



















|  | B | [-C | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 182 |  | See |  |
| 1830 | Question 4 - Option | Seeresponse to auestion 4 |  |
| 1831 | Question 4 - Option | See response to Oussion 4 |  |
| 3 | Question 4 - Option | We do not support this option as it will lead to divergent application across the EEA, and tor Groups operating throughout the EEA make it harder to implement. |  |
| 1833 | Question 5 | Our view is that we do not support the proposal to submit both internal model and standard formula forms (even at a local NCA level) by insurers if they esed in their internal model approval process (IMAP). Building sysems to cap be submitted electronically, involves building reporting processes and submission templates that may not be required longer term. For firms in IMAP any standard formula data should be sourced through the IMAP application process, not through the submission of QRTs. We consider both options to be equally burdensome and potentially costly for limited future benefit. <br> However, should EIOPA pursue this line of reporting, we would prefer Option 2, predicated on the basis expressed in paragraph 2.68 that this will form a single data request to support both the IM pre application process and interim reporting process. |  |
|  | Question 5 - Option | Seeresponse to Ouestion 5 |  |
|  | Stion 5 - Option | See response to Question 5 |  |
|  | Question 6 | Our support for Option 3 is predicated on the fact that 1 year before Solvency II we would expect clarity from the European Commission on which 3rd country regimes will be considered equivalent or granted transitional recognition as equivalent. We do not wish to expend time and resource implement country regimes will be considered equivalent or granted transitional recognition as equivalent. We do not wish to expend time and res Solvency II capital and reporting rules in 3rd countries, which ultimately when Solvency 2 are implemented are considered equivalent. |  |
|  | Question 6 - Option | We do not support Option 1, as it would result in wasted time and resource in implementing and applying Solvency II accounting rules in respect of subsidiaries in 3rd country regimes, which are deemed equivalent when S2 becomes effective. |  |
| 183 | $\left.\right\|_{2} ^{\text {Question } 6 \text { - Option }}$ | We do not support Option 2, as this provides too much discretion to National Supervisors raising the risk inconsistent application of Equivalence across the EEA and that potentially we implement and apply Solvency II accounting rules in respect of subsidiaries in 3rd country regimes, which are deemed |  |
| 18 | Question 6 - Option | EIOPA's wish not to prejudice the European Commission's future deliberations on equivalence, it is crucial that 1 year before <br> Solvency II implementation we have clarity on which 3rd country regimes are deemed equivalent to avoid unnecessary expenditure on implementation |  |
|  | Question 6 - Option | We do not support this option as it will be burdensome to provide calculations on two separate bases, and an unnecessary if one of these bases is not <br> used for Solvency 2 reporting depending on the final equivalence decision. |  |
|  | Question 7 |  firms preparedness for 52 P3 reporting, then it would be most appropiate if firms prepared their submissions to Regulators on their best view of what ancillary own funds and USPs the expected to be approved. This should not in ourview preiudice NCAs final decision on whether to approve these item <br>  |  |
|  | Question 7 - Option | We support this opion. |  |
|  | estion 7 - Option | See response to oustion 7 |  |
|  | Question 7 - Option | ion 7 |  |

