

## Reinsurance Accounting Principles #2001 Preparing for Codification

By

Myles J. Tilley

***About the Author:*** Myles Tilley is a Manager in the Assurance and Advisory Business Services practice area of Ernst & Young, LLP's Boston office.

***Abstract:*** Beginning with the year 2001, state regulators have mandated that insurance company financial statements adhere to a new set of codified accounting principles. This article provides an overview of the evolution of the property/casualty reinsurance aspects of those accounting principles.

### **Introduction**

Anyone involved in marketing, underwriting, or accounting for property/casualty reinsurance in the USA needs to have a basic understanding of the relevant accounting guidance promulgated by the accounting profession and the insurance regulatory community. Moreover, growing concern<sup>1</sup> over the uniformity and completeness of the existing regulatory accounting guidance has prompted the regulatory community to undertake a broad reassessment of statutory accounting guidance (known as the “codification project”),

---

<sup>1</sup> “Failed Promises” (1990) & “Wishful Thinking” (1994) – Congressional reports on the investigation of insurance company insolvencies called the existing state system of regulation into question and proposed a federal role.

including guidance on reinsurance.

With this project essentially complete, it is expected<sup>2</sup> that the resulting codified accounting principles will need to be applied in financial statements reporting on 2001 activity filed with regulatory officials beginning next year. Controversy concerning the application of accounting guidance for determining whether or not reinsurance agreements contain “risk transfer” continues. Alternative accounting treatments that result from this analysis can significantly affect the financial statements of both parties to a reinsurance transaction.

The objective of this article is to provide an understandable overview of the current property/casualty reinsurance accounting guidance, including a discussion of its more controversial elements.

### **Who makes these rules?**

The individual states, not the federal government, have regulated the business of insurance in the United States since the mid-1800’s. This allocation of governmental power was essentially ratified by Congress, with the passage of the McCarran-Ferguson Act in 1945, in response to a Supreme Court decision<sup>3</sup> which called into question the states’ role<sup>4</sup>. One aspect of this regulatory responsibility has been the authority to prescribe accounting rules governing the financial

---

<sup>2</sup> The individual states must formally adopt Codification.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. vs South-Eastern Underwriters Association

<sup>4</sup> A federal oversight role continues to exist, primarily with respect to anti-trust issues.

statements, exhibits, and schedules which are required to be submitted to the state regulatory officials.

Over the years, a body of accounting practices known as statutory accounting practices (SAP) has evolved from the coordinated activities of the state regulators and their nationwide association, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC). Although each state prescribes its own accounting rules (which may be unique), the influence of the NAIC in producing model legislative bills<sup>5</sup> means that the NAIC, more than any other single party, has been responsible for the development of SAP. Owing to the overriding regulatory interest in the solvency of insurers, SAP tends to be highly conservative in nature and is focused on the balance sheet.

For insurance enterprises that are required to (or choose to) prepare financial statements on a generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) basis, there are additional rule making bodies that are relevant to their financial statements. The need to prepare GAAP basis financial statements generally arises as a result of the differing information needs of investors and creditors which are not satisfied by SAP-based financial statements. For example, publicly held entities must submit GAAP financial statements to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Since 1973, the chief rule making body for GAAP has been the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB). As a result of its focus on providing

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, the NAIC initially developed the Model Act which was later passed by Congress as the McCarran-Ferguson Act.

information for investor and creditor decision-making, GAAP tends to be less conservative in nature than SAP, and is more focused on the measurement of earnings.

Over the years, the statutory guidance for reinsurance accounting has been amended to more closely align with the GAAP guidance. Accordingly, an overview of the evolution of the key elements of the GAAP guidance is presented below followed by a discussion of the current SAP guidance and the major differences from GAAP guidance which currently exist.

### **Origins of GAAP rules for reinsurance accounting**

In 1982, the FASB issued Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 60 (SFAS 60) entitled “*Accounting and Reporting by Insurance Enterprises*”. This was the result of an initiative undertaken by the FASB to extract specialized accounting and reporting principles from previously published guidance issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and issue them as Statements of Financial Accounting Standards. SFAS 60 essentially adopted, without significant change, the principles previously laid out in AICPA publications. An explanation of the major provisions of SFAS 60 follows.

