as the relevant laws, regulations and certain policies. Other information required by the assessors may not be publicly available, for example any self-assessments, operational guidelines for resolution authorities and the overall results of resolvability assessments of and recovery and resolution planning for financial institutions, and institution specific cooperation agreements.<sup>9</sup> If the need for such information for the purposes of the assessment is demonstrated, it should be provided to assessors unless doing so would breach secrecy or confidentiality requirements that bind the relevant public authorities. Experience has shown that some concerns related to confidentiality may be solved through *ad hoc* arrangements between the public authorities of the jurisdiction being assessed, the assessors and the insurers to which the information relates.<sup>10</sup>

Assessors should note any instances where required information is not provided or where requested meetings could not be held, and indicate the reasons why the information was not provided or the meeting not held and the impact this had on the completeness and accuracy of the assessment. In the absence of valid reasons for the failure of the assessed jurisdiction to provide requested information or arrange requested meetings, assessors should be entitled to conclude that the jurisdiction has not implemented the specific KA for which that information or those meetings were relevant and reflect this in their rating.

## F. Assessors’ Recommendations and Action Plan

Assessors should make appropriate recommendations for the jurisdiction assessed. It is the responsibility of the jurisdiction to develop an action plan that includes specific actions and measures to improve the resolution regime.

The desired outcome of an assessment is a shared view between assessors and the authorities on recommended actions needed to improve a jurisdiction’s resolution regime. However, the

---

<sup>9</sup> As the objective of the methodology is not to assess the resolvability of individual institutions, access to individual results of supervisory and resolvability assessments of and recovery and resolution planning for individual financial institutions is not necessary.

<sup>10</sup> Some organisations and agencies involved in an assessment provide comfort letters on their policies on the treatment of confidential information rather than signing confidentiality agreements.

actions to be recommended are ultimately a decision for the assessors. Undue emphasis should not be placed on the specific grade that is given; rather, attention should focus on the commentary that accompanies the assessment of each KA and on the measures recommended in the Action Plan. This may be particularly important where the ECs for certain KAs (and therefore the grading) are interconnected.

Recommendations relating to the preconditions (see section V below) will not be part of the Action Plan, but may be included in general recommendations for strengthening the resolution regime.

## IV. Application and assessments of recovery and resolution planning requirements

In October 2010, the FSB published a policy framework for addressing the systemic and moral hazard risks associated with systemically important financial institutions (SIFIs) whose disorderly failure, because of their size, complexity and systemic interconnectedness, would cause significant disruption to the wider financial system and economic activity.<sup>11</sup> The policy framework recommended that in particular financial institutions that are clearly systemic in a global context (G-SIFIs) should be subject to recovery and resolution planning to reduce the probability and impact of their failure. In November 2011, the FSB published an integrated set of policy measures to implement the policy framework, which included the recovery and resolution planning requirements set out in the Key Attributes.<sup>12</sup> The FSB made a commitment to apply the framework initially to banks and to review how to extend the framework to a wider group of SIFIs.<sup>13</sup>

In July 2013, the FSB, in consultation with the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (IAIS) and national authorities, identified an initial list of nine G-SIIs using an assessment methodology developed by the IAIS. The policy measures that should apply to them include the recovery and resolution planning requirements for G-SIFIs set out in the Key Attributes.<sup>14, 15</sup> In November 2017, the FSB, also in consultation with the IAIS and national authorities, decided not to publish a new list of G-SIIs for 2017. FSB members agreed that this approach was necessary given that the IAIS was developing an activities-based approach to systemic risk.<sup>16</sup>

In November 2019, The Financial Stability Board (FSB) welcomed the finalisation and publication of the IAIS's Holistic Framework for Systemic Risk in the Insurance Sector, for implementation in 2020.<sup>17</sup> In light of the finalised holistic framework, the FSB, in consultation with the IAIS and national authorities, has decided to suspend G-SII identification as from the beginning of 2020. In November 2022, the FSB will, based on the initial years of implementation of the holistic framework, review the need to either discontinue or re-establish an annual identification of G-SIIs by the FSB in consultation with the IAIS and national authorities.

Most of the KAs apply generally to resolution regimes for “financial institutions that could be systemically significant or critical if they fail”. **KAs 8 to 10** are aimed specifically at G-SIFIs, and home jurisdictions may find them relevant for other insurers whom they identify as systemic.

**KAs 8 and 9** require home and key host authorities of G-SIFIs to maintain a Crisis Management Group (CMG) and institution-specific cooperation agreements (COAGs). **KA 10** provides that resolvability assessments that evaluate the feasibility of resolution strategies, and their credibility

---

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r\\_101111a.pdf](http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r_101111a.pdf).

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/Policy-Measures-to-Address-Systemically-Important-Financial-Institutions.pdf>.

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r\\_101111a.pdf](http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r_101111a.pdf).

<sup>14</sup> [http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r\\_130718.pdf?page\\_moved=1](http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r_130718.pdf?page_moved=1).

<sup>15</sup> FSB (2014) *Key Attributes of Effective Resolution Regimes for Financial Institutions* (October). Includes Annexes containing sector-specific guidance that set out how the KAs should be applied for insurers and financial market infrastructures.

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.fsb.org/2017/11/review-of-the-list-of-global-systemically-important-insurers-g-siis/>

<sup>17</sup> FSB (2019) press release *FSB welcomes insurance holistic framework*, November.

in light of the likely impact of the firm's failure on the financial system and the overall economy, should be undertaken "at least for G-SIFIs."

The recovery and resolution planning requirement set out in **KA 11** applies to any financial institution that could be systemically significant or critical in the event of failure. Effective recovery and resolution planning in accordance with KA 11 may also require arrangements for cooperation and coordination between home and relevant host authorities to the extent that a financial institution that could be systemically significant or critical if it were to fail has cross-border operations that are material to the financial institution. Accordingly, EC 11.2 also assesses the existence of appropriate arrangements for cross-border cooperation and coordination in relation to insurers with cross-border operations that are not G-SIIs.

**KA 11** should be assessed if there is a G-SII domiciled in the jurisdiction, or if there are firms that the supervisory and resolution authorities have determined could be systemically important if they fail.

Assessments under this methodology should focus on whether a resolution regime provides the framework, powers and requirements necessary to implement **KAs 8 to 11** in the jurisdiction under review, rather than examining how the regime has been or may be applied to individual insurers in specific scenarios (i.e., idiosyncratic versus systemic).<sup>18</sup> The assessment would not require confidential insurer-specific information to be shared with assessors where this is not possible under the applicable legal framework.

---

<sup>18</sup> Other FSB monitoring processes, including the Resolvability Assessment Process or 'RAP', focus on how the requirements are met in relation to individual G-SIIs.

## V. Preconditions for effective resolution regimes

A number of preconditions have a direct impact on the effectiveness of resolution regimes. These include:

- A. a well-established framework for financial stability, surveillance and policy formulation (Precondition A);
- B. an effective system of supervision, regulation and oversight of insurers (Precondition B);
- C. effective mechanisms for the protection of policyholders (Precondition C);
- D. a robust accounting, auditing and disclosure regime (Precondition D); and
- E. a well-developed legal framework and judicial system, in particular liquidation/bankruptcy regime (Precondition E).

Some of these preconditions are likely to be outside the direct responsibility and/or competencies of resolution authorities.

Insufficient implementation of the preconditions can seriously undermine the quality and effectiveness of resolution. The presence of the preconditions will have a positive, and weaknesses in those areas may have a negative, impact on the effectiveness of resolution regimes. Where assessors have concerns about weaknesses in the preconditions, their assessment should note any actual or potential negative impact.

Assessors should not assess the preconditions themselves, as this is beyond the scope of an assessment of the Key Attributes. Instead, assessors should rely on IMF and WB assessments<sup>19</sup> having regard to any actions taken by authorities and any changes of preconditions that may have occurred after the conduct of those assessments. When relevant, the assessors should include in their analysis the links between the implementation of individual preconditions and the effectiveness of resolution regimes. To the extent that shortcomings in preconditions are material to the effectiveness of resolution, they may affect the grading of the affected KAs.

### Precondition A: A well-established framework for financial stability, surveillance and policy formulation

In view of the interplay between the real economy and the financial system, it is important that jurisdictions have a robust framework for macro-prudential surveillance and the formulation and implementation of financial stability policy.<sup>20</sup> Such a framework should specify the authorities responsible for the following functions:

---

<sup>19</sup> The main sources of information on the extent to which the preconditions are present in a jurisdiction will be reports of country assessments carried out by the IMF and WB under the FSAPs and ROSCs relating to relevant supervisory standards. For the FSB's compendium of standards, see [http://www.fsb.org/what-we-do/about-the-compendium-of-standards/?page\\_moved=1](http://www.fsb.org/what-we-do/about-the-compendium-of-standards/?page_moved=1).

<sup>20</sup> The results of a FSAP or ROSC carried out by the IMF and/or WB may be used to assess the existence and effectiveness of such a framework.

- identifying systemic risk in the financial system;
- monitoring and analysing market and other financial and economic factors that may lead to the accumulation of systemic risks;
- formulating and implementing appropriate policies; and
- assessing how such policies may affect individual financial institutions and the financial system more broadly.

## Precondition B: An effective system of supervision, regulation and oversight of insurers

Jurisdictions should have a system of supervision, regulation and oversight that meets the relevant regulatory and supervisory standards (see IAIS<sup>21</sup>) and that:

- develops and maintains a forward-looking assessment of the risk profile of individual insurers, thereby enabling supervisors to identify, assess and take action with respect to risks arising from individual insurers or the financial system as a whole;
- provides for increased intensity of supervision of an insurer that is encountering difficulties that, if not addressed, could jeopardise its continued viability and ensures that such heightened supervisory attention will support early intervention and orderly resolution in those cases where serious problems cannot be remedied by other measures;
- provides the supervisor with an adequate range of enforcement tools to bring about timely corrective action and address unsafe and unsound practices or activities that could pose risks to insurers or to the financial system; and
- provides for a framework for the winding up and exit of insurance legal entities from the market.<sup>22</sup>

## Precondition C: Effective mechanisms for the protection of policyholders

Jurisdictions should have effective mechanisms for the protection of policyholders and clear rules on the treatment of assets held in support of or as reserves for policyholder obligations.

Jurisdictions that have in place a PPS should:

---

<sup>21</sup> See "Insurance Core Principles" (<https://www.iaisweb.org/page/supervisory-material/insurance-core-principles/file/70028/all-adopted-icps-updated-november-2017>), November 2017.

<sup>22</sup> Jurisdictions may point to such a framework for winding up and exit of insurance legal entities as satisfying certain KA requirements. Assessors must bear in mind that, in any event, the overall legal framework must in fact be in compliance with *all* Key Attributes requirements

- promote a high level of coordination and cooperation between a PPS administrator and other agencies that constitute the ‘safety net’ to support clear allocation of responsibilities and accountability and effective crisis management; and
- ensure the involvement of a PPS administrator at a sufficiently early stage of a crisis if it is necessary to facilitate a resolution of an insurer.

## Precondition D: A robust accounting, auditing and disclosure regime

There should be a robust accounting, auditing and disclosure regime that includes the following elements:

- comprehensive and well defined accounting principles and rules that command wide international acceptance;
- a system of independent external audits designed to provide a true and fair view of the financial position of insurers, with auditors held accountable for their work; and
- sound arrangements for transparency and disclosure of information.

## Precondition E: A well-developed legal framework and judicial system

There should be a well-developed legal framework and judicial system that includes the following elements:

- a corpus of laws, including corporate, liquidation/bankruptcy, contract, consumer protection, private property laws and conflict of laws rules, that is clear and consistently enforced;
- effective creditor rights systems consistent with the WB principles,<sup>23</sup>
- a creditor hierarchy that specifies, in a clear and transparent manner, the position of policyholders and any other creditors, and the treatment of any insurance products offered by insurers within that hierarchy;
- an independent judiciary; and
- availability of independent and qualified professionals (for example, accountants, auditors, lawyers and insolvency practitioners), who are subject to appropriate accreditation and oversight and whose work is required to comply with technical and ethical standards that are set and enforced by official or professional bodies and consistent with international standards.

---

<sup>23</sup> See “Principles for Effective Insolvency and Creditor/Debtor Regimes” (<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/919511468425523509/ICR-Principles-Insolvency-Creditor-Debtor-Regimes-2016.pdf>), 2016.

## VI. Assessment methodology<sup>24</sup>

The methodology proposes a set of essential criteria (ECs) that the assessors should use to assess and grade compliance with a KA. The explanatory notes (ENs) provide examples, explanations and cross-references to other relevant KAs, and specific definitions not included in the Definitions of key terms (see Section I). The ENs do not contain assessment criteria, but are intended to guide the interpretation of the KAs and the ECs.

### KA 1 Scope

- 1.1** Any financial institution that could be systemically significant or critical if it fails should be subject to a resolution regime that has the attributes set out in this document (“Key Attributes”). The regime should be clear and transparent as to the financial institutions (hereinafter “firms”) within its scope. It should extend to:
- (i) holding companies of a firm;
  - (ii) non-regulated operational entities within a financial group or conglomerate that are significant to the business of the group or conglomerate; and
  - (iii) branches of foreign firms.<sup>25</sup>
- 1.2** *Financial market infrastructure (“FMIs”) should be subject to resolution regimes that apply the objectives and provisions of the Key Attributes in a manner appropriate to FMIs and their critical role in financial markets. The choice of resolution powers should be guided by the need to maintain continuity of critical FMI functions.*
- 1.3** The resolution regime should require that at least all domestically incorporated global SIFIs (“G-SIFIs”):
- (i) have in place a recovery and resolution plan (“RRP”), including a group resolution plan, containing all elements set out in I-Annex 4 (see Key Attribute 11);
  - (ii) are subject to regular resolvability assessments (see Key Attribute 10); and
  - (iii) are the subject of institution-specific cross-border cooperation agreements (see Key Attribute 9).

#### *Essential criteria for KA 1*

- EC 1.1** The scope of application of the resolution regime and the circumstances in which it applies are clearly defined in the legal framework. The resolution regime covers any insurer that is, or could be, systemically significant or critical in the event of failure.
- EC 1.2** The scope of the resolution regime covers the following entities located within the jurisdiction:

---

<sup>24</sup> Original text of the *Key Attributes* is provided in boxes in assessment methodology for each KA. KAs which are not related to the assessment of a jurisdiction’s compliance with the *Key Attributes* with respect to the insurance sector are in grey italics.

<sup>25</sup> This should not apply where jurisdictions are required by the applicable legal framework to recognise resolution of financial institutions under the law of, and carried out by the authorities of their home jurisdiction (for example, the EU Directives on the Winding up and Reorganisation of credit institutions and of insurance undertakings).

- (i) holding companies;
  - (ii) non-regulated operational entities within a financial group or conglomerate that are significant to the business or continuity of the insurer's critical operations; and
  - (iii) domestic branches of foreign insurers.
- 

### *Explanatory notes for KA 1*

**EN 1 (a) Scope** – The purpose of the assessment of KA 1 is to determine whether the jurisdiction has in place a resolution regime, with the required scope, that broadly reflects the attributes set out in the Key Attributes. A detailed assessment of the components of the resolution regime will be carried out in accordance with other KAs (including KAs 9, 10 and 11). Accordingly, a resolution regime could be compliant with KA 1, even when there are shortcomings in the implementation of other KAs. If such shortcomings are severe—for example, the resolution regime relies exclusively on supervisory powers or lacks most of the resolution powers—it would not be compliant with KA 1. (See EN 3 (f))

**EN 1 (b) Form of resolution regime** – KA 1 is neutral as to the form of the regime, provided that all insurers that could be systemically significant or critical in the event of failure are subject to a resolution regime that broadly reflects the attributes set out in the Key Attributes. Jurisdictions may have a separate regime for insurers, or a single regime covering different types of financial institutions, including insurers. The resolution regime may adapt, modify or be distinct from the applicable insolvency regime (for example, a special insolvency regime for insurers), but the relationship between the resolution regime and the insolvency regime and the circumstances in which the resolution regime will apply or supersede the insolvency regime should be clear in the legal framework.