**SFAS 60: What are “short-duration” and “long-duration” insurance contracts?**

SFAS 60 makes a distinction between short-duration and long-duration insurance contracts in presenting its guidance. This distinction does not exist outside of the accounting literature, but provides a versatile way in which to classify those insurance contracts (potentially not yet devised) to which particular aspects of the accounting guidance apply. As the name implies, long-duration contracts are defined as those in which benefits and services are provided over an extended period. In addition, long-duration contracts are generally characterized by a prohibition on unilateral changes to the contract terms. As such, a perfect example would be a whole life insurance policy which may be kept in force for the insured’s lifetime with the payment of one or more premiums, and which will pay a benefit upon the death of the insured.

Conversely, short-duration contracts are defined as those in which benefits and services are provided for a fixed period of short duration. In addition, short-duration contracts are generally characterized by the ability of the insurer to cancel or revise the premium at the beginning of each contract period. Accordingly, an ideal example would be a personal automobile policy that is typically in force for a year at most, and allows the insurer the opportunity to reprice the policy premium at each policy anniversary.

Although not explicitly defined this way in the guidance, almost all property and casualty insurance contracts qualify as short-duration contracts. However, not all short-duration con-

tracts are property and casualty insurance contracts. For instance, a yearly renewable term life insurance policy, which may provide a death benefit in the event of the insured's death during the one-year policy period, would be considered a short-duration insurance contract. Although a short-duration insurance contract may have a one-year policy period, for casualty lines the period over which settlements are made related to insured events which occur during the policy period may be considerably longer – up to 20 years and beyond in some cases.

**SFAS 60: What rules apply to “short duration” contracts?**

SFAS 60 provides the following four basic rules which apply to the measurement of revenues and costs for short duration insurance contracts:

Premium revenue (premiums earned)<sup>6</sup> ordinarily must be recognized over the period of the contract in proportion to the amount of insurance protection provided. The period of the contract is the period from the policy effective date to the policy expiration date. This is typically achieved through the calculation of the amount of the deferred premium revenue (the unearned premium) that is associated with the amount of insurance coverage that has not yet been provided as of the financial statement date<sup>7</sup>. However, in some cases the insur-

---

<sup>6</sup> If premiums are adjustable (through retrospective rating, etc.) and the ultimate premiums are reasonably estimable, then ultimate premiums must be used as the basis of this premium revenue recognition. If premiums are adjustable and the ultimate premiums are not reasonably estimable, an alternate amortization method (cost recovery method/deposit method) which postpones income recognition must be utilized.

<sup>7</sup> This generally assumes that the insurance protection is provided evenly over the period of the contract.

ance protection may be exhausted prior to the expiration date of the policy. In those cases it is therefore appropriate to fully recognize the premium revenue when the insurance protection has been fully used.

Claim costs (including claim adjustment costs) must be recognized when the insured events occur and must include an estimate for claims which have been incurred, but which have not been reported to the insurer (IBNR). Changes in estimates are recognized in the future period in which the estimate is changed. This significantly affects the nature of insurance enterprises financial statements since current period earnings can be materially affected (either positively or negatively) by changes in estimated claims costs from prior periods.

Acquisition costs, which vary with and are primarily related to the acquisition of new and renewal insurance contracts (commissions, brokerage, etc), are capitalized and charged to expense in proportion to the amount of associated premium revenue recognized. When reinsurance ceded agreements provide for recovery of acquisition costs from the reinsurer (through a ceding commission for instance), then net acquisition costs are to be capitalized and charged to expense in proportion to net premium revenue recognized<sup>8</sup>.

Costs, other than claims' costs, that do not vary with and primarily relate to the acquisition of new and renewal insurance contracts are expensed as incurred.

---

<sup>8</sup> This SFAS 60 guidance has been superseded by SFAS 113.

Special rules for revenue and cost recognition apply if a “premium deficiency” exists. This occurs when future expected claims and other costs (including unamortized acquisition costs) exceed the related unearned premium<sup>9</sup> (the future revenue to be recognized). In such a case, following the rules for revenue and cost recognition laid out above would result in the postponement of the recognition of a loss. If such a deficiency exists, the amount of the probable loss must be recognized by first charging unamortized acquisition cost to expense, and then by establishing a liability for the remaining excess, if any. This is necessary because it is a general principle of accounting that if a loss is probable and the amount is reasonably estimable, then it should be accrued for by means of a charge against income<sup>10</sup>.

SFAS 60 and SFAS 5, *Accounting for Contingencies*, provide for a special rule to apply whenever an insurance or reinsurance contract does not provide “indemnification of the insured or the ceding enterprise by the insurer or reinsurer against loss or liability” (i.e. risk transfer). In these situations, SFAS 60 and 5 require that “the premium paid less the premium to be retained shall be accounted for as a deposit” by the insured or the ceding enterprise. However, no further explanation of the conditions necessary for risk transfer nor deposit accounting is provided in either SFAS 60 or 5<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup>Anticipated investment income may be considered in determining whether a premium deficiency exists but must be disclosed if it is considered

<sup>10</sup> SFAS 5

<sup>11</sup> This SFAS 60 guidance has been superceded by SFAS 113.



The final major provision of SFAS 60 is the so-called “net” accounting provision. “Net” accounting entails that only reinsurance ceded balances that relate to paid claim and claim adjustment expenses be classified explicitly as assets (with an allowance for estimated uncollectable amounts). The typically more significant reinsurance ceded balances that relate to liabilities for unpaid claims and claim adjustment expenses are deducted directly from these liabilities. Likewise, reinsurance ceded unearned premiums are also deducted directly from the related unearned premium liability. Receivables and payables from the same reinsurer are also netted, and reinsurance ceded premiums and recoveries on claims may be netted to the related premiums and claims items, and need not appear on the face of the statement of earnings<sup>12</sup>.

When SFAS 60 was released, the FASB noted that it did not address certain issues currently being studied by the insurance industry and the accounting and actuarial professions. Among other things, this included the question of what would constitute “risk transfer” under a reinsurance contract.

**SFAS 113: FASB issues a statement exclusively addressing reinsurance.**

More than 10 years passed from the issuance of SFAS 60 before, in 1992, the FASB issued SFAS 113 entitled “*Accounting and Reporting for Reinsurance of Short-Duration and Long-Duration Contracts*” which provided

---

<sup>12</sup> This SFAS 60 guidance has been superseded by SFAS 113.

some guidance on the “risk transfer” question. High interest rates in the 1980’s<sup>13</sup> increased the gap between the economic and book value of property/casualty insurers’ liabilities, particularly in the casualty lines of business. The temptation (among both buyers and sellers) to unlock this difference through the use of innovative reinsurance products was great. Buyers were interested in the financial statement engineering possibilities which were available, and sellers liked the opportunity to earn virtually “risk free” profits following a minimal investment in creative expertise.

Thus, the “risk transfer” question took on increasing importance. For its part, SFAS 60 only inadequately addressed this issue<sup>14</sup>. Although it required deposit accounting<sup>15</sup> for reinsurance contracts that did not transfer risk, it failed to provide any guidance on how this transfer of risk should be assessed. SFAS 113 also responded to other significant concerns about reinsurance accounting which existed. Chief among these other concerns were issues such as “net” accounting for reinsurance, the overall adequacy of reinsurance disclosures, and the limited guidance regarding reinsurance accounting contained in SFAS 60. While only the risk transfer guidance within SFAS 113 applies to both assuming and ceding enterprises, its accounting and reporting guidance

---

<sup>13</sup> Between 1980 and 1985 interest rates reached unusually high levels. For instance, rates on 5 year treasury securities ranged from 10% to 15%. These levels have not returned since.

<sup>14</sup> Some regulatory officials (New York – Regulation 108) responded to the emerging market for loss portfolio transfer reinsurance in 1984 by requiring specialized SAP accounting and disclosure for such transactions.

<sup>15</sup> Effectively removing the financial reporting benefits of such contracts

is typically used by assuming companies since GAAP provides little, if any, other pertinent guidance for these entities.

**SFAS 113: “Net” accounting is abolished.**

Well-publicized insurance company failures in the late 1980’s<sup>16</sup> involving particularly heavy users of reinsurance gave critics of the “net” accounting provisions of SFAS 60 excellent justification for their concerns. In addition, the accounting profession had long wrestled with the apparent inconsistency between the “net” accounting allowed by SFAS 60 and the established criteria for offsetting previously established<sup>17</sup>. As a result, SFAS 113 abolished the practice of “net” accounting for reinsurance<sup>18</sup> by requiring that assets be established for “reinsurance receivables” including paid and unpaid claims, claims settlement expenses, and estimates for unsettled claims and IBNR and that offsetting only be utilized where a right of setoff exists<sup>19</sup>. A separate asset for prepaid reinsurance premiums (premiums paid to the reinsurer related to the unexpired portion of the reinsured contracts, also known as ceded unearned premiums) is also required.