**EN 1 (c) Determination of systemic significance** – The resolution regime should be transparent as to the insurers within its scope. Resolution regimes may apply more broadly than to systemically significant or critical insurers. Where the scope of application of some or all resolution powers is limited to insurers determined to be systemically significant or critical in failure, the regime should provide for that determination to be made in advance of any failure or at the point when intervention is being considered. In cases where the regime provides for determinations in advance, it should be possible to also apply the regime to insurers that are shown to be systemically significant or critical at the point of failure, given the prevailing circumstances at that time. Depending on the circumstances at the time of their failure, even an insurer that has not been identified as systemically significant or critical ex ante could prove systemic as a result of contagion or a loss of confidence in the insurance system.

As a practical matter, assessors are not expected to make a factual determination as to which insurers in the jurisdiction under assessment could be systemically significant or critical at failure. Instead, assessors may examine whether existing guidelines, criteria or procedures for assessing whether an insurer could be systemically significant or critical if it fails have enabled or would enable the authorities in the relevant jurisdiction to apply the resolution regime or resolution powers to an insurer when necessary to meet the resolution objectives.

**EN 1 (d) Holding companies** – The resolution regime should extend to holding companies insofar as that is necessary to resolve an insurance company or a financial group as a whole. Certain powers, which only apply in respect of insurance contracts (including the powers identified in EC 3.17 and the powers to restructure insurance liabilities in EC 3.13), need not apply to a holding company that is not an insurance company. See EN 3 (b) on the conditions for the exercise of resolution powers in respect of holding companies.

**EN 1 (e) Domestic branches of foreign insurers** – Resolution authorities should have resolution powers with regard to local branch operations of foreign insurers. Such powers should be assessed in relation to the relevant powers under KA 3. A regime is not required to apply to domestic branches of foreign insurers, in cases where resolution of such branches falls within a regime that gives exclusive competence in the resolution of a financial institution to the home resolution authority, and requires the host resolution authorities to recognise or grant automatic mutual recognition of a resolution of the financial institution and all its branches carried out by the home resolution authority.

**EN 1 (f) Non-regulated operational entities within a financial group or conglomerate** – Non-regulated operational entities may provide services (for example, treasury services, risk management and valuation, accounting, human resources support, IT, transaction processing or legal services and compliance) that are significant to the business or are necessary for the continuity of critical functions carried out within the financial group. The abrupt withdrawal of those services could jeopardise the resolution objective of maintaining those functions. The resolution regime should extend to non-regulated operational entities within a financial group or conglomerate, so that measures can be taken in relation to such entities insofar as that is necessary to support the resolution of an affiliated insurance company or the financial group as a whole. The resolution authority should therefore be able to exercise appropriate powers to achieve that objective. Such powers should be assessed in relation to the relevant powers under KA 3.2 (iv).

## KA 2 Resolution Authority

- 2.1** Each jurisdiction should have a designated administrative authority or authorities responsible for exercising the resolution powers over firms within the scope of the resolution regime (“resolution authority”). Where there are multiple resolution authorities within a jurisdiction their respective mandates, roles and responsibilities should be clearly defined and coordinated.
- 2.2** Where different resolution authorities are in charge of resolving entities of the same group within a single jurisdiction, the resolution regime of that jurisdiction should identify a lead authority that coordinates the resolution of the legal entities within that jurisdiction.
- 2.3** As part of its statutory objectives and functions, and where appropriate in coordination with other authorities, the resolution authority should:
- (i) pursue financial stability and ensure continuity of systemically important financial services, and payment, clearing and settlement functions;
  - (ii) protect, where applicable and in coordination with the relevant insurance schemes and arrangements, such depositors, insurance policy holders and investors as are covered by such schemes and arrangements;
  - (iii) avoid unnecessary destruction of value and seek to minimise the overall costs of resolution in home and host jurisdictions and losses to creditors, where that is consistent with the other statutory objectives; and
  - (iv) duly consider the potential impact of its resolution actions on financial stability in other jurisdictions.
- 2.4** The resolution authority should have the authority to enter into agreements with resolution authorities of other jurisdictions.
- 2.5** The resolution authority should have operational independence consistent with its statutory responsibilities, transparent processes, sound governance and adequate resources and be subject to rigorous evaluation and accountability mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of any resolution measures. It should have the expertise, resources and the operational capacity to implement resolution measures with respect to large and complex firms.
- 2.6** The resolution authority and its staff should be protected against liability for actions taken and omissions made while discharging their duties in the exercise of resolution powers in good faith, including actions in support of foreign resolution proceedings.
- 2.7** The resolution authority should have unimpeded access to firms where that is material for the purposes of resolution planning and the preparation and implementation of resolution measures.

### *Essential criteria for KA 2*

- EC 2.1** The legal framework clearly identifies one or more resolution authorities and provides it or them with a clear mandate. Where there are multiple resolution authorities or where multiple authorities are involved in a resolution process, the resolution regime provides for the identification of a lead authority that coordinates the resolution of entities within a financial group or conglomerate, or the resolution of a single insurer, within that jurisdiction; sets out clear arrangements for the coordination; and provides for a clear allocation of objectives, functions and powers of those authorities.

**EC 2.2** The statutory objectives and functions of the resolution authority include those set out in KA 2.3, as applicable to the sectoral responsibilities of the resolution authority.

Where the exercise of resolution powers requires court involvement, the objectives of that involvement are broadly aligned with the statutory objectives and functions set out in KA 2.3. Administrators appointed by a court are expected to act in accordance with those objectives and functions.

**EC 2.3** The resolution authority is, by law and in practice, operationally independent in the performance of its statutory responsibilities. There are arrangements, procedures and safeguards against undue political or industry influence, which include:

- (i) internal governance arrangements which promote sound and independent decision-making;
- (ii) rules and procedures for the appointment and dismissal of the head of the authority, members of the governing body (where relevant) and senior management; and
- (iii) rules on conflicts of interest.

**EC 2.4** The resolution authority is accountable through a transparent framework for the discharge of its duties in relation to its statutory responsibilities. This framework includes procedures for reviewing and evaluating actions that the resolution authority takes in carrying out its statutory responsibilities, and the periodic publication of reports on its resolution actions and policies, as necessary.

**EC 2.5** The resolution authority has adequate human and budgetary resources or access to such resources, to enable it to carry out its resolution functions effectively without undermining its independence, both before and during a crisis.

**EC 2.6** The legal framework provides legal protection through statute for the resolution authority, its head, members of the governing body and its staff and any agents against liability for actions taken or omissions made while discharging their duties in good faith and acting within the scope of their powers, including actions taken in support of foreign resolution proceedings; including indemnification against any costs of defending any such actions.

**EC 2.7** Under the legal framework, the resolution authority has unimpeded access to the premises of insurers where necessary for the purposes of resolution planning and the preparation and implementation of resolution measures.

---

*Explanatory notes for KA 2*

**EN 2 (a) Designated administrative authority or authorities** – KA 2 requires jurisdictions to confer resolution powers on administrative authorities to ensure that actions can be taken in a timely manner to deliver the objectives of the framework. Jurisdictions may designate as their

resolution authorities one or more authorities, including, for example, central banks, insurance supervisors, PPS administrators, ministries of finance or dedicated administrative authorities.

**EN 2 (b) Involvement of PPS administrators in exercise of resolution powers** – Where a PPS administrator is involved in the exercise of resolution powers (e.g. the portfolio transfer power or the power to establish a bridge institution), the role of the PPS administrator should be clearly defined. If a resolution regime enables a PPS administrator to exercise a resolution power directly over an insurer without the prior consent of another authority, the PPS administrator is effectively the authority responsible for the exercise of that resolution power and, as such, needs to be an administrative authority that complies with the KA 2 requirements for resolution authorities for the purposes of the exercise of that power. If a PPS administrator can exercise a resolution power directly over an insurer but only on the direction of a designated authority, the PPS administrator is not considered an authority responsible for the exercise of that resolution power and therefore does not need to comply with the KA 2 requirements.

**EN 2 (c) Lead authority** – KA 2 requires the resolution regime to identify a lead resolution authority in cases where the resolution of an insurer or of insurance companies within a financial group or conglomerate falls within the statutory responsibilities of more than one resolution authority. This might be the case, for example, where there are separate resolution authorities and resolution action is required in relation to domestic entities of different financial sectors. The lead authorities for financial groups within a jurisdiction may vary according to the nature of the group structure and the entities within the group. A regime complies with EC 2.1 if it contains provision for a lead authority to be identified on a case-by-case basis: advance identification is not necessary.

**EN 2 (d) Arrangements to coordinate the resolution of insurance companies forming part of a financial group or conglomerate** – While coordination does not require that the lead authority has powers to direct or issue binding instructions to other authorities, the arrangements for coordination should provide a process for single decisions to be made in the case of any disagreement between the authorities. Evidence of compliance with this requirement might include specific statutory provision for coordination by an identified lead authority, memoranda of understanding or other documented arrangements between authorities that provide for the type of information to be exchanged, confidential channels for communication and contact persons, etc.

KA 2 requires coordination arrangements with respect to the resolution of a single insurer (for example where more than one authority acts as resolution authority) and/or the resolution of multiple regulated financial institutions within a financial group or conglomerate, including insurance companies. Where certain entities in the group could be subject to ordinary corporate insolvency proceedings, coordination with insolvency administrators for other group entities may also be important for effective resolution and should be considered as part of overall resolution planning under KA 11. Where both a bank resolution regime and an insurance resolution regime are applicable to a financial conglomerate, it should be made clear ex-ante (e.g. as part of resolution planning under KA 11) which resolution regime(s) apply(ies) to the holding company and how coordination takes place between the bank and insurance resolution authorities.

**EN 2 (e) Resolution objectives** – A resolution regime for insurers should meet the general objectives set out in the *Key Attributes* (Preamble and KA 2.3). It should make it feasible to resolve an insurer without severe systemic disruption or exposing taxpayers to loss, while

protecting vital economic functions through mechanisms that make it possible for shareholders and unsecured creditors to absorb losses in a manner that respects the hierarchy of claims in liquidation. For insurers, the objective of resolution regime should specify the protection of policyholders. This however does not mean that policyholders will be fully protected under all circumstances, and does not exclude the possibility that losses be absorbed by policyholders to the extent they are not covered by PPSs. The resolution authority should always choose a resolution approach that achieves the resolution objectives, including the protection of policyholders.

**EN 2 (f) Operational independence** – The requirement that the resolution authority be operationally independent does not mean it can have no functions other than resolution. An authority that carries out resolution functions may also carry out other functions, such as supervision or policyholder protection, provided that adequate governance arrangements are in place to manage any conflicts of interests that may arise from combining those functions within a single authority.

It is not inconsistent with the operational independence of the resolution authority if some aspects of resolution are not under its exclusive discretion. This may be the case, in particular, where temporary public funding is provided to support a resolution. A requirement to obtain governmental approval for certain resolution actions, for example those that have implications for public funds, does not in itself mean that the resolution authority is not operationally independent. The requirement for operational independence should also not prevent the resolution authority from coordinating and sharing information with finance ministries and other governmental authorities where necessary for the exercise of resolution functions and achieving the statutory objectives of resolution.

When assessing compliance with KA 2 the assessors should reach a judgement as to whether the rules and procedures for the appointment and dismissal of the head of the authority, members of the governing body (where relevant) and senior management limit the potential for undue political interference. Appropriate safeguards could include transparent appointment procedures; statutory constraints that would prevent the head of the resolution authority being removed during his or her term of office for reasons other than those specified in law; and public disclosure of the reason(s) for that early dismissal.

**EN 2 (g) Accountability** – The requirement for procedures for reviewing and evaluating actions that the resolution authority takes in carrying out its statutory responsibilities may be satisfied by procedures for internal review by management within the resolution authority or by an operationally independent function within the resolution authority. An internal review is distinct from judicial review, which is provided for in KA 5.4. Provision for review of the effectiveness of the resolution authority in meeting its statutory objectives by an appropriate external body would strengthen accountability. The resolution authority should also publish periodic reports on its resolution actions and policies relating to its mandate and its statutory objectives at sufficiently frequent intervals to keep stakeholders and the public adequately informed about the authority's resolution activities. Public reports may include case-specific reports that are released once the resolution of an insurer has concluded, assessing the outcome of the resolution and the effectiveness with which the resolution was carried out by reference to the statutory objectives. The resolution authority should however not be required to disclose publicly the operational resolution plans or results of resolvability assessments of individual insurers.

**EN 2 (h) Human and financial resources** – The assessment of the adequacy of human and budgetary resources should take into account the size and complexity of the insurers under the responsibility of the respective resolution authority. Budgetary resources refer to the resources necessary to finance the administrative costs of the authority as they pertain to resolution, including costs of training, onsite work and coordination work with other resolution authorities, IT and other equipment needed to carry out resolution functions. (Requirements relating to funding of resolution are set out in KA 6). Human resources refers to the ability of the authority to attract and retain staff with sufficient expertise, and in sufficient numbers, to carry out its resolution functions, and to commission outside experts with the necessary professional skills and independence where necessary to support those functions, including where the resolution authority is separate from the supervisory authorities, the ability to draw upon the expertise of the latter. The resolution authority should also have an adequate training budget and programme for its personnel to ensure that their knowledge and skills remain current and that they have the expertise to deal with the resolution of large and complex insurers operating in its jurisdiction.

**EN 2 (i) Protection from liability** – Protection from liability should not prevent judicial review of the actions of the resolution authority (cf. KA 5.4).

**EN 2 (j) Access to premises** – The right to seek access to premises may be subject to applicable privileges or constitutional protections, legal remedies or due process requirements that are consistent with KA 5.4.

## KA 3 Resolution powers

- 3.1** Resolution should be initiated when a firm is no longer viable or likely to be no longer viable, and has no reasonable prospect of becoming so. The resolution regime should provide for timely and early entry into resolution before a firm is balance sheet insolvent and before all equity has been fully wiped out. There should be clear standards or suitable indicators of non-viability to help guide decisions on whether firms meet the conditions for entry into resolution.
- 3.2** Resolution authorities should have at their disposal a broad range of resolution powers, which should include powers to do the following:
- (i) Remove and replace the senior management and directors and recover monies from responsible persons, including claw-back of variable remuneration;
  - (ii) Appoint an administrator to take control of and manage the affected firm with the objective of restoring the firm, or parts of its business, to on-going and sustainable viability;
  - (iii) Operate and resolve the firm, including powers to terminate contracts, continue or assign contracts, purchase or sell assets, write down debt and take any other action necessary to restructure or wind down the firm's operations;
  - (iv) Ensure continuity of essential services and functions by requiring other companies in the same group to continue to provide essential services to the entity in resolution, any successor or an acquiring entity; ensuring that the residual entity in resolution can temporarily provide such services to a successor or an acquiring entity; or procuring necessary services from unaffiliated third parties;
  - (v) Override rights of shareholders of the firm in resolution, including requirements for approval by shareholders of particular transactions, in order to permit a merger, acquisition, sale of substantial business operations, recapitalisation or other measures to restructure and dispose of the firm's business or its liabilities and assets;
  - (vi) Transfer or sell assets and liabilities, legal rights and obligations, including deposit liabilities and ownership in shares, to a solvent third party, notwithstanding any requirements for consent or novation that would otherwise apply (see Key Attribute 3.3);
  - (vii) Establish a temporary bridge institution to take over and continue operating certain critical functions and viable operations of a failed firm (see Key Attribute 3.4);
  - (viii) Establish a separate asset management vehicle (for example, as a subsidiary of the distressed firm, an entity with a separate charter, or as a trust or asset management company) and transfer to the vehicle for management and run-down non-performing loans or difficult-to-value assets;
  - (ix) Carry out bail-in within resolution as a means to achieve or help achieve continuity of essential functions either (i) by recapitalising the entity hitherto providing these functions that is no longer viable, or, alternatively, (ii) by capitalising a newly established entity or bridge institution to which these functions have been transferred following closure of the non-viable firm (the residual business of which would then be wound up and the firm liquidated) (see Key Attribute 3.5);
  - (x) Temporarily stay the exercise of early termination rights that may otherwise be triggered upon entry of a firm into resolution or in connection with the use of resolution powers (see Key Attribute 4.3 and Annex IV);

- (xi) Impose a moratorium with a suspension of payments to unsecured creditors and customers (except for payments and property transfers to central counterparties (CCPs) and those entered into the payment, clearing and settlements systems) and a stay on creditor actions to attach assets or otherwise collect money or property from the firm, while protecting the enforcement of eligible netting and collateral agreements; and
- (xii) Effect the closure and orderly wind-down (liquidation) of the whole or part of a failing firm with timely pay-out or transfer of insured deposits and prompt (for example, within seven days) access to transaction accounts and to segregated client funds).