---

<sup>16</sup> The failures of Mission, Transit, and Integrity were chronicled in the 1990 Congressional Report on Insurance company insolvencies “*Failed Promises*”. Reinsurance was identified as the number two cause of the insolvencies.

<sup>17</sup> APB 10, issued in 1966, provided that “It is a general principle of accounting that the offsetting of assets and liabilities in the balance sheet is improper except where a right of setoff exists”. FASB Interpretation 39 issued in 1992 (just prior to the issuance of SFAS 113) established 4 conditions that are required to be met in order for a “right of setoff” to exist.

<sup>18</sup> In cases where the reinsurance transaction constitutes a complete extinguishment of the cedant’s liability to the policyholder (novations and assumption reinsurance) the related assets and liabilities may be removed from the financial statements.

<sup>19</sup> As defined in FASB Interpretation 39

**SFAS 113: What constitutes “risk transfer” in reinsurance of short-duration contracts?**

SFAS 113 expands on SFAS 60 by providing two conditions that both must be met<sup>20</sup> in order to determine if a reinsurance contract provides “indemnification against loss or liability” relating to insurance risk. These two conditions are listed below:

1. The reinsurer must assume “significant” insurance risk under the reinsured portions of the underlying insurance contracts.
2. It must be “reasonably possible”<sup>21</sup> that the reinsurer may realize a “significant” loss from the transaction.

With respect to the first condition, in circumstances where the likelihood of “significant” variation in either the amount or the timing of the reinsurers’ payments is “remote”<sup>22</sup> the condition is not considered to be met. Reinsurance contracts may contain terms that may prevent this condition from being met. Any term, or combination of terms, that has the effect of reducing the reinsurers risk to this level will prevent this condition from being met. For instance

---

<sup>20</sup> An exception exists for reinsurance contracts that transfer substantially all insurance risk related to the underlying insurance contracts to the reinsurer. It is necessary that the cedant retain “insignificant” insurance risk in this regard

<sup>21</sup> (SFAS 5, paragraph 3) The chance of the future event or events occurring is more than remote but less than likely.

<sup>22</sup> (SFAS 5, paragraph 3) The chance of the future event or events occurring is slight.

(although unrealistic), a quota share reinsurance contract may provide a fixed percentage ceding commission as well as a fixed percentage loss ratio cap (above which the reinsurer will not share in any underlying losses). If the sum of these percentages (representing the maximum pay-back to the reinsured) were less than 100%, clearly the reinsurer could not have assumed significant insurance risk.

Analysis of the second condition requires that all cash flows between the cedant and the reinsurer be discounted to present value<sup>23</sup> under reasonably possible outcomes. The resulting present value gain or loss is compared to the present value of amounts paid or deemed to have been paid to the reinsurer. If it can be demonstrated that the reinsurer is exposed to a “significant” loss under a ‘reasonably possible’ scenario, then this condition is considered to be met. Below is a sample illustration of the type of calculations required to perform this evaluation.

#### **Sample calculations - Reasonable possibility of a significant loss**

Assumptions:

1. Ceding Commission percentage: 30% of gross ceded premiums
2. Loss and LAE ratio cap: 80% of gross ceded pre-

---

<sup>23</sup> SFAS 113 requires a consistent rate (selected using judgment) be used for all scenarios since interest rate risk is not a component of insurance risk

miums

3. Reasonably possible underlying loss ratio range:  
from 60% to 90%

<b><i>High Loss Ratio Scenario</i></b>					
<b><u>Assumptions:</u></b>					
<b>Underlying Loss ratio:</b>	90.0%				
<b>Loss ratio cap:</b>	80%				
<b>Limited Loss Recovery:</b>	80,000				
<b>% Loss paid in year:</b>	50%	20%	15%	15%	100%
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	
<b>Reinsurance Premium:</b>	100,000				100,000
<b>Ceding Commission:</b>	30,000				30,000
<b><u>Reinsurance Loss</u></b>					
<b>Recoveries:</b>	<u>45,000</u>	<u>18,000</u>	<u>13,500</u>	<u>3,500</u>	<u>80,000</u>
<b>Reinsurers Cash Flow</b>	25,000	(18,000)	(13,500)	(3,500)	(10,000)
<b>PV factor (7%, midyear)</b>	0.9667	0.9035	0.8444	0.7891	
<b>Reinsurers PV Cash Flow</b>	24,168	(16,263)	(11,399)	(2,762)	(6,256)