**3.3** Resolution authorities should have the power to transfer selected assets and liabilities of the failed firm to a third party institution or to a newly established bridge institution. Any transfer of assets or liabilities should not:

- (i) require the consent of any interested party or creditor to be valid; and
- (ii) constitute a default or termination event in relation to any obligation relating to such assets or liabilities or under any contract to which the failed firm is a party (see Key Attribute 4.2).

**3.4** Resolution authorities should have the power to establish one or more bridge institutions to take over and continue operating certain critical functions and viable operations of a failed firm, including:

- (i) the power to enter into legally enforceable agreements by which the authority transfers, and the bridge institution receives, assets and liabilities of the failed firm as selected by the authority;
- (ii) the power to establish the terms and conditions under which the bridge institution has the capacity to operate as a going concern, including the manner under which the bridge institution obtains capital or operational financing and other liquidity support; the prudential and other regulatory requirements that apply to the operations of the bridge institution; the selection of management and the manner by which the corporate governance of the bridge institution may be conducted; and the performance by the bridge institution of such other temporary functions as the authority may from time to time prescribe;
- (iii) the power to reverse, if necessary, asset and liability transfers to a bridge institution subject to appropriate safeguards, such as time restrictions; and
- (iv) the power to arrange the sale or wind-down of the bridge institution, or the sale of some or all of its assets and liabilities to a purchasing institution, so as best to effect the objectives of the resolution authority.

**3.5** Powers to carry out bail-in within resolution should enable resolution authorities to:

- (i) write down in a manner that respects the hierarchy of claims in liquidation (see Key Attribute 5.1) equity or other instruments of ownership of the firm, unsecured and uninsured creditor claims to the extent necessary to absorb the losses; and to
- (ii) convert into equity or other instruments of ownership of the firm under resolution (or any successor in resolution or the parent company within the same jurisdiction), all or parts of unsecured and uninsured creditor claims in a manner that respects the hierarchy of claims in liquidation;
- (iii) upon entry into resolution, convert or write-down any contingent convertible or contractual bail-in instruments whose terms had not been triggered prior to entry into resolution and treat the resulting instruments in line with (i) or (ii).

- 3.6** The resolution regime should make it possible to apply bail-in within resolution in conjunction with other resolution powers (for example, removal of problem assets, replacement of senior management and adoption of a new business plan) to ensure the viability of the firm or newly established entity following the implementation of bail-in.
- 3.7** In the case of insurance firms, resolution authorities should also have powers to:
- (i) undertake a portfolio transfer moving all or part of the insurance business to another insurer without the consent of each and every policy holder; and
  - (ii) discontinue the writing of new business by an insurance firm in resolution while continuing to administer existing contractual policy obligations for in-force business (run-off).
- 3.8** Resolution authorities should have the legal and operational capacity to:
- (i) apply one or a combination of resolution powers, with resolution actions being either combined or applied sequentially;
  - (ii) apply different types of resolution powers to different parts of the firm's business (for example, retail and commercial banking, trading operations, insurance); and
  - (iii) initiate a wind-down for those operations that, in the particular circumstances, are judged by the authorities to be not critical to the financial system or the economy (see Key Attribute 3.2 xii).
- 3.9** In applying resolution powers to individual components of a financial group located in its jurisdiction, the resolution authority should take into account the impact on the group as a whole and on financial stability in other affected jurisdictions, and undertake best efforts to avoid taking actions that could reasonably be expected to trigger instability elsewhere in the group or in the financial system.

### *Essential criteria for KA 3*

- EC 3.1** The legal framework includes clear criteria that provide for timely and early entry into resolution before an insurer is balance sheet insolvent, when an insurer is no longer viable or when it is likely to be no longer viable and, in either case, has no reasonable prospect of return to viability.
- EC 3.2** Effective and adequate arrangements including evaluation and decision-making processes are in place to support the timely determination of non-viability or likely non-viability and entry into resolution.
- EC 3.3** The resolution authority has powers to remove and replace senior management and directors of the insurer in resolution.
- EC 3.4** The resolution authority or another relevant authority has the power to recover monies, including variable remuneration, from persons whose actions or omissions have caused or materially contributed to the failure of the insurer.
- EC 3.5** The resolution authority has powers to temporarily take control and operate an insurer in order to achieve its orderly resolution. This includes powers to take actions to restructure or wind down the insurer's operations; terminate, continue or transfer

existing contracts; enter into new contracts and service agreements to ensure the continuity of essential services and functions; and purchase or sell assets.

- EC 3.6** The resolution authority has powers to ensure continuity of essential services by:
- (i) requiring that the insurer in resolution temporarily provides, to any successor or acquiring entity to which assets and liabilities of the insurer have been transferred, such services related to those assets and liabilities;
  - (ii) requiring companies in the same group (whether or not they are regulated) to continue to provide such services to the insurer in resolution or to any successor or acquiring entity at a reasonable rate of reimbursement; or
  - (iii) procuring such services from unaffiliated third parties on behalf of the insurer in resolution.
- EC 3.7** The resolution authority has the power to effect the sale of the insurer or its merger with another institution, or the transfer of assets or liabilities (including insurance contracts and any associated assets and liabilities) to a third party, bridge institution or management vehicle without requiring the consent of any interested private parties, including the shareholders, or creditors, of the insurer in resolution. This power includes the power to transfer related reinsurance contracts.
- EC 3.8** The resolution authority has the powers set out in KA 3.4 to establish one or more bridge institutions. The legal framework specifies, or gives the resolution authority the power to specify, the terms and conditions under which a bridge institution will be set up and operate as a going concern, including:
- (i) its ownership structure;
  - (ii) the sources of capital, its operational financing and liquidity support;
  - (iii) the applicable regulatory requirements, including regulatory capital;
  - (iv) the applicable corporate governance framework; and
  - (v) the process for appointing the management of the bridge institution and its responsibilities.
- EC 3.9** The resolution authority has the power to establish a separate management vehicle for the purposes of managing and winding down assets or liabilities transferred to it from an insurer in resolution, including through a run-off of insurance contracts.
- EC 3.10** The resolution authority has the power to reverse the transfer of assets or liabilities to a bridge institution or to a management vehicle. The exercise of the reverse transfer power is subject to appropriate safeguards, such as time restrictions.
- EC 3.11** The resolution authority has powers that would allow it to give effect to the following actions to absorb losses and achieve the resolution objectives subject to the safeguards described in KAs 5.1 and 5.2:

- (i) write down equity and cancel shares or other instruments of ownership of the insurer;
- (ii) write down unsecured creditor claims (see EC 3.13 on powers to restructure insurance liabilities);
- (iii) exchange or convert into equity or other instruments of ownership of the insurer, any successor in resolution (such as a bridge institution to which part or all of the business of the failed insurer is transferred) or the parent company within that jurisdiction, all or parts of unsecured creditor claims (see EC 3.13 on powers to restructure insurance liabilities);
- (iv) override pre-emption rights of existing shareholders of the insurer;
- (v) issue new equity or other instruments of ownership;
- (vi) issue warrants to equity holders or subordinated (and if appropriate senior) debt holders whose claims have been subject to bail-in (to enable adjustment of the distribution of shares based on a further valuation at a later stage); and
- (vii) suspend (or to seek suspension of) shares and other relevant securities from listing and trading for a temporary period, if necessary to effect the bail-in.

(In order to comply with this EC, it is not necessary to have the power to apply a bail-in to policyholder claims. See EC 3.12.)

**EC 3.12** The legal framework provides clarity as regards the scope of the bail-in power set out in KA 3.5, including the range of liabilities covered and whether or not policyholder claims are excluded from bail-in, the grounds or triggers for the exercise of the power, and application in a manner that respects the hierarchy of claims as established in KA 5.1.

**EC 3.13** The resolution authority has powers to restructure insurance liabilities (whether currently due and payable or contingent) subject to the safeguards described in KAs 5.1 and 5.2.

**EC 3.14** The resolution authority has the power to impose a suspension of payments (moratorium) on unsecured creditors. This includes the power to temporarily restrict or suspend the rights of policyholders to withdraw from their insurance contracts.

**EC 3.15** The resolution authority has the power to issue or obtain a stay of creditor actions to attach assets or otherwise collect money or property from the insurer.

**EC 3.16** The resolution authority has the power to effect the closure and orderly wind-down of the whole or part of a failing insurance company, and in such event, has the capacity and practical ability to effect or secure all of the following:

- (i) the timely pay-out to policyholders in respect of valid and eligible claims;

- (ii) the transfer of insurance contracts and any associated assets and liabilities to a third party or bridge institution; and
- (iii) the discontinuation of the writing of new business while existing contractual policy obligations continue to be administered (run-off).

**EC 3.17** The legal framework enables the resolution authority either to combine resolution actions or to apply resolution actions sequentially.

---

### *Explanatory notes for KA 3*

**EN 3 (a) Non-viability** – The concept of non-viability should permit the exercise of resolution powers before an insurer is insolvent (meaning balance-sheet insolvent, cash-flow insolvent, or any other definition of insolvency used for the purposes of the applicable insolvency regime) and before all equity has been fully wiped out. The assessment of non-viability should not therefore require proof that the insurer is insolvent.

‘No reasonable prospect of return to viability’ means that there are no measures that could reasonably be taken by the insurer, including recovery measures identified in its recovery plan or supervisory early intervention measures, that are likely to restore the insurer to viability in a timeframe that is reasonable having regard to the circumstances and the risks to financial stability and to policyholders that are associated with the non-viability of the insurer.

**EN 3 (b) Early exercise of resolution powers in respect of a holding company** – The legal framework should permit the exercise of any applicable resolution powers in respect of a holding company sufficiently early to allow resolution authorities, in appropriate cases, to take action at the level of the holding company to manage the failure of all or parts of the financial group (including one or more insurance companies).

**EN 3 (c) Quantitative or qualitative criteria to assess non-viability** – The conditions for entry into resolution or exercise of resolution powers should be clear and transparent and set out in law: the standards or suitable indicators of non-viability may be set out in guidance or other policy documents. The requirement for clear and transparent criteria specifying when resolution can be initiated may be satisfied by the identification of quantitative or qualitative factors that are used by the relevant public authority to guide its decisions as to whether an insurer meets the conditions for entry into resolution. General examples of non-viability could include:

- (i) regulatory capital, assets backing technical provisions, or other prudential requirements fall below specified minimum levels;
- (ii) the insurer is expected to be unable to pay liabilities as they fall due;
- (iii) there is a serious impairment of the insurer’s access to market-based funding sources;
- (iv) the insurer depends on official sector financial assistance to sustain operations or would be dependent in the absence of resolution;

- (v) recovery measures have failed, or there is a strong likelihood that proposed recovery measures will not be sufficient, to return the insurer to viability or cannot be implemented in a timely manner.

Relying exclusively on criteria for non-viability that are closely aligned with insolvency or likely insolvency under a jurisdiction's legal framework would not meet the test for timely and early entry into resolution (since it should always be possible to apply resolution measures before an insurer is balance-sheet insolvent and before equity has been fully wiped out).

**EN 3 (d) Timely entry into resolution** – A determination of non-viability and entry into resolution must be capable of being made sufficiently quickly to preserve financial stability and support the statutory objectives of resolution. Depending on the circumstances of the failure and the business model of the insurer, the appropriate timing may vary. For some insurers, non-viability may not immediately threaten financial stability. However, for insurers writing insurance contracts that may involve short-term liquidity risk or holding large positions in derivatives transactions or securities lending activities, for example, urgent intervention may be necessary. The resolution regime should enable the resolution authority to respond and intervene in the necessary timeframe to preserve financial stability in a broad range of failure scenarios that could arise with respect to insurers in their jurisdiction. Timely entry into resolution does not imply that all aspects of the resolution must be completed immediately. The resolution authority should, however, have the means to stabilise an insurer immediately and ensure that essential services and systemic functions remain open and operating to avoid the disruption and contagion that would otherwise accompany their closure. (See also EN 5 (d)).

**EN 3 (e) Powers of the resolution authority** – Where the EC refer to powers of the resolution authority to take specific resolution actions, those powers should be clearly set out in the legal framework applicable to the authority. Where those powers are not clearly set out in the legal framework, the onus is on the assessed jurisdiction to demonstrate that the resolution authority has such powers with a sufficient legal basis.

**EN 3 (f) Characteristics of resolution powers** – The resolution powers may be exercised by the resolution authority directly or through an appointed administrator with appropriate objectives (see EN 3 (i)). The powers should be assessed on the basis of the ability to achieve the outcome specified in the relevant EC, rather than the terminology used in the legal framework, which may differ between jurisdictions. Powers that achieve the outcomes specified in KA 3.2 may not necessarily be labelled as 'resolution powers'. Nevertheless, in order to comply with KA 3.2 and to enable authorities to deliver their statutory resolution objectives and achieve the necessary outcomes, the powers should have certain features that distinguish them from powers used for ordinary supervisory purposes, and from ordinary corporate insolvency regimes.

- (i) **Ability to interfere with third party rights** – Resolution powers enable the resolution authority to interfere with third party rights (for example, by imposing a moratorium on the enforcement of claims and imposing a temporary stay on early termination rights) and to allocate losses to creditors and shareholders.
- (ii) **Exercisable by an administrative authority** – Resolution powers should be exercisable by an administrative resolution authority directly or through an appointed administrator subject to oversight by the resolution authority (see EN 3 (i)). While it is not necessarily inconsistent with the *Key Attributes* if the resolution regime makes provision for a court

order or confirmation for the exercise of resolution powers to be effective, it is important to ensure that any requirement for court approval does not impede rapid intervention and the ability to achieve the specified objectives of resolution. (See KA 5.4, which requires authorities to take account of the time needed for court processes in resolution planning so as not to compromise effective implementation of resolution measures, and EN 5 (d), which indicates how provision for court involvement might be consistent with the speed and flexibility necessary for effective resolution powers.)

(See also KA 5.5 and EN 5 (e), which provide that resolution regimes should not provide for judicial actions that could constrain the implementation, or result in the reversal of, measures taken by a resolution authority acting within its legal powers.)

- (iii) **Exercisable without shareholder, reinsurer or creditor consent** – Resolution powers must not require or be contingent on the cooperation of the failing insurer or its shareholders, and should be exercisable without the consent of the insurer, its shareholders, creditors or reinsurers. It is critical for effective resolution that all resolution powers be exercisable by authorities without any need for shareholder consent or triggering any other third party rights (such as the rights of a reinsurer or policyholder) that prevent, impede or interfere with resolution (subject to the safeguards described in KAs 4 and 5). In order to ensure legal certainty and transparency to shareholders, creditors and other interested parties, the powers to override any requirement for consent should be clear. A requirement for the consent of the entity receiving transferred assets and liabilities (including the consent of its shareholders) is not inconsistent with effective resolution powers. Requirements to notify shareholders, creditors or other interested parties of transfers are not inconsistent with KA 3.3 (i), provided that there is no right of veto or requirement for consent by shareholders, creditors or other interested parties, nor a requirement for a minimum period of notification prior to resolution.

**EN 3 (g) Powers to remove and replace management** – It is not inconsistent with KA 3.2 (i) if the powers to remove and replace management are subject to the employee protection regime of the jurisdiction, provided that such protections do not impede the ability of the resolution authority to swiftly remove and replace such persons. However, exercise of the power to remove and replace senior management and directors specified in KA 3.2 (i) should not be conditional on proof of responsibility for the failure of the insurer on the part of individuals to be removed. EC 3.3 will be satisfied if the resolution authority or the supervisor has powers to remove an existing director or senior management and any new appointment is subject to its assessment or approval.

**EN 3 (h) Recovery of monies and claw-back** – The power of the resolution authority to “claw-back” variable remuneration specified in KA 3.2 (i) should include:

- (i) the power to reduce or prevent the payment of deferred elements of variable remuneration that have been awarded but not yet paid out; and
- (ii) the power to recover variable remuneration that has already been paid.

The power to recover monies may include the imposition of fines or other administrative penalties or the investigation and pursuit of claims against a responsible person by any of the following:

- (i) the resolution authority;
- (ii) another agency or authority (for example, the supervisor or regulatory authority);
- (iii) judicial authorities; or
- (iv) other governmental disciplinary or enforcement bodies.

Monies may be recovered directly from the individual or from any available professional liability insurance. Claims might include claims for damages in civil or criminal proceedings. The responsibility of a person for the failure of the insurer should be determined in accordance with the jurisdiction's legal framework.

The need for a court order to recover the sums or benefits paid to persons responsible for failure of the insurer does not prevent the regime from being compliant with KA 3.2 (i).

**EN 3 (i) Appointment of administrator to take control and operate an insurer in resolution**

– If the legal framework authorises the resolution authority itself to carry out the resolution of an insurer, a power for the resolution authority to appoint or secure the appointment of an administrator is not necessary for compliance with KA 3.2 (ii).

Where the resolution regime provides for the resolution authority to carry out resolution, in whole or in part, through the appointment of an administrator, the administrator should be subject to oversight by the resolution authority. Factors relevant to that oversight may include a requirement (set out either in the resolution regime or the administrator's terms of appointment) for the administrator to:

- (i) be subject to instructions of the resolution authority, report regularly to the resolution authority and provide any information the resolution authority requires;
- (ii) provide periodic budgets or forecasts to the resolution authority for review or approval;
- (iii) notify or obtain the consent or approval of the resolution authority or supervisory authority before taking or prohibiting certain major actions (including sale of major assets or parts of the business; encumbrances placed on assets; hiring and dismissal of senior or key employees and managers; payment of bonuses to employees; pay-out to creditors, commencing litigation and approving settlements); or
- (iv) provide all necessary cooperation and information with all relevant authorities (for example, a supervisory authority or PPS administrator) to fulfil their mandates.

Administrators appointed by a court should be expected to be instructed to act in accordance with the statutory objectives and functions set out in KA 2.3. The resolution authority should have the power to replace or dismiss the administrator, or to recommend the removal of the administrator to the court if the administrator fails to pursue the statutory objectives of resolution.

**EN 3 (j) Powers to operate and resolve the insurer, including powers to terminate, continue or transfer contracts**

– The powers of the resolution authority to operate and resolve the insurer, including powers to terminate, continue or transfer contracts, should enable the resolution authority to carry out the insurance business or parts of it so that the insurer can:

- (i) continue to fulfil existing insurance contracts; and
- (ii) permit the exercise by policyholders of options under existing insurance contracts.
- (iii) buy reinsurance or, in the case of a reinsurer, buy retrocession coverage.

**EN 3 (k) Powers to ensure continuity of essential services provided by companies in the same group** – Essential services may be provided by a non-regulated subsidiary or other entity within the financial group, or a third party. To ensure the continuity of essential services provided by companies in the same group, the resolution authority should have powers to: (i) require companies that are located within the jurisdiction (whether or not they are regulated) to continue to provide those services; or (ii) require the insurer to ensure the continuity of services through its contractual agreements (see EC 11.7) with such companies or its corporate control over them, combined with powers to require changes to ensure resolvability as provided in KA 10.5 and EC 10.3.

An evaluation of the effectiveness of such arrangements, in light of the structure of financial groups in the jurisdiction under review and the powers available under the resolution regime, should be included in an assessment of a jurisdiction’s compliance with EC 3.6 (ii). If the resolution authority relies on corporate control of service companies to achieve continuity, assessors should consider the potential for the group entity to enter insolvency separate from the resolution and the impact of that on the resolvability of the insurer.

‘Reasonable rate of reimbursement’ means a rate that covers the costs to the entity within the group of providing the service. This may be different from the ‘commercial rate of consideration’ for services provided by entities at arms-length, which reflects the market price for such services.

Non-regulated subsidiaries or other entities within the financial group that do not provide essential services may be considered out of scope of the resolution regime. However, for such entities to remain outside of the scope of the resolution regime, certain conditions would have to be met, including among others that the failure or prospective entry into insolvency of such entities could not trigger the initiation of resolution proceedings with respect to an insurer (or insurers) in the group and that corporate insolvency proceedings of such entities linked through common ownership would not impede resolution of the insurer.

**EN 3 (l) Choice of assets and liabilities to be transferred** – The resolution authority should be able to select which assets, rights or liabilities will be transferred to a third party, bridge institution and management vehicle so as to best achieve the statutory objectives of resolution, subject to the following:

- (i) the resolution authority would only be permitted to transfer all financial contracts with a particular counterparty to a new entity and would not be permitted to select for transfer individual financial contracts with the same counterparty and subject to the same netting agreement; and
- (ii) where liabilities are secured by collateral, the liabilities and associated collateral (including guarantees that provide credit support under a governing credit support or similar type of agreement) should be either transferred or left behind together. The legal framework may provide for exemptions from this constraint where that is necessary to

effect an orderly resolution, and the regime otherwise provides adequate protection for counterparties of the contractual benefits. For this purpose, examples of adequate protection might include substituting collateral, the provision of a credit support agreement or financial compensation to counterparties.

The legal framework may set out additional considerations to guide the exercise of the authorities' discretion when selecting which liabilities to transfer so as to ensure that creditors are treated in accordance with the principles set out in KA 5.1 and that the objectives of resolution are met. For example, the resolution regime may stipulate that a transfer using the power set out in KA 3.3 can only be made to an entity that has the expertise, capacity and resources to effectively assume the shares, assets and liabilities transferred, so as to engender sufficient confidence in creditors and counterparties that the public policy objectives of financial stability and continuity can be met.

**EN 3 (m) Bridge institutions** – A “bridge institution” means a legal entity that is separate from the insurer in resolution that is used to temporarily acquire and maintain as a going concern some or all of the assets, liabilities and operations of the insurer in resolution (including shares or other instruments of ownership in subsidiaries) with the objective to later transfer such assets, liabilities and operations to one or more private sector purchasers. If this proves not to be possible, the regime should provide for the operations of the bridge institution to be wound down in an orderly manner, including by run-off of insurance contracts, where appropriate. It is not necessary that the resolution regime prescribes an express and binding term for the operation of a bridge institution. However, in the absence of a time limit, the resolution regime should contain principles or guidelines to the effect that the bridge institution should not operate on a permanent basis and that involvement by public authorities in the ownership and control of the bridge institution should end as soon as is reasonably practicable.

The legal framework should be explicit as to what capital and other regulatory requirements, if any, will apply to bridge institutions. Where the establishment and operation of a bridge institution has potential implications for public funds, a requirement for the resolution authority to obtain governmental approval for use of a bridge institution does not, by itself, mean that a jurisdiction does not comply with KA 3.4.

**EN 3 (n) Management vehicle** – A “management vehicle” means a legal entity that is separate from the insurer and used to remove, manage and wind-down part of the balance sheet of an insurer in resolution, such as insurance contracts that are to be run-off or assets that are impaired or difficult to value. (While less common compared to banks, an insurer may have loans or investments in lower grade bonds or portfolios of complex derivatives that are difficult to value.) The relevant statute need not use the term ‘management vehicle’ for a jurisdiction to be treated as compliant. The vehicle may be used to receive, manage or sell the assets or liabilities of more than one insurer, or may be established for use in the resolution of a specific insurer. The resolution authority or other public authority may either manage the assets in the asset management vehicle itself or through an agent, or it may appoint an independent asset manager to manage the assets in accordance with a mandate set by the resolution authority.

**EN 3 (o) Powers to establish a bridge institution or management vehicle** – The legal framework of a jurisdiction can comply with KA 3.2 (vii) and (viii) and KA 3.4 if it provides for the establishment of a single entity to perform the functions of a bridge institution and management vehicle; or if another agency or body such as a PPS administrator has the power to: (i) directly

perform the functions of a bridge institution and/or management vehicle; or (ii) (either through explicit statutory provision or through its general powers) establish a legal entity to function as a bridge institution and/or management vehicle, so long as the requirements for such KAs are otherwise met.

**EN 3 (p) Reverse transfers and appropriate safeguards** – The ability to transfer assets or liabilities back from the bridge institution or management vehicle to the insurer in resolution may be established either in the legal framework or as a matter of contract required by the legal framework. Appropriate safeguards for the exercise of a power to transfer assets or liabilities back from a bridge institution or management vehicle might include the following:

- (i) an exclusion from the scope of those reverse transfer powers of liabilities that might provoke a creditor run and undermine the operations of the bridge institution or management vehicle and continuity of the business transferred to it;
- (ii) appropriate transparency about the assets and liabilities that may be subject to the reverse transfer power, either by positive identification in the transfer instrument or explicit exclusion of categories in legislation; and
- (iii) clear and binding limitations on the period during which liabilities may be returned.

**EN 3 (q) Power to carry out bail-in within resolution** – In order to comply with ECs 3.11 and 3.13, it is not necessary to have the power to apply a bail-in to policyholder claims. However, the range of liabilities subject to bail-in powers should, taken together, be sufficiently broad to achieve effective resolution without the need to rely on public ownership or bail-out as a means of resolving insurers (see EN 3 (r)).

The powers to: (i) write down equity and unsecured creditor claims of the insurer in resolution; and (ii) to convert unsecured claims into equity or other instruments of ownership in the insurer in resolution, a parent company or a newly established entity or bridge institution, may either be explicit statutory powers or a facet of a general power of the resolution authority to value claims and assign losses to creditors. As an example of the latter, bail-in may also be achieved where equity and unsecured debt holders bear losses and receive payment for remaining value in the form of equity and debt securities of a newly established company.

The jurisdiction's legal framework does not need to use the term 'bail-in' in order to be assessed as compliant with EC 3.11, provided that the resolution powers available under the legal framework enable the resolution authority both to effectively write down equity and unsecured creditor claims and to effectively convert such claims into equity or other instruments of ownership by at least one of the methods set out in KA 3.2 (ix). Where bail-in is executed through capitalising a newly established entity or bridge institution (KA 3.2 (ix) (ii)) it would not be necessary for the resolution authority to have the power to suspend shares and other relevant securities of the failed insurer from listing and trading in accordance with EC 3.11.

In determining whether all of the actions referred to in EC 3.11 are necessary to achieve the objectives of the KAs, due consideration should be given to the structure and complexity of the financial sector of the jurisdiction under review, including the extent to which such factors may be reflected in the jurisdiction's policy approach to bail-in.

In addition, the exercise of the bail-in power should respect the statutory hierarchy of claims while providing flexibility to depart from the general principle of *pari passu* treatment of creditors of the same class, in a way that is consistent with KA 5.1.

**EN 3 (r) Scope of liabilities that can be bailed in or restructured** – As a general matter, the range of liabilities subject to bail-in or restructuring powers (ECs 3.11 to 3.13) should, taken together, be sufficiently broad to achieve effective resolution without the need to rely on public ownership or bail-out as a means of resolving insurers. This means that the range of liabilities subject to bail-in or restructuring, either singly or when exercised alongside other resolution powers and funding sources, should be sufficiently broad to achieve effective loss absorption and recapitalisation. Insurers' liabilities (in particular the liabilities of an insurance company) may be predominantly owed to insurance policyholders and, in such cases, there may be limited amounts of non-policyholder liabilities that rank junior in the creditor hierarchy to policyholder liabilities. To the extent that jurisdictions choose to include policyholder claims in the scope of bail-in-able liabilities, they should have clear rules on how to apply the bail-in tool to such claims, the grounds or triggers for bail-in and any limits or safeguards that may apply.

The requirement for clarity and certainty as regards the scope of the bail-in power does not preclude discretion for authorities to determine the scope of unsecured liabilities that are subject to bail-in powers in each individual resolution case, subject to the safeguards under KA 5.2. Some degree of flexibility may be necessary for authorities to take full account of the circumstances of each individual case, including prevailing market conditions, recognising that counterparties and policyholders need a similar degree of advance certainty about the treatment of their claims and the levels of loss to which they are exposed in the event of a bail-in, as applies with use of any other resolution tool.

**EN 3 (s) Power to restructure insurance liabilities** – The power to restructure liabilities arising under insurance contracts may include:

- (i) reducing or terminating future (or contingent) benefits and guarantees, such as the sum assured or the annuity provided, or the guaranteed minimum sum assured or the guaranteed annuity rate, in a manner that allocates losses to policyholders;
- (ii) where insurance contracts have a surrender value, reducing the value of contracts upon surrender to enable losses to be imposed on policyholders that surrender their contracts;
- (iii) terminating or restructuring options provided to policyholders, for example as part of a deferred or variable annuity contract;
- (iv) settling crystallised and contingent insurance obligations by payment of an amount calculated as a proportion of estimated present and, if possible, future claims, to provide a more rapid and cost-effective resolution where future claims are uncertain and run-off is not feasible or there is no time to carry out a detailed actuarial valuation;
- (v) reducing the value of, or restructuring reinsurance contracts issued by the insurer, for example by imposing limits on a policy, to allow losses to be imposed on cedants, as appropriate and where this does not compromise financial stability; and

(vi) limiting the coverage of a non-life insurance policy, for example in terms of pay-out.

The power to restructure insurance liabilities may include the power to write down insurance liabilities. However, the inclusion of such power is not required to comply with ECs 3.11 and 3.13.

The exercise of the powers to restructure insurance liabilities should (i) respect the statutory hierarchy of claims while providing flexibility to depart from the general principle of *pari passu* treatment of creditors of the same class, in a way that is consistent with KA 5.1, and (ii) observe the “no creditor worse off than in liquidation” principle in KA 5.2. Where insurance liabilities are backed by specified assets, any restructuring of the liabilities may have to take into account the value of the specified assets.

**EN 3 (t) Powers to impose a payment moratorium and suspend withdrawals from insurance contracts** – The duration and scope of a payment moratorium and of a restriction or suspension of policyholders’ withdrawal rights should be sufficiently flexible to achieve this objective without endangering financial stability. The power to impose a moratorium should not apply to payments and property transfers to CCPs and those entered into payment, clearing and settlements systems, while protecting the enforcement of eligible netting and collateral agreements.

## KA 4 Set-off, netting, collateralisation, segregation of client assets

- 4.1** The legal framework governing set-off rights, contractual netting and collateralisation agreements and the segregation of client assets should be clear, transparent and enforceable during a crisis or resolution of firms, and should not hamper the effective implementation of resolution measures.
- 4.2** Subject to adequate safeguards, entry into resolution and the exercise of any resolution powers should not trigger statutory or contractual set-off rights, or constitute an event that entitles any counterparty of the firm in resolution to exercise contractual acceleration or early termination rights provided the substantive obligations under the contract continue to be performed.
- 4.3** Should contractual acceleration or early termination rights nevertheless be exercisable, the resolution authority should have the power to stay temporarily such rights where they arise by reason only of entry into resolution or in connection with the exercise of any resolution powers. The stay should:
- (i) be strictly limited in time (for example, for a period not exceeding 2 business days);
  - (ii) be subject to adequate safeguards that protect the integrity of financial contracts and provide certainty to counterparties (see I-Annex 5 on Conditions for a temporary stay); and
  - (iii) not affect the exercise of early termination rights of a counterparty against the firm being resolved in the case of any event of default not related to entry into resolution or the exercise of the relevant resolution power occurring before, during or after the period of the stay (for example, failure to make a payment, deliver or return collateral on a due date).
- The stay may be discretionary (imposed by the resolution authority) or automatic in its operation. In either case, jurisdictions should ensure that there is clarity as to the beginning and the end of the stay.
- 4.4** Resolution authorities should apply the temporary stay on early termination rights in accordance with the guidance set out in I-Annex 5 to ensure that it does not compromise the safe and orderly operations of regulated exchanges and FMIs.