4. Loss Payment pattern: Year 1: 50%, Year 2: 20%,  
Year 3: 15%, Year 4: 15%

5. Appropriate discount rate: 7%

Based on this sample illustration, under the worst reasonably possible scenario (the high loss ratio scenario), the reinsurer is exposed to a present value loss of \$6,256. Although the FASB was asked to provide additional guidance concerning the meaning of the term “significant” in this context, its response was limited to clarifying that the significance of the loss must be evaluated in relation to the present value of the amounts paid to the reinsurer. Accordingly, the question to be asked becomes “is the reinsurers \$6,256 loss significant in rela-

tion to the reinsurers \$96,670 (\$100,000 times .9667) premium payment ?” . The lack of any further guidance on this issue must be taken as an indication that judgment be applied in the analysis. Some have suggested using as a benchmark that anything less than a 10% loss cannot be considered significant. If that concept were to be applied to the above example, the second required condition for risk transfer would not be satisfied.

If either one of the two conditions is not met, the reinsurance contract must be accounted for as a deposit as required under SFAS 60.

**SFAS 113: What are “prospective” and “retroactive” reinsurance contracts?**

For reinsurance contracts which qualify for reinsurance accounting treatment (that is, they pass the “risk transfer” test), SFAS 113 draws a distinction between “prospective” and “retroactive” reinsurance contracts. This classification is necessary in order to apply the rules regarding the recognition of revenues and costs. Prospective reinsurance contracts provide coverage for future insured events that may occur under the contracts subject to the reinsurance. A typical property catastrophe excess reinsurance contract, entered into at the beginning of the coverage period, is an example of a prospective reinsurance contract. Retroactive reinsurance contracts provide coverage for past insured events that have occurred under the contracts subject to the reinsurance. A loss portfolio transfer reinsurance contract (where all the underly-

ing contracts subject to the reinsurance have expired) illustrates this classification.

The determination of whether a reinsurance contract is prospective or retroactive depends solely on whether the underlying insured events have already occurred. In this regard, the insured event for an occurrence policy is the occurrence of a loss, but the insured event for a claims made policy is the reporting to the insurer of a loss. Accordingly, a claims made reinsurance contract may be either prospective, retroactive, or both depending the nature of the underlying insured events<sup>24</sup>. Unfortunately, many reinsurance contracts provide coverage that effectively combines both classifications. For instance, a company wishing to exit a line of business may negotiate a reinsurance agreement that provides both classifications of coverage. In this case, SFAS 113 requires the prospective and the retroactive elements to be accounted for separately. If bifurcation is not possible, SFAS 113 requires the entire contract to be accounted for as a retroactive reinsurance contract.

**SFAS 113: What rules apply to revenue and cost recognition for “short-duration” contracts?**

For prospective reinsurance, there is no change to the rules contained in SFAS 60. For retroactive reinsurance, the

---

<sup>24</sup> If the underlying insurance contracts are occurrence policies and the reinsurance provides coverage for claims which occurred prior to the effective date of the reinsurance contract but which are reported to the reinsurer during the reinsurance contract term – the reinsurance is at least partly retroactive. If the underlying insurance contracts are claims made policies the reinsurance may be prospective.



accounting revolves around the relationship between the amount paid to the reinsurer and the recorded amount (book value) of the liabilities reinsured. If the liabilities exceed the amount paid, the amount of the difference must be recorded as a deferred gain and amortized over the remaining settlement period<sup>25</sup>. If the amount paid exceeds the liabilities, the amount of the difference must be charged to earnings. Since the amount of this difference is subject to reevaluation over the entire settlement period as claims are paid and new estimates of the amounts unpaid are prepared, SFAS 113 requires that changes in the estimated liabilities relating to the underlying reinsured contracts be recognized in earnings in the period of the change and that reinsurance receivables and the deferred gain be adjusted or established as a result.