### *Essential criteria for KA 4*

- EC 4.1** The legal framework is clear regarding the treatment of specific assets linked to insurance contracts (e.g., investment-linked products, unit-linked products), including whether legal or accounting segregation of such assets is required. Where legal segregation is required, that segregation is enforceable during the resolution of an insurer and there are clear rules on how losses are shared between policyholders and other creditors in the event of shortfalls in any pool of assets.
- EC 4.2** The legal framework does not permit the exercise by counterparties of early termination rights that arise by reason only of the entry into resolution of, or the exercise of any resolution power against an insurer, provided the substantive obligations (for example, payment and delivery obligations) under the contract continue to be performed.
- EC 4.3** The legal framework does not permit the exercise by reinsurers of any rights to terminate or not reinstate coverage under an existing contracts of reinsurance that arise by reason only of the entry into resolution of, or the exercise of any resolution

power against an insurer, provided the substantive obligations (for example, premium payment) under the contract continue to be performed.

**EC 4.4** Where financial contracts are not subject to the prohibition referred to in EC 4.2, the legal framework provides, in relation to such contracts, for a temporary stay on the exercise of early termination rights that arise by reason only of entry into resolution or in connection with the exercise of any resolution powers, subject to the following conditions:

- (i) the stay is limited in time;
- (ii) if the stay is used in connection with a transfer power, the resolution authority is not permitted to select for transfer some, but not all, contracts with the same counterparty that are subject to the same netting agreement;
- (iii) where the contracts to which the early termination right relates are transferred to another entity or remain with an insurer that has been recapitalised in resolution, early termination rights can be exercised after the expiry of the stay period only in the event of a separate default under the terms of the contract that is not based on the entry into resolution or the exercise of resolution powers; and
- (iv) where those contracts remain with the failing insurer that has not been recapitalised, any early termination rights that were subject to the stay may be exercised immediately on the expiry of the stay or, if earlier, a notification by the resolution authority that the contracts will remain with that insurer.

---

#### *Explanatory notes for KA 4*

**EN 4 (a) Treatment of specific assets linked to insurance contracts** – EC 4.1 sets out how KA 4.1 should be understood and applied in relation to the treatment of specific assets linked to insurance contracts. KA 4.1 and II-Annex 3 to the *Key Attributes* on Client Asset Protection in Resolution provide a framework for ensuring that a jurisdiction’s treatment of client assets does not impede orderly resolution. Client assets are assets that are held by a financial institution (directly or indirectly through a custodian) for or on behalf of a client in the course of, or in connection with, services provided by the financial institution to the client and where the client has a proprietary or similar right to the return of the asset or its substitute in the event of insolvency or resolution of the financial institution. Assets held in connection with the insurance business, including specific assets that are linked to insurance contracts (e.g., some or all of unit-linked insurance contracts), will typically not be classified as ‘client assets’ if policyholders do not have proprietary claims or other rights to the return of the linked assets. Lack of clarity surrounding the treatment of these types of insurance contracts and the associated assets in resolution and applicable legal protections, including a possible segregation, could nevertheless impede orderly resolution in a manner similar to where such shortcomings were present in a framework for client assets. For that reason, assessors should consider whether the treatment in resolution of specific assets linked to insurance contracts is clear and transparent.

**EN 4 (b) Prohibition or Temporary stay in relation to early termination rights in resolution**

– Under the legal framework, the exercise of any contractual provision providing for early termination as a result of entry into resolution or the exercise of resolution powers in any contract with a domestically incorporated insurer should be subject to either a prohibition in accordance with KA 4.2 or a temporary stay in accordance with KA 4.3 as applicable. Where the legal framework includes both kinds of provision, it should be clear in advance, for any type of such contract, which provision would apply to those early termination rights in a resolution of the financial institution under the domestic regime.

The purpose of the temporary stay is to allow a short period of time for the resolution authority to make a determination on the treatment of the contracts that are subject to the stay, during which counterparties are not able to accelerate or terminate those contracts or exercise any other applicable remedies. To this end, regimes which do not allow termination before the end of the stay even if the contract terms are not met by the resolution authority during the period of the stay, could be regarded as compliant for the purpose of EC 4.4 (iii). Where a stay on early termination rights has been imposed, only those counterparties whose contracts remain with the failing insurer, which will cease to operate and will be wound down and liquidated, will be able to exercise termination rights for reason of the resolution action on the expiry of the stay. Where a counterparty's contracts are either transferred to an entity that will be responsible for performing the obligations under the contract (such as a third party purchaser or bridge institution) or remain with the insurer that has been recapitalised as a result of the resolution action (for example, through bail-in), that counterparty should only be able to terminate if there is a separate breach, such as a failure to meet payment or delivery obligations, that constitutes an event of default under the contract.

**EN 4 (c) Prohibition on exercise of certain rights in reinsurance contracts in connection with resolution**

– The legal framework should prohibit reinsurers from exercising any rights under contracts of reinsurance with an insurer in resolution to terminate that contract or not to reinstate cover in accordance with contractual terms under an existing contract, where those rights arise only in connection with the resolution. The prohibition should not apply if the insurer does not continue to meet its own obligations under the contract of reinsurance.

## KA 5 Safeguards

- 5.1** Resolution powers should be exercised in a way that respects the hierarchy of claims while providing flexibility to depart from the general principle of equal (*pari passu*) treatment of creditors of the same class, with transparency about the reasons for such departures, if necessary to contain the potential systemic impact of a firm's failure or to maximise the value for the benefit of all creditors as a whole. In particular, equity should absorb losses first, and no loss should be imposed on senior debt holders until subordinated debt (including all regulatory capital instruments) has been written-off entirely (whether or not that loss-absorption through write-down is accompanied by conversion to equity).
- 5.2** Creditors should have a right to compensation where they do not receive at a minimum what they would have received in a liquidation of the firm under the applicable insolvency regime ("no creditor worse off than in liquidation" safeguard).
- 5.3** Directors and officers of the firm under resolution should be protected in law (for example, from law suits by shareholders or creditors) for actions taken when complying with decisions of the resolution authority.
- 5.4** The resolution authority should have the capacity to exercise the resolution powers with the necessary speed and flexibility, subject to constitutionally protected legal remedies and due process. In those jurisdictions where a court order is still required to apply resolution measures, resolution authorities should take this into account in the resolution planning process so as to ensure that the time required for court proceedings will not compromise the effective implementation of resolution measures.
- 5.5** The legislation establishing resolution regimes should not provide for judicial actions that could constrain the implementation of, or result in a reversal of, measures taken by resolution authorities acting within their legal powers and in good faith. Instead, it should provide for redress by awarding compensation, if justified.
- 5.6** In order to preserve market confidence, jurisdictions should provide for flexibility to allow temporary exemptions from disclosure requirements or a postponement of disclosures required by the firm, for example, under market reporting, takeover provisions and listing rules, where the disclosure by the firm could affect the successful implementation of resolution measures.

### *Essential criteria for KA 5*

- EC 5.1** The resolution authority is required to exercise resolution powers in a way that respects the applicable hierarchy of claims.
- EC 5.2** The legal framework requires the resolution authority, as a general principle, to observe the principle of equal (*pari passu*) treatment of creditors of the same class while permitting departure from that principle where it is necessary for either of the following purposes: (i) to protect financial stability by containing the potential systemic impact of the insurer's failure; or (ii) to maximise the value of the insurer for the benefit of all creditors.
- EC 5.3** The resolution regime provides that creditors that receive less as a result of resolution than they would have received in liquidation have a right to compensation. The legal framework specifies how the right to compensation can be exercised.

- EC 5.4** The legal framework protects the directors and officers of an insurer in resolution against liability, including to shareholders and creditors of the insurer, arising from actions taken when acting in compliance with decisions and instructions of domestic resolution authorities.
- EC 5.5** The legal framework enables the resolution authority to exercise the powers in KA 3 in a timely manner and without any delay that could compromise the achievement of the objectives mentioned in KA 2.3. Where prior court approval is required, the timelines required for completing court proceedings are consistent with KA 5.4 and are incorporated into resolution planning.
- EC 5.6** The legal framework provides that the only remedy that can be obtained from a court or tribunal through judicial review of measures taken by resolution authorities acting within their legal powers and in good faith is compensation, to the exclusion of any remedy that could constrain the implementation of, or reverse, any such measure taken by the resolution authority.
- EC 5.7** The legal framework allows for temporary exemptions from disclosure requirements, for example, under market reporting and listing rules, or the postponement of a disclosure, by an insurer to be granted in circumstances where that disclosure could affect the successful implementation of resolution measures.
- 

### *Explanatory notes for KA 5*

**EN 5 (a) Departure from the *pari passu* principle** – The circumstances in which, or purposes for which, departure from the *pari passu* principle is permitted should be specified in the legal framework. For example, the resolution authority may choose to differentiate creditors of the same class in a resolution, including in a run-off, if necessary to maximise the value for creditors as a whole or to minimise the potential systemic impact of an insurer's failure.

**EN 5 (b) Exercise of rights to compensation** – The requirement in EC 5.3 for provision as to how creditors' right to compensation can be exercised and quantified might be satisfied by some or all of the following: specification of the body or authority responsible for administering the compensation and financially responsible for paying it; procedures for application for compensation; methodologies for the assessment of the value of the payments or benefits under insurance contracts that policyholders would have received in a liquidation of the insurer; a transparent process by which the amount of compensation payable and point in time for purposes of valuation are determined; and procedures for review and challenge of that determination. The purpose of the requirement is to establish to a reasonable level of satisfaction that the right to compensation is substantive.

**EN 5 (c) Scope of the legal protection** – The scope of legal protection for directors, officers and staff of the insurer in resolution should extend to civil actions relating to all actions taken in good faith when acting in accordance with, or giving effect to, decisions and instructions of the domestic resolution authorities and of foreign resolution authorities where such decisions and

instructions have effect in the jurisdiction under review (see KA 7.5). Legal protection may be conferred through either immunity or indemnification.

**EN 5 (d) Court involvement in the resolution process** – KAs 2.1, 2.3, 3.1 and 5.4 should be read in conjunction. KA 2.1 requires jurisdictions to confer resolution powers on administrative authorities to ensure that resolution can proceed in a timely manner in order to achieve the objectives of financial stability set out in KA 2.3. KA 3.1 requires timely and early entry into resolution before an insurer becomes not viable. To the extent that court approvals are required, timely exercise of resolution powers, consistent with KA 5.4, could be facilitated by a legal framework that provides for:

- (i) expedited procedures (for example, with shortened notice, filing and decision deadlines for appeals);
- (ii) applications by the resolution authority without notice to the insurer or other affected parties; and
- (iii) standing of the resolution authority in any resolution-related court proceedings.

Consistent with KA 3.1, in order to achieve timely entry into resolution, the resolution authority, should have means to immediately stabilize the insurer and ensure that essential services and systemic functions remain open and operating to avoid the disruption and contagion that would otherwise accompany their closure. For example, this could entail temporarily suspending policyholders' surrender rights under insurance contracts, pending transfer of those contracts to another insurer or bridge institution, or putting in place arrangements for a run-off of those contracts.

**EN 5 (e) Powers of the court** – KA 5.5 is directed at statutory remedies provided under the resolution regime in connection with resolution measures that are within the legal powers of the resolution authority and taken in good faith, which should be limited to the award of monetary compensation. It does not limit statutory judicial remedies that may be available in relation to actions by the resolution authority that are unlawful because they have been taken in bad faith or are otherwise outside its legal powers, and does not constrain the general or inherent powers of the court to award remedies.

**EN 5 (f) Regulatory disclosure requirements** – Regulatory disclosure requirements refer to disclosures to the public (for example, regular and ad hoc disclosures under market reporting, takeover and listing rules), and not to disclosures that are required to be made to supervisors or any other public authority. The legal framework should provide that any such waiver or postponement will be temporary and short term, and that the grant of a waiver or postponement is disclosed after the relevant information is disclosed.

**EN 5 (g) Exemptions from disclosure in a cross-border context** – The power to grant temporary exemptions from domestic disclosure requirements should also be exercisable where resolution measures are taken by a foreign resolution authority, if disclosure of those measures under domestic requirements could affect the successful implementation of those foreign measures. Cooperation in accordance with KA 7.1 and processes to support foreign resolution measures under KA 7.5 should include the use of the power to grant exemptions from domestic disclosure requirements in appropriate cases.

## KA 6 Funding of firms in resolution

- 6.1** Jurisdictions should have statutory or other policies in place so that authorities are not constrained to rely on public ownership or bail-out funds as a means of resolving firms.
- 6.2** Where temporary sources of funding to maintain essential functions are needed to accomplish orderly resolution, the resolution authority or authority extending the temporary funding should make provision to impose any losses incurred on (i) shareholders and unsecured creditors subject to the “no creditor worse off than in liquidation” safeguard (see Key Attribute 5.2); and recover them (ii) if necessary, from the financial system more widely.
- 6.3** Jurisdictions should have in place privately-financed deposit insurance or resolution funds, or a funding mechanism with ex post recovery from the industry of the costs of providing temporary financing to facilitate the resolution of the firm.
- 6.4** Any provision by the authorities of temporary funding should be subject to strict conditions that minimise the risk of moral hazard, and should include the following:
- (i) a determination that the provision of temporary funding is necessary to foster financial stability and will permit implementation of a resolution option that is best able to achieve the objectives of an orderly resolution, and that private sources of funding have been exhausted or cannot achieve these objectives; and
  - (ii) the allocation of losses to equity holders and residual costs, as appropriate, to unsecured and uninsured creditors and the industry through ex-post assessments, insurance premium or other mechanisms.
- 6.5** As a last resort and for the overarching purpose of maintaining financial stability, some countries may decide to have a power to place the firm under temporary public ownership and control in order to continue critical operations, while seeking to arrange a permanent solution such as a sale or merger with a commercial private sector purchaser. Where countries do equip themselves with such powers, they should make provision to recover any losses incurred by the state from unsecured creditors or, if necessary, the financial system more widely.

### *Essential criteria for KA 6*

- EC 6.1** The legal framework establishes credible arrangements to provide temporary financing (including both temporary liquidity support and temporary solvency support), in terms of the nature, availability and sufficiency of the funding, that can assist the use of the resolution powers set out in KA 3 and achieve the resolution objectives. Those arrangements include one or a combination of the following:
- (i) a privately funded resolution fund;
  - (ii) a privately funded PPS;
  - (iii) a privately funded fund with combined policyholder protection and resolution functions;
  - (iv) recourse to public funds, coupled with a mechanism for recovery from the industry of any losses incurred in the provision of public funds.
- EC 6.2** If the resolution regime provides for the provision of temporary recourse to public funds under point (iv) of EC 6.1, it also ensures that such financing is made available only if:

- (i) it has been assessed as necessary for financial stability by supporting the implementation of a resolution option that best achieves the statutory objectives of resolution (see KA 2.3);
- (ii) private sources of funding have been exhausted or would not achieve those objectives; and
- (iii) losses are allocated in accordance with the hierarchy of claims to (a) shareholders, (b) unsecured creditors and (c) as appropriate, policyholders;
- (iv) if necessary, public funds are recovered from the insurance sector or financial industry.

**EC 6.3** If the resolution regime includes the option of placing an insurer under temporary public ownership as part of a resolution action the exercise of that option is subject to the following conditions:

- (i) the failure of the insurer, or its resolution through all other options, would cause financial instability; and
- (ii) there are clear rules regarding the allocation of losses to shareholders and creditors or, if necessary, recovery from financial system participants more widely.