To illustrate the effect of these requirements, assume a retroactive reinsurance agreement is entered into whereby the ceding company pays \$100 of premium for \$150 million of coverage for liabilities with a recorded value of \$110. Further assume that the expected settlement period will be 5 years<sup>26</sup>. At inception, the transaction will result in a reinsurance recoverable of \$110 and a deferred gain of \$10. If adverse development of \$30 occurred in year 1 (meaning that the ceding company has incurred losses of \$30 in year 1 as a result of the change in estimate of the losses on the underlying policies), the reinsurance recoverable would be adjusted to \$140 and the

---

<sup>25</sup> Defined in SFAS 113 as "The estimated period over which a ceding enterprise expects to recover substantially all amounts due from the reinsurer under the terms of the reinsurance contract". The gain may be amortized using either an interest method or the recovery method.

<sup>26</sup> Assume amortization will be straight line

deferred gain would be adjusted to \$40 prior to any year 1 settlements or amortization. At the end of year 1, the ceding company will record \$8 in earnings related to the amortization of the deferred gain but will record a charge of \$30 for the adverse development on the underlying policies reinsured.

Alternately, if favorable development of \$15 occurred in year 1 the reinsurance recoverable would be adjusted to \$95, the deferred gain would be eliminated, and a \$5 charge to earnings would result prior to any year 1 settlements or amortization<sup>27</sup>. Therefore, two significant impacts of the retroactive rules are 1) to prevent cedents from recording any immediate gains from retroactive reinsurance transactions, and 2) to prevent cedents from avoiding income statement impacts as a result of prior year adverse loss development on policies subject to retroactive reinsurance coverage.

**“Funded Cat” covers receive some special attention.**

In July 1993, the FASB’s Emerging Issues Task Force (EITF)<sup>28</sup> issued EITF 93-6 entitled “*Accounting for Multiple-year Retrospectively Rated Contracts by Ceding and Assuming Companies*”. EITF 93-6 applies to multiple year reinsurance contracts<sup>29</sup> having obligatory terms which can result in changes to the contracts’ future coverage and/or the amount and timing of future cash flows depending on the

---

<sup>27</sup> These examples appeared in *FASB Viewpoints*, Question no 34.

<sup>28</sup> The EITF was formed in order to assist the FASB by identifying emerging issues that require its attention. The EITF considers more narrowly focused issues as well as issues that require immediate attention.

<sup>29</sup> Insurance contracts were later addressed in EITF 93-14 with the result that similar provisions apply.

experience of the contract and which cannot be avoided through cancellation.

One such type of agreement was commonly known as a “funded cat” cover. Through coverage and premium adjustment mechanisms these agreements provided for some “pay back” of losses recovered under the agreement through future increases in premium payments or decreases in coverage amounts. The effect was to spread catastrophe shock losses over multiple years. FASB and SEC interest in these types of contracts increased following the unusually heavy catastrophic losses which occurred in 1992. EITF 93-6 essentially requires that changes to future coverage and/or cash flows under the reinsurance agreement which result from the experience to date be recognized in the earnings of both the ceding and the assuming companies in the same period as the experience arises, assuming such accruals would be settled in the event of early termination of the contract.

**Deposit Accounting: Accounting for agreements that do not include risk transfer.**

As described above, GAAP requires deposit accounting in situations where insurance or reinsurance contracts do not contain risk transfer. However, until the release of the AICPA’s Accounting Standards Executive Committee Statement of Position No. 98-7 (SOP 98-7), *Deposit Accounting: Accounting for Insurance and Reinsurance Contracts That Do Not Transfer Insurance Risk* in 1998, the precise nature of “deposit accounting” was not defined.

Although SOP's do not rise to the authoritative level of a SFAS, they nonetheless are considered to be a component of GAAP and are approved by the FASB. SOP 98-7 classified insurance and reinsurance contracts which do not transfer insurance risk into 4 categories:

1. Contracts which transfer only significant timing risk
2. Contracts which transfer neither significant timing nor underwriting risk
3. Contracts which transfer only significant underwriting risk
4. Contracts which transfer indeterminate risk

At the inception of the contract, a deposit asset (or liability) is established based on the amount of consideration received or paid less any explicitly identified premium or fees to be retained independent of the results of the contract. Over the settlement period of the contract, the accounting required depends on the category into which it falls. For contracts falling into categories 1 & 2, the interest method is required. As changes in the estimates of the amount and timing of recoveries occur, the effective yield should be recalculated, and the deposit should be adjusted to the amount that would have existed at the balance-sheet date had the new effective yield been applied since the inception of the contract. Changes in the carrying amount of the deposit should be reported as interest income or interest expense.

For contracts in category 3, the deposit amount should be set at the proportion of unexpired coverage until losses are incurred that will be reimbursed. At that point, the deposit should be set at the proportion of unexpired coverage plus the present value of expected future cash flows. As the deposit amount is changed due to the passage of time and changes in the estimates of the amount and timing of recoveries, revenues and expenses should be included as incurred loss<sup>30</sup>. With respect to contracts in category 4, SOP 98-7 analogizes the uncertainties surrounding these contracts to uncertainties associated with foreign property and liability reinsurance. Accordingly, contracts which transfer indeterminate risk should use the open year method of accounting cited in SOP 92-5, *Accounting for Foreign Property and Liability Insurance Contracts*<sup>31</sup>.

This completes the discussion of the major elements of the GAAP guidance for reinsurance accounting. The concluding section describes the current SAP guidance and its relationship to the GAAP guidance described above.

### **SAP Guidance**

One of the main factors leading to the formation of the NAIC in the late 1800s was the need for uniform financial reporting by insurers to state regulatory officials. In response, the NAIC produced the first version of what is the current

---

<sup>30</sup> Or expense if the entity is not an insurance enterprise

<sup>31</sup> SSAP 62 rejects this guidance

NAIC annual statement reporting form. Over the years, the NAIC has extensively revised and expanded the annual statement and has supplemented this with other accounting reference materials, including the *NAIC Accounting Practices and Procedures Manual for Property and Casualty Insurance* and the *NAIC Annual Statement Instructions for Property and Casualty Insurance*. Most recently, the codification project has resulted in the preparation of the *Statutory Accounting Principles Statement of Concepts and Statutory Hierarchy* and 73 individual *Statements of Statutory Accounting Principles* (SSAP's) dealing with different SAP accounting issues. Prior to codification, the main source of SAP guidance for reinsurance accounting was *Chapter 22 of the NAIC Accounting Practices and Procedures Manual for Property and Casualty Insurance* (Chapter 22) as revised.

### **SAP Guidance: Comparison to GAAP**

After the issuance of SFAS 113 in 1992, in October 1994, the NAIC revised its guidance on reinsurance accounting, *Chapter 22*, to adopt the provisions of SFAS 113. Shortly thereafter, Chapter 22 was amended to adopt the provisions of EITF 93-6 with a few modifications. *Chapter 22* also included a number of special provisions that are not contained in the GAAP guidance. These include a provision for reinsurance contracts that are not “reduced to written form and signed by the parties within nine months” of their effective date. For these contracts, there is a presumption that they are retroactive, and as such, must be accounted for as retroactive rein-

insurance agreements<sup>32</sup>. In addition, certain agreements are specifically required to be accounted for as prospective reinsurance. These include: structured settlements, novations, termination or reduction in participations in reinsurance agreements, and intercompany reinsurance agreements meeting specified criteria<sup>33</sup>.

*Chapter 22* also stipulates certain specific conditions that reinsurance agreements must meet before the ceding company may take credit for the reinsurance in its SAP financial statements. These include that the agreement must contain an acceptable insolvency clause, that recoveries must be payable without delay, that no guarantees of profit between the ceding company and the reinsurer may exist, and that the agreement contain an acceptable reports and remittances clause. Retroactive reinsurance agreements are subject to additional conditions that the consideration paid be fixed; that subsequent adjustments depending on actual experience may only be payable to the ceding company; and that the agreement may not be canceled or rescinded without the approval of the commissioner of the domiciliary state of the ceding company.

During the codification process, the NAIC did not substantially alter the existing SAP guidance for reinsurance

---

<sup>32</sup> There are a number of exceptions to this rule. They include: facultative contracts, contracts where the "lead reinsurer" has signed within 9 months, contracts entered into prior to 12/31/96 where more than 50% of the capacity had signed within 9 months, and agreements where one party is in conservation, rehabilitation, receivership, or liquidation.

<sup>33</sup> Where the companies are 100% owned by a common parent or ultimate controlling person and no surplus gain results.

accounting contained in *Chapter