### *Explanatory notes for KA 6*

**EN 6 (a) Funding arrangements** – Funding arrangements should provide for adequate resources in a resolution to assist the use of any of the powers listed in KA 3.2 in order to achieve the statutory objectives of resolution. These could include, but not be limited to, the resources and legal powers to provide funds to support a transfer of insurance contracts, to capitalise or fund a bridge institution, and to provide temporary guarantees to facilitate the implementation of the resolution and maintain the provision of essential services. Funding for resolution should be raised from the insurer and its creditors, and, if necessary, from other insurance sector or financial industry participants. However, this does not prevent initial funding by the government provided that those public funds are recovered in due course from assets of the insurer, its unsecured creditors (including policyholders unprotected by a PPS) or, if necessary, insurance or financial system participants. Deduction from future tax liabilities as a result of increased contributions to PPS and resolution funds is not necessarily considered public funding of resolution. The resolution fund or other funds for resolution purposes may be either privately or publicly administered, provided that the ultimate source of the funding is private.

Where there is more than one fund or funding mechanism in a jurisdiction that may apply, there are rules in place that determine the contribution of each in any particular case.

**EN 6 (b) Transparent rules and policies on the use of PPS** – If a jurisdiction has in place one or more PPS, there should be transparent rules and policies on the use of such scheme. These

should make specific provision about the conditions for the use of the scheme and the extent of the contribution that may be made, including details of any applicable limits to the contribution (e.g. any aggregate caps on the total use of such scheme or any coverage levels for individual policyholders) and details of the scope of products covered by such funding arrangements and what, if any, are excluded. There should be clarity on any other restrictions on the use of a PPS, such as limitations on payment periods or limitations on the extent to which PPS may be pooled between types of business. Where the PPS has borrowed public funds in the exercise of its functions, explicit provision is made for repayment by industry contributions.

**EN 6 (c) Mechanism for recovery of public funding** – Where jurisdictions rely on public funds for the provision of temporary financing to support the use of resolution powers, the mechanism for recovery from the industry of losses arising from that funding should be based on explicit provision in the legal framework.

**EN 6 (d) Temporary public ownership not a required resolution tool** – It is not necessary for a resolution regime to include the power to place a failing insurer into temporary public ownership. Temporary public ownership refers to nationalisation of the insurer (through acquisition by the government or a public authority of its shares or other instruments of ownership) and is distinct from resolution measures that involve the transfer of assets and liabilities from an insurer to an entity owned or controlled by the state or a public authority, such as a bridge institution.

**EN 6 (e) Conditions for temporary public ownership** – EC 6.3 may be complied with if the conditions set out in points (i) and (ii) are met by policies and guidance. These conditions are not required if the resolution regime of a jurisdiction does not provide for or prohibits temporary public ownership as a resolution tool.

## KA 7 Legal framework conditions for cross-border cooperation

- 7.1** The statutory mandate of a resolution authority should empower and strongly encourage the authority wherever possible to act to achieve a cooperative solution with foreign resolution authorities.
- 7.2** Legislation and regulations in jurisdictions should not contain provisions that trigger automatic action in that jurisdiction as a result of official intervention or the initiation of resolution or insolvency proceedings in another jurisdiction, while reserving the right of discretionary national action if necessary to achieve domestic stability in the absence of effective international cooperation and information sharing. Where a resolution authority takes discretionary national action it should consider the impact on financial stability in other jurisdictions.
- 7.3** The resolution authority should have resolution powers over local branches of foreign firms and the capacity to use its powers either to support a resolution carried out by a foreign home authority (for example, by ordering a transfer of property located in its jurisdiction to a bridge institution established by the foreign home authority) or, in exceptional cases, to take measures on its own initiative where the home jurisdiction is not taking action or acts in a manner that does not take sufficient account of the need to preserve the local jurisdiction's financial stability.\* Where a resolution authority acting as host authority takes discretionary national action, it should give prior notification and consult the foreign home authority.
- 7.4** National laws and regulations should not discriminate against creditors on the basis of their nationality, the location of their claim or the jurisdiction where it is payable. The treatment of creditors and ranking in insolvency should be transparent and properly disclosed to depositors, insurance policy holders and other creditors.
- 7.5** Jurisdictions should provide for transparent and expedited processes to give effect to foreign resolution measures, either by way of a mutual recognition process or by taking measures under the domestic resolution regime that support and are consistent with the resolution measures taken by the foreign home resolution authority. Such recognition or support measures would enable a foreign home resolution authority to gain rapid control over the firm (branch or shares in a subsidiary) or its assets that are located in the host jurisdiction, as appropriate, in cases where the firm is being resolved under the law of the foreign home jurisdiction. Recognition or support of foreign measures should be provisional on the equitable treatment of creditors in the foreign resolution proceeding.
- 7.6** The resolution authority should have the capacity in law, subject to adequate confidentiality requirements and protections for sensitive data, to share information, including recovery and resolution plans (RRPs), pertaining to the group as a whole or to individual subsidiaries or branches, with relevant foreign authorities (for example, members of a CMG), where sharing is necessary for recovery and resolution planning or for implementing a coordinated resolution.
- 7.7** Jurisdictions should provide for confidentiality requirements and statutory safeguards for the protection of information received from foreign authorities.

\* This should not apply where jurisdictions are subject to a binding obligation to respect resolution of financial institutions under the authority of the home jurisdiction (for example, the EU Winding up and Reorganisation Directives).

## *Essential criteria for KA 7*

- EC 7.1** The legal framework empowers and strongly encourages the resolution authority, wherever possible, to act to achieve a cooperative solution with foreign resolution authorities, and contains no material barriers to cooperation.
- EC 7.2** The legal framework does not provide for automatic action as a result of official intervention or the initiation of resolution or insolvency proceedings in other jurisdictions.
- EC 7.3** The legal framework (as applicable to the resolution or insolvency of an insurer) does not discriminate among creditors of the same class on the basis of their nationality, the location of their claim or the jurisdiction where their claim is payable.
- EC 7.4** The legal framework of the jurisdiction under review establishes a transparent and expedited process through which the resolution measures taken in the exercise of the resolution powers under KA 3 and KA 4 by a foreign resolution authority can be given effect in the jurisdiction under review. The process applies with respect to a branch, subsidiary, or assets of a foreign insurer located in, or a liability governed by the law of, the jurisdiction under review.<sup>26</sup> The process provides for recognition or the taking of measures under the domestic resolution or supervisory legal framework that support and are consistent with the resolution measures taken by the foreign resolution authority, as necessary to give effect to a foreign resolution measure. Recognition or support of foreign resolution measures is provisional on the equitable treatment of domestic creditors in the foreign resolution proceeding.
- EC 7.5** The resolution regime enables the resolution authority to take resolution action with respect to the local branch of a foreign insurer (i) to support a foreign resolution and (ii) on its own initiative where the home authority is not taking action or is acting in a manner that does not take sufficient account of the need to preserve financial stability in the local jurisdiction.
- EC 7.6** The resolution regime requires that, prior to exercising resolution powers in relation to a branch of a foreign insurer on its own initiative and independently of action taken by the home authority, the resolution authority give prior notice of the intended measure to, and consult the home resolution authority.

---

<sup>26</sup> This does not apply to the extent that jurisdictions are required by the applicable legal framework to recognise resolution of financial institutions (including automatic mutual recognition) under the law of their home jurisdiction and carried out by the authorities of their home jurisdiction. However, EC 7.4 applies in an assessment of such jurisdictions in relation to a branch, subsidiary, or assets of a foreign insurer located in, or a liability governed by the law of, the jurisdiction under review that are not covered by such an obligation to recognise resolution actions by the home jurisdiction of that insurer.

## *Explanatory notes for KA 7*

**EN 7 (a) Assessment of KA 7** – The assessment methodology is designed to enable assessors to examine compliance with each KA and the KAs overall. To avoid duplication in the assessment, and to simplify the process, the availability of resolution powers with respect to a subsidiary or a branch of a foreign insurer (including those that could be used to provide support to a foreign resolution or to take discretionary national action in accordance with KAs 7.3 and 7.5) is assessed under KA 3 and KA 4. The assessment under KA 7 would therefore focus on whether the resolution and other related powers can be applied in a manner that facilitates cross-border cooperation. For similar reasons, access to information and information sharing requirements under the *Key Attributes*, including those under KA 7.6 and KA 7.7, are assessed under KA 12.

**EN 7 (b) Empowerment and encouragement to achieve cooperative solutions (EC 7.1)** – Jurisdictions may demonstrate that a resolution authority is empowered and encouraged to achieve a cooperative solution by observing the other ECs specified for KA 7 and, in particular, by having in place cross-border enforcement frameworks of the type described in KA 7.5. Material barriers to cooperation may include, for example, requirements that prevent recognition in the absence of reciprocity even where recognition would be in the best interest of the jurisdiction under review, and provisions that provide for automatic action as a result of official intervention or the initiation of resolution or insolvency proceedings in foreign jurisdictions.

**EN 7 (c) “Automatic action” (EC 7.2)** – The types of “automatic action” that are relevant under KA 7.2 include any form of resolution action provided for in KA 3.2 or other liquidation or winding-down procedures or acts by public authorities that have the same effect, including the withdrawal of the institution’s license. The reference to “automatic action” does not cover actions or events that may be triggered by an official intervention (e.g., taking supervisory corrective action, imposing a sanction or placing the insurer under public ownership or control) or the initiation of resolution or insolvency proceedings in other jurisdictions, so long as the relevant authority in the jurisdiction under review retains discretion to act or to refrain from acting (e.g., with respect to the withdrawal of an insurance license). Nor does “automatic action” refer to any action as a result of contractual provisions; these issues are addressed separately in KA 4. Similarly, it does not cover any automatic effects of recognition (for example, the imposition of a temporary stay on creditor actions) that are intended to facilitate giving effect to foreign resolution actions in accordance with KA 7.5. The ability of a host authority to refrain from taking action may be considered as evidence that the jurisdiction’s legal framework does not provide for “automatic action”.

**EN 7 (d) Non-discriminatory treatment of creditors (EC 7.3)** – The principle of non-discrimination applies regardless of the type of presence that the insurer subject to resolution or insolvency proceedings has in the jurisdiction under review (i.e., a branch, subsidiary, or assets located in, or a liability governed by the law of the jurisdiction under review). In particular, the principle applies in the resolution of a parent insurer in the home jurisdiction or in the resolution of a branch or subsidiary in a host jurisdiction. In either case the applicable legal framework should not discriminate between creditors of the same class on the basis of their nationality, their residence, the location of their claim, or the jurisdiction where their claim is payable. In particular, under the applicable creditor hierarchy, claims of foreign creditors (that is, creditors that are foreign nationals or non-residents) of the entity under resolution must be entitled to the same

treatment as the claims of local creditors of the same class. Moreover, in a home resolution proceeding with respect to an insurer, claims of creditors of a foreign branch must be accorded the same priority and be entitled to the same treatment as claims of the same class against the insurer. Laws and regulations should not be explicitly discriminatory or discriminatory in their effect. For instance, differences in procedures (for example, subjecting certain claims to expedited treatment) may have discriminatory effects.

**EN 7 (e) Statutory approaches to give effect to foreign resolution measures (EC 7.4) – KA 7.5 and EC 7.4** pertain to “statutory” (i.e., as opposed to “contractual”) approaches for giving effect to foreign resolution measures, which—in addition to primary legislation—may comprise other components of the legal framework such as legal precedent. Statutory approaches encompass recognition and the taking of measures under the domestic resolution or supervisory legal framework that support and are consistent with the resolution measures taken by the foreign resolution authority. Recognition and supportive measures complement each other and in practice, both may be required to achieve the desired outcome. Legal and procedural differences may mean that a recognition process is more suitable for certain resolution actions or certain situations, while supportive measures may be the preferred approach for others. The combination of recognition and support measures available in a jurisdiction should enable the resolution authority, supervisory authority, or court in the jurisdiction under review to give effect to resolution measures (e.g., change of control, transfer of assets and liabilities, bail-in, and stays of contractual rights) taken in the exercise of any of the resolution powers set forth under KA 3 and KA 4 by a foreign resolution authority against an insurer in that jurisdiction, with respect to a branch, subsidiary, or assets of a foreign insurer located in, or a liability governed by the law of, the jurisdiction under review.

- **Recognition of the foreign resolution measure** – Recognition implies that, at the request of a foreign authority, a jurisdiction would accept the commencement of a foreign resolution proceeding domestically and thereby empower the relevant domestic authority (either a court or an administrative agency) to enforce the foreign resolution measure or grant other forms of domestic relief, for example, a stay on domestic creditor proceedings. Recognition is not dependent on the exercise of resolution powers in the local jurisdiction. Once recognition is granted, the measure adopted by the foreign resolution authority can be given effect in accordance with the domestic law, even if there are no grounds for commencement of domestic resolution proceedings.
- **Supporting the foreign resolution measure** – Supportive measures may involve the taking of resolution measures or supervisory measures under the relevant domestic law (for example, resolution law, insurance law or securities law) to produce the effect of, or otherwise support, the resolution measure taken by the foreign resolution authority. (Consequently, the concept of support applies only where a foreign insurer has a branch, subsidiary or some other regulated presence (e.g., listed securities) in the jurisdiction under review.) The ability to take supportive measures would be limited both by the availability of powers under the domestic regime and the legal authority to use those powers in a manner that facilitates cross-border cooperation.
- **Use of resolution powers to support a foreign resolution** – An assessment under KA 7 would determine whether available resolution powers could be used to produce the effect of resolution measures taken by a foreign resolution authority

against the foreign insurer. In making that determination, assessors should examine whether the statutory objectives of the resolution authority, or other aspects of the legal framework, permit the resolution authority to use resolution powers to provide assistance to, or cooperate with a foreign resolution authority. The use of resolution powers to provide support to a foreign resolution would entail the commencement of resolution proceedings against a domestic branch or subsidiary of a foreign insurer.

- **Use of supervisory powers to support foreign resolutions** – Examples of supervisory powers that can be taken to support a foreign resolution include, but are not limited to, circumstances where: (i) approvals are required for changes in ownership or control of the insurer or its subsidiaries; (ii) a waiver of regulatory requirements may be needed (e.g., capital requirements of a bridge institution; market disclosure requirements); (iii) approvals are required for the appointment of local branch managers and officers of the insurer; or (iv) directions to regulated entities are needed to ensure the continuity of essential services. Where reference is made to supervisory approvals, there can be reliance, where appropriate, on an assessment conducted under the IAIS *Insurance Core Principles*.<sup>27</sup> Where the resolution and supervisory authorities are not the same entity, the ability of those authorities to coordinate in obtaining in a timely manner the necessary supervisory approvals to support a resolution action should be assessed.
- **Exercise of discretion not to take domestic action** – In some cases, the jurisdiction under review may be able to support a foreign resolution measure simply by not taking domestic action. However, it may be the case that forbearance by the domestic resolution or supervisory authority is by itself insufficient to give effect to a foreign resolution measure, for example, where a stay on local creditor actions is needed, or an insurance license for a new owner of the local operations needs to be issued on an expedited basis.

**EN 7 (f) Processes for recognition and support (EC 7.4)** – Jurisdictions may achieve the objectives of KA 7.5 through an administrative or judicial process or a combination of administrative and judicial processes. Having a transparent process implies that the process should be established and set out in advance. Jurisdictions should endeavour to assist relevant stakeholders in understanding how the process works and how their interests may be affected by, at a minimum, providing a short written summary of the relevant process(es) by which effect can be given to foreign resolution measures. For processes to be expedited, the processes should allow the jurisdiction to give effect to the foreign resolution measure in a timely manner, bearing in mind that the necessary timeline will depend on the specific measure in question. The processes in the jurisdiction under review should occur on a basis that is sufficiently timely so as to not undermine the home resolution authorities' exercise of resolution powers. In practice, certain resolution measures must be given effect immediately upon the commencement of resolution (e.g., a stay on creditor actions), while others may take longer. Where the process requires involvement of judicial authorities, such involvement should be consistent with the

---

<sup>27</sup> See <https://www.iaisweb.org/page/supervisory-material/insurance-core-principles/file/70028/all-adopted-icps-updated-november-2017>, November 2017.

requirements under KA 5.4. To the extent that supervisory approvals are required to give effect to a foreign resolution measure under the legal framework of the jurisdiction under review, there should be an expedited process for the foreign resolution authority to obtain the relevant approvals. Such processes shall include coordination arrangements between supervisory and resolution authorities, where they are not the same entity.

**EN 7 (g) Conditions for giving effect to foreign resolution measures (EC 7.4)** – EC 7.4 provides that recognition or support of foreign measures should be provisional on the equitable treatment of creditors in the foreign resolution proceeding. In the context of recognition where the creditor hierarchy of the foreign jurisdiction may apply, it would be consistent with the standard to make recognition conditional on, at minimum, creditors in the host jurisdiction receiving treatment equal to that of home-country creditors with similar legal rights (i.e., a non-discrimination requirement). However, since ‘equitable’ treatment of creditors is not tantamount to ‘equal’ treatment, jurisdictions have flexibility to take into consideration public policy to determine what is ‘equitable’ on a case-by-case basis.

Recognition or support of foreign resolution measures may be subject to additional conditions other than equitable treatment of creditors. However, a decision not to give effect to a foreign resolution measure should be limited to cases where, in substance, the implementation of the measure would:

- (i) have adverse effects on domestic financial stability (for example, they would affect the continuity of economic functions that are critical to the domestic financial system; or would be inconsistent with or undermine the implementation of domestic resolution action that has already been undertaken by the host authority before it becomes aware of the resolution measure of the home authority);
- (ii) contravene public policy; or
- (iii) have material fiscal implications (for example, by exposing public authorities or taxpayers to loss).

**EN 7 (h) Prior notification and consultation (EC 7.6)** – The provision that a resolution authority (acting as host authority) should give prior notice of measures taken on its own initiative to, and consult, a foreign home resolution authority does not require consent from the home authority to any of the decisions taken by the host authority, but rather that the host authority makes good faith efforts to communicate with the home authority the nature of its concerns and the actions it proposes to take.

## KA 8 Crisis Management Groups (CMGs)

- 8.1** Home and key host authorities of all G-SIFIs should maintain CMGs with the objective of enhancing preparedness for, and facilitating the management and resolution of, a cross-border financial crisis affecting the firm. CMGs should include the supervisory authorities, central banks, resolution authorities, finance ministries and the public authorities responsible for guarantee schemes of jurisdictions that are home or host to entities of the group that are material to its resolution, and should cooperate closely with authorities in other jurisdictions where firms have a systemic presence.
- 8.2** CMGs should keep under active review, and report as appropriate to the FSB and the FSB Peer Review Council on:
- (i) progress in coordination and information sharing within the CMGs and with host authorities that are not represented in the CMGs;
  - (ii) the recovery and resolution planning process for G-SIFIs under institution-specific cooperation agreements; and
  - (iii) the resolvability of G-SIFIs.

### *Essential criteria for KA 8*

- EC 8.1** If the jurisdiction under review is the home jurisdiction of one or more G-SIIs, a CMG is established and maintained for each G-SII that includes the authorities that would be involved in the resolution of the G-SII (including supervisory authorities, central banks, resolution authorities, finance ministries and the public authorities responsible for guarantee schemes of jurisdictions that are home or host to entities of the group that are material to its resolution). A policy, process and criteria are maintained for determining which jurisdictions are host to entities that are material for a group-wide resolution of the insurer and are represented in the CMG.
- EC 8.2** If the jurisdiction under review is the home jurisdiction of one or more G-SIIs, it has processes to ascertain which jurisdictions that are not represented in the CMG assess the local operations of the G-SII as systemically important to the local financial system. There is a documented process for cooperation, or other evidence of efforts to cooperate with relevant authorities in those jurisdictions that have been identified through this process.
- EC 8.3** The jurisdiction under review (if it is not itself the home jurisdiction) participates, when invited, in a CMG for a G-SII.

---

### *Explanatory notes for KA 8*

**EN 8 (a) Jurisdictions material for resolution of G-SIIs** – For operational reasons, the membership of CMGs may be restricted to the relevant authorities of those jurisdictions that are material for the resolution of the insurer in question. A jurisdiction is material for resolution when the authorities in that jurisdiction have responsibilities relating to significant or critical operations for the G-SII, including its material operating entities or the holding company.

In making that determination, the home authority may take into account multiple factors, including:

- (i) the size as a whole of the activities (including presence of assets, funding, etc.) conducted in the host jurisdiction and their significance for the group;
- (ii) the extent to which those activities are likely to have an impact on the continuity of the global operations of the insurer;
- (iii) the extent to which information on the insurer held in the host jurisdiction, for example, presence of significant data centres under the control of host authorities, is critical for resolution;
- (iv) the capacity of the host authorities to cooperate and to support a group-wide solution, including the legal authority to share information and safeguard confidential information; and
- (v) the role of the host authorities in implementing a group-wide resolution strategy.

An assessment of the capacity of host authorities to cooperate and support a group-wide solution might take into account the authority's powers under the applicable legal framework to share information and support resolution actions taken by other jurisdictions, and any relevant experience of cooperation with that authority.

**EN 8 (b) Jurisdictions not represented on the CMG** – The processes in place to ascertain which host jurisdictions that are not represented in the CMG assess the local operations of the insurer as systemically important to the local financial system should be sufficiently systematic to enable the home authority to be aware of the relevant jurisdictions.

**EN 8 (c) Cooperation with host jurisdictions not represented in the CMG** – The level of cooperation with relevant authorities in host jurisdictions where the insurer has a systemic presence that are not represented in the CMG is not necessarily the same as that required between members of a CMG. But, as a minimum, cooperation with such non-CMG host jurisdictions should inform the authorities in those jurisdictions about how resolution strategies and the measures set out in recovery and resolution plans affect the parts of the insurer that are systemic in their jurisdiction (see EC 11.11), if at all.

**EN 8 (d) Host Participation in CMGs** – If the jurisdiction under review is a host country to G-SIIs, and there are no legal or policy impediments to its participation in CMGs, COAGs or the cross-border aspects of resolvability assessment, but it has not been asked to participate, the EC 8.3 should be considered “not applicable”.

## KA 9 Institution-specific cross-border cooperation agreements

- 9.1** For all G-SIFIs, at a minimum, institution-specific cooperation agreements, containing the essential elements set out in Annex I, should be in place between the home and relevant host authorities that need to be involved in the planning and crisis resolution stages. These agreements should, inter alia:
- (i) establish the objectives and processes for cooperation through CMGs;
  - (ii) define the roles and responsibilities of the authorities pre-crisis (that is, in the recovery and resolution planning phases) and during a crisis;
  - (iii) set out the process for information sharing before and during a crisis, including sharing with any host authorities that are not represented in the CMG, with clear reference to the legal bases for information sharing in the respective national laws and to the arrangements that protect the confidentiality of the shared information;
  - (iv) set out the processes for coordination in the development of the RRP for the firm, including parent or holding company and significant subsidiaries, branches and affiliates that are within the scope of the agreement, and for engagement with the firm as part of this process;
  - (v) set out the processes for coordination among home and host authorities in the conduct of resolvability assessments;
  - (vi) include agreed procedures for the home authority to inform and consult host authorities in a timely manner when there are material adverse developments affecting the firm and before taking any significant action or crisis measures;
  - (vii) include agreed procedures for the host authority to inform and consult the home authority in a timely manner when there are material adverse developments affecting the firm and before taking any discretionary action or crisis measure;
  - (viii) provide an appropriate level of detail with regard to the cross-border implementation of specific resolution measures, including with respect to the use of bridge institution and bail-in powers;
  - (ix) provide for meetings to be held at least annually, involving top officials of the home and relevant host authorities, to review the robustness of the overall resolution strategy for G-SIFIs; and
  - (x) provide for regular (at least annual) reviews by appropriate senior officials of the operational plans implementing the resolution strategies.
- 9.2** The existence of agreements should be made public. The home authorities may publish the broad structure of the agreements, if agreed by the authorities that are party to the agreement.

### *Essential criteria for KA 9*

- EC 9.1** If the jurisdiction under review is home to a G-SII, it maintains a COAG with all members of the CMG and publicly discloses the existence of those agreements.
- EC 9.2** If the jurisdiction under review is invited by the home jurisdiction to be party to a COAG for a G-SII, it has concluded, or can demonstrate that it is engaging in good faith negotiations towards the conclusion of, an agreement with other members of the CMG.

---

*Explanatory notes for KA 9*

**EN 9 (a) Separate terms on information sharing** – The terms on information sharing between members of the CMG may be standard and documented separately from the insurer-specific elements of agreements and procedures for the operation of CMGs and the development of recovery and resolution plans. However, agreements on information sharing set out in supervisory MoUs may only be used to meet the requirements of EC 9.1 if they refer explicitly to information sharing for the purposes of planning or carrying out resolution: provision for the exchange of information for supervisory or oversight purposes only is not sufficient.

**EN 9 (b) Nature of COAGs** – Jurisdictions should strive towards multi-lateral institution-specific cooperation agreements so as to promote consistency and transparency of policy commitments across all relevant jurisdictions. Bilateral forms of COAGs are less conducive to effective cross-border coordination among multiple jurisdictions as they may generate a complex and opaque web of agreements that pose significant implementation challenges, due to lack of transparency and the potential for misalignment.

**EN 9 (c) Good faith negotiations towards the conclusion of an agreement** – The onus is on the assessed jurisdiction to demonstrate that it is engaging in good faith negotiations towards the conclusion of an agreement.

## KA 10 Resolvability assessments

- 10.1** Resolution authorities should regularly undertake, at least for G-SIFIs, resolvability assessments that evaluate the feasibility of resolution strategies and their credibility in light of the likely impact of the firm's failure on the financial system and the overall economy. Those assessments should be conducted in accordance with the guidance set out in I-Annex 3.
- 10.2** In undertaking resolvability assessments, resolution authorities should in coordination with other relevant authorities assess, in particular:
- (i) the extent to which critical financial services, and payment, clearing and settlement functions can continue to be performed;
  - (ii) the nature and extent of intra-group exposures and their impact on resolution if they need to be unwound;
  - (iii) the capacity of the firm to deliver sufficiently detailed accurate and timely information to support resolution; and
  - (iv) the robustness of cross-border cooperation and information sharing arrangements.
- 10.3** Group resolvability assessments should be conducted by the home authority of the G-SIFI and coordinated within the firm's CMG taking into account national assessments by host authorities.
- 10.4** Host resolution authorities that conduct resolvability assessments of subsidiaries located in their jurisdiction should coordinate as far as possible with the home authority that conducts resolvability assessment for the group as a whole.
- 10.5** To improve a firm's resolvability, supervisory authorities or resolution authorities should have powers to require, where necessary, the adoption of appropriate measures, such as changes to a firm's business practices, structure or organisation, to reduce the complexity and costliness of resolution, duly taking into account the effect on the soundness and stability of on-going business. To enable the continued operations of systemically important functions, authorities should evaluate whether to require that these functions be segregated in legally and operationally independent entities that are shielded from group problems.

### *Essential criteria for KA 10*

- EC 10.1** If the jurisdiction under review is home to one or more G-SIFIs or insurers that are subject to a requirement for resolution plans under KA 11, arrangements and processes are in place whereby the resolution authorities undertake, in cooperation with relevant host authorities, regular group resolvability assessments, including when there are material changes to the resolution plan.
- EC 10.2** If the jurisdiction under review is host to one or more G-SIFIs or insurers that are subject to a requirement for resolution plans under KA 11, it has in place arrangements and processes whereby the resolution authorities cooperate with the home jurisdiction and contribute to the development of the resolvability assessments where invited to do so by the home jurisdiction, including by sharing results of local resolvability assessments with the home authority.
- EC 10.3** The supervisory authorities or resolution authorities have the power to require changes to an insurer's business practices, legal, operational or financial structures or organisation that are necessary to improve the resolvability of the insurer.

---

## *Explanatory notes for KA 10*

**EN 10 (a) Relationship between KA 10 resolvability assessment and RAP** – The technical resolvability assessments to be carried out in accordance with KA 10 are distinct from the FSB Resolvability Assessment Process (RAP), which is carried out annually for G-SIIs. The former are carried out at a technical level by staff of the home resolution authority, in cooperation with staff of the host authorities that participate in the CMG, and inform and iterate with resolution planning. The RAP is carried out at the level of the FSB, and involves a high level overview of the resolvability of G-SIIs and common obstacles to resolvability. The results of the detailed technical KA 10 resolvability assessments are used as the basis of the RAP. Participation of jurisdictions in the RAP is not assessed under this methodology.

**EN 10 (b) Action to improve resolvability** – The power for supervisory or resolution authorities to require insurers to make changes to improve their resolvability should be sufficiently broad so as to include a range of possible requirements such as: changes to legal structure or operational organisation to facilitate the legal and economic separation of critical functions from other functions; the divestment of specific assets; issuance of loss absorbing capacity by particular parts of the group to support a specific resolution strategy; limiting maximum individual and aggregate exposures; the establishment of a financial holding company in a mixed-activity group; limiting or ceasing existing activities; restricting the development of new business lines or sale of new products, or imposing structural or organisational requirements on the way such business lines or products are provided; addressing intra-group exposures between insurers and non-insurers in financial conglomerates; ensuring effective segregation of client assets; changes to the reinsurance strategy; and drawing up service agreements (either intra-group or with third parties) to support the continued provision of critical functions in resolution.

Powers to require changes to improve resolvability should be exercisable in advance of any financial problems in the insurer that could lead to non-viability, and should not be contingent on the existence of such problems. Their use should take due account of the effect on the soundness and stability of the on-going domestic and foreign operations of the insurer.

The assessors should evaluate whether the authorities are able to compel such changes, the range of measures that can be required and the circumstances in which the powers can be exercised, including by assessing any experience of the use of such powers. It is not inconsistent with EC 10.3 if the legal framework includes safeguards for insurers, such as a right of appeal.

## KA 11 Recovery and resolution planning

- 11.1** Jurisdictions should put in place an on-going process for recovery and resolution planning, covering at a minimum domestically incorporated firms that could be systemically significant or critical if they fail.
- 11.2** Jurisdictions should require that robust and credible RRP, containing the essential elements of Recovery and Resolution Plans set out in I-Annex 4, are in place for all G-SIFIs and for any other firm that its home authority assesses could have an impact on financial stability in the event of its failure.
- 11.3** The RRP should be informed by resolvability assessments (see Key Attribute 10) and take account of the specific circumstances of the firm and reflect its nature, complexity, interconnectedness, level of substitutability and size.
- 11.4** Jurisdictions should require that the firm's senior management be responsible for providing the necessary input to the resolution authorities for (i) the assessment of the recovery plans; and (ii) the preparation by the resolution authority of resolution plans.
- 11.5** Supervisory and resolution authorities should ensure that the firms for which a RRP is required maintain a recovery plan that identifies options to restore financial strength and viability when the firm comes under severe stress. Recovery plans should include:
- (i) credible options to cope with a range of scenarios including both idiosyncratic and market wide stress;
  - (ii) scenarios that address capital shortfalls and liquidity pressures; and
  - (iii) processes to ensure timely implementation of recovery options in a range of stress situations.
- 11.6** The resolution plan is intended to facilitate the effective use of resolution powers to protect systemically important functions, with the aim of making the resolution of any firm feasible without severe disruption and without exposing taxpayers to loss. It should include a substantive resolution strategy agreed by top officials and an operational plan for its implementation and identify, in particular:
- (i) financial and economic functions for which continuity is critical;
  - (ii) suitable resolution options to preserve those functions or wind them down in an orderly manner;
  - (iii) data requirements on the firm's business operations, structures, and systemically important functions;
  - (iv) potential barriers to effective resolution and actions to mitigate those barriers;
  - (v) actions to protect insured depositors and insurance policy holders and ensure the rapid return of segregated client assets; and
  - (vi) clear options or principles for the exit from the resolution process.
- 11.7** Firms should be required to ensure that key Service Level Agreements can be maintained in crisis situations and in resolution, and that the underlying contracts include provisions that prevent termination triggered by recovery or resolution events and facilitate transfer of the contract to a bridge institution or a third party acquirer.
- 11.8** At least for G-SIFIs, the home resolution authority should lead the development of the group resolution plan in coordination with all members of the firm's CMG. Host authorities that are involved in the CMG or are the authorities of jurisdictions where the firm has a systemic

presence should be given access to RRP and the information and measures that would have an impact on their jurisdiction.

- 11.9** Host resolution authorities may maintain their own resolution plans for the firm's operations in their jurisdictions cooperating with the home authority to ensure that the plan is as consistent as possible with the group plan.
- 11.10** Supervisory and resolution authorities should ensure that RRP are updated regularly, at least annually or when there are material changes to a firm's business or structure, and subject to regular reviews within the firm's CMG.
- 11.11** The substantive resolution strategy for each G-SIFI should be subject, at least annually, to a review by top officials of home and relevant host authorities and, where appropriate, the review should involve the firm's CEO. The operational plans for implementing each resolution strategy should be, at least annually, reviewed by appropriate senior officials of the home and relevant host authorities.
- 11.12** If resolution authorities are not satisfied with a firm's RRP, the authorities should require appropriate measures to address the deficiencies. Relevant home and host authorities should provide for prior consultation on the actions contemplated.

### *Essential criteria for KA 11*

- EC 11.1** The resolution regime requires the development and maintenance of RRP for all G-SIFIs for which the jurisdiction is the home country and for any other insurer that could be systemically significant or critical if it fails.
- EC 11.2** The development and maintenance of RRP for insurers covered by EC 11.1 that are not G-SIFIs takes into account the specific circumstances of the individual insurers, including their nature, complexity, interconnectedness, level of substitutability and size and the extent of cross-border operations.
- EC 11.3** The legal framework imposes the responsibility for the development and maintenance of insurers' recovery planning process on the board and senior management, subject to regular review by supervisory or resolution authorities. Maintenance includes reviewing and updating the recovery plan at least annually, and sooner in the event of material changes to the insurer's business or structure.
- EC 11.4** The legal framework requires recovery plans to:
- (i) include measures for addressing capital shortfalls and liquidity pressures;
  - (ii) set out credible recovery options to deal with a range of stress scenarios covering both idiosyncratic and market wide stress; and
  - (iii) define clear backstops and escalation procedures, identifying the quantitative and qualitative criteria that would trigger implementation of the plan by the insurer.
- EC 11.5** The resolution regime sets out the requirements for the content of resolution plans which, at a minimum, include a substantive resolution strategy and an operational

plan that meets the requirements set out in points (i) to (vi) of KA 11.6 (for all insurers).

- EC 11.6** If the jurisdiction is home to a G-SII, the home resolution authority has a process in place for the authorities represented on the CMG or equivalent arrangement to review the substantive resolution strategy for the insurer and for the agreement of that strategy by top officials of those authorities.
- EC 11.7** In order to support operational continuity of the critical functions of an insurer in resolution, the resolution regime:
- (i) requires insurers to ensure that their Service Level Agreements, that are required to maintain continuity of critical functions or critical shared services, can be maintained in crisis situations and in resolution, and that the underlying contracts include provisions that prevent termination from being triggered by recovery or resolution events, and facilitate transfer of the contract to a bridge institution or a third party acquirer; and
  - (ii) ensures that, as part of resolution planning for insurers that are FMI participants, resolution authorities consider how the insurer in resolution or a successor would maintain access to the FMI services that are necessary to support the critical functions of the insurer.
- EC 11.8** The resolution regime requires authorities to review and, to the extent necessary, update resolution plans at least annually, and sooner upon the occurrence of an event that materially changes the insurer's business or structure, including its operations, strategy or risk exposure. That review includes assessment of the feasibility and credibility of the resolution plans in the light of the likely impact of the insurer's failure on the financial system and the overall economy.
- EC 11.9** If the jurisdiction is home to an insurer with material cross-border operations that is subject to a resolution planning requirement in the home jurisdiction, the home resolution authority has a process in place, including appropriate and proportionate arrangements for cross-border cooperation and information sharing with host authorities, to support the development and maintenance of recovery and resolution plans.
- EC 11.10** If the jurisdiction is home to a G-SII, the home resolution authority has a process in place to develop a group-wide resolution strategy and plan for the G-SII in coordination with all members of the insurer's CMG, and gives all members of the CMG access to the insurer's RRP and information on measures that would have an impact on their jurisdiction.
- EC 11.11** If the jurisdiction is home to a G-SII, the home resolution authority has a process in place to cooperate with authorities of jurisdictions where the G-SII has a systemic presence that are not members of the CMG, and provide authorities in those jurisdictions with access to relevant material from the RRP and information on resolution strategies or measures that the home resolution authority judges would have an impact on their jurisdiction.

- EC 11.12** If the jurisdiction under review is a host to an insurer that is subject to a resolution planning requirement in the host jurisdiction and maintains its own resolution plans for the insurer's local operations in its jurisdiction, there is a clear process for coordination with the home authority to ensure that the plan is as consistent as possible with the group plan.
- EC 11.13** If the jurisdiction under review is home to a G-SII, it has in place a process for coordination with authorities participating in the CMG for the review, at least annually, of:
- (i) the resolution strategy by top officials of home and relevant host authorities, involving the insurer's CEO where appropriate; and
  - (ii) the operational plans for the implementation of the resolution strategy by senior officials of the relevant (home and host) authorities.
- EC11.14** The supervisory or resolution authority has the power to require an insurer to take measures to address deficiencies in its recovery plan and provide inputs to their resolution plan, and in cases where authorities require insurers to prepare a resolution plan, furnish its resolution plan.
- 

### *Explanatory notes for KA 11*

**EN 11 (a) Proportionality of the RRP requirement** – Requirements for RRPs (including a requirement for the frequency of the update of the RRPs) should be implemented in a way that reflects the nature, complexity, interconnectedness, level of substitutability, size and extent of cross-border operations of insurers in the jurisdiction under review. Accordingly, the requirements relating to the development and maintenance of RRPs for G-SIIs are more detailed and more extensive than for other insurers, particularly with respect to cross-border cooperation as reflected in KAs 8 to 10.

With reference to resolution planning, the assessment should be focused on whether the jurisdiction is in compliance with KA 11 and its content requirements for plans, which may be determined also through secondary information, including information and materials from relevant authorities knowledgeable about resolution planning and the plans.

**EN 11 (b) Appropriate and proportionate arrangements for cross-border cooperation and coordination with key host authorities** – If the jurisdiction is home to a G-SII, the home authority should have appropriate and proportionate arrangements for cross-border cooperation and coordination with the relevant host authorities set out under KAs 8 and 9 relating to the establishment of the CMG and the adoption of COAGs.

Processes for cooperation with authorities that are not members of a CMG should provide those authorities, at a minimum, with sufficient information on the resolution strategy and plan for insurers that are systemically significant in their jurisdiction so that those authorities understand the impact, if any, that the strategy and measures set out in the plan would have on the insurer's

operations in their jurisdiction. However, a jurisdiction may limit or refuse access to information in the RRP on the basis that the recipient authority is unable to provide necessary assurances that the information will be kept confidential.

If the jurisdiction is home to an insurer that is not a G-SII but which is required to undertake recovery and resolution planning and has operations in foreign jurisdictions that are material to the financial group, the home authority should have established or have undertaken reasonable efforts to establish appropriate and proportionate arrangements for cross-border cooperation and coordination with the relevant host authorities to support the process of recovery and resolution planning. The home authority should seek to establish a cross-border coordinating forum (e.g., an extended supervisory college) with a mandate to cover cross border recovery and resolution planning for the insurer. Reasonable efforts include inviting foreign jurisdictions that are material to the group to participate in such a coordinating forum (whether or not they participate) and demonstrable progress on coordination and cooperation e.g., documented arrangements for coordination and information sharing between members of the forum, including for sharing RRP's etc.

## KA 12 Access to information and information sharing

- 12.1** Jurisdictions should ensure that no legal, regulatory or policy impediments exist that hinder the appropriate exchange of information, including firm-specific information, between supervisory authorities, central banks, resolution authorities, finance ministries and the public authorities responsible for guarantee schemes. In particular:
- (i) the sharing of all information relevant for recovery and resolution planning and for resolution should be possible in normal times and during a crisis at a domestic and a cross-border level;
  - (ii) the procedures for the sharing of information relating to G-SIFIs should be set out in institution-specific cooperation agreements (see Annex I); and
  - (iii) where appropriate and necessary to respect the sensitive nature of information, information sharing may be restricted, but should be possible among the top officials of the relevant home and host authorities.
- 12.2** Jurisdictions should require firms to maintain Management Information Systems (MIS) that are able to produce information on a timely basis, both in normal times for recovery and resolution planning and in resolution. Information should be available at the group level and the legal entity level (taking into account information needs under different resolution scenarios, including the separation of individual entities from the group). Firms should be required, in particular, to:
- (i) maintain a detailed inventory, including a description and the location of the key MIS used in their material legal entities, mapped to their core services and critical functions;
  - (ii) identify and address exogenous legal constraints on the exchange of management information among the constituent entities of a financial group (for example, as regards the information flow from individual entities of the group to the parent);
  - (iii) demonstrate, as part of the recovery and resolution planning process, that they are able to produce the essential information needed to implement such plans within a short period of time (for example, 24 hours); and
  - (iv) maintain specific information at a legal entity level, including, for example, information on intra-group guarantees and intra-group trades booked on a back-to-back basis.

### *Essential criteria for KA 12*

- EC 12.1** The resolution authority has the power under the legal framework to access any information from insurers that is material for the planning, preparation and implementation of resolution measures in a timely manner.
- EC 12.2** The legal framework permits, and contains adequate legal gateways for, the disclosure, in normal times and during a crisis, of non-public information (including insurer-specific information) necessary for recovery and resolution planning and for carrying out resolution to domestic and foreign authorities that could have a role in resolution, including as appropriate supervisory authorities, central banks, resolution authorities, finance ministries and the public authorities responsible for guarantee schemes. Disclosure under those legal gateways is conditional on the recipient authority being subject to adequate confidentiality requirements and safeguards that are appropriate to the nature and sensitivity of the information to be disclosed.

- EC 12.3** The legal framework or resolution regime incorporates adequate safeguards to protect the confidentiality of non-public information received from other domestic or foreign authorities. Such safeguards:
- (i) require authorities to keep such information confidential and to use it only in accordance with the terms on which the information was provided;
  - (ii) prohibit domestic authorities from disclosing such information to other domestic or foreign authorities or other third parties without the prior express consent of the authority that provided it, unless such disclosure is compelled by law; and
  - (iii) exclude information received from foreign authorities from mandatory disclosure pursuant to freedom of information or similar legislation that may exist in that jurisdiction, or treat such information as falling under an exemption from disclosure requirements.
- EC 12.4** The resolution authority has policies and procedures in place to control and monitor the dissemination within the authority of non-public information received from a foreign home or host authority.
- EC 12.5** Insurers subject to a recovery and resolution planning requirement are required to maintain management information systems that are capable of producing information necessary for recovery and resolution planning, assessing resolvability and the conduct of resolution, including the items specified in KA 12.2, and delivering that information to authorities on a timely basis.
- EC 12.6** The jurisdiction has in place processes (for example, through regular examinations) to test insurers' ability to produce information for recovery and resolution planning and in resolution on a timely basis.

---

### *Explanatory notes for KA 12*

**EN 12 (a) Access to Information and Information Sharing** – To avoid duplication in the assessment, access to information and information sharing requirements under the *Key Attributes*, including those under KA 7.6 and KA 7.7, are assessed under KA 12.

Access by the resolution authority to information may take the form of direct access to the insurer established in the jurisdiction or indirect access through a supervisory authority or other relevant authority. However, if the resolution authority requires additional information to prepare for resolution it should have direct access to the insurer.

**EN 12 (b) “Adequate Legal gateways”** – A jurisdiction that relies on legal gateways to share information for supervisory purposes cannot be compliant or largely compliant with EC 12.1 if those gateways are not sufficiently broad to encompass necessary information sharing with non-supervisory authorities, potentially including central banks, resolution authorities, public bodies administering resolution and protection funds, and Ministries of Finance; or if it is not explicitly

clear that the purposes for which information can be shared encompass the full range of activities and functions related to recovery and resolution planning, and preparing for and carrying out resolution. (See paragraphs 1.1 to 1.8 of I-Annex 1 to the *Key Attributes* on Information Sharing for Resolution Purposes.) Similarly, a jurisdiction would not be compliant or largely compliant with KA 12 if there were legal, regulatory or other policy impediments that materially hinder the ability of the relevant authorities to share information.

**EN 12 (c) Limitations or refusals to exchange confidential information** – A jurisdiction should not be considered as non-compliant or materially non-compliant with EC 12.1 if it requires requesting authorities to enter into such confidentiality or similar agreement as may be necessary under its law to preserve privilege or confidentiality protections as a condition for sharing information; or if it reasonably limits or refuses the exchange of non-public information on the grounds that the authorities requesting the information are unable to provide assurances that are satisfactory to the jurisdiction under review that the confidentiality of the information will be protected. However, the assurances required should not be so extensive as to undermine the objectives of effective information sharing for resolution-related purposes.

When considering a request for non-public information, the authority that is requested to provide non-public information may take into account whether the requesting authority has a legitimate interest in the non-public information for recovery and resolution planning or resolution purposes, and may require the requesting authority to provide information about that interest and assurances regarding the purposes for which the information will be used.

**EN 12 (d) Adequate safeguards to protect confidentiality of non-public information** – An authority that receives confidential information, and its staff and agents, should be subject to adequate confidentiality requirements that continue to apply to former staff and agents, the breach of which gives rise to legal sanctions (which might include criminal penalties). Paragraphs 1.10 to 1.14 of I-Annex 1 to the *Key Attributes* on Information Sharing for Resolution Purposes provide further guidance on adequate standards of confidentiality to support information sharing.

**EN 12 (e) Situations in which disclosure of confidential information is compelled by law** – The legal framework should authorise domestic authorities to refuse any demand to disclose confidential information in their possession or control that they have received from a foreign authority for the purposes of resolution, unless they are compelled under national law to disclose in the restricted cases mentioned below.

Situations in which an authority can be compelled to disclose confidential information should be of an exceptional nature (for example, a request for information by a court or tribunal with powers of subpoena, legislative bodies or an investigative commission established by a legislative body). In the event that the authority is compelled to disclose such confidential information, it should be required to promptly notify the originating authority (unless legally prohibited from doing so), indicating what information it is compelled to release and, to the extent appropriate, the circumstances surrounding the release, and to take all reasonable steps to resist disclosure of the confidential information to the extent appropriate and permitted by applicable laws and legal process. The disclosing authority should also take all reasonable steps to ensure that confidential information is disclosed under seal or made subject to a protective order limiting any further disclosure.

## Explanatory note to methodology (2026)

Following the original publication of this assessment methodology, the FSB published guidance on the scope of insurers subject to recovery and resolution planning requirements in the Key Attributes.<sup>28</sup> That guidance revises the definition of a critical function to have the following three elements:

- (1) The function is provided by the insurer to third parties not affiliated with the insurer;
- (2) The sudden failure to provide the function would be likely to have a material impact on the financial system *or* the real economy; and
- (3) The function cannot be substituted within a reasonable period of time and at a reasonable cost.<sup>29</sup>

Prior to the FSB's amendment in 2026, the definition of a critical function used "and" rather than "or" in element 2.

---

<sup>28</sup> FSB (2026), *Scope of Insurers Subject to the Recovery and Resolution Planning Requirements in the FSB Key Attributes: Final report*, April.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* (emphasis added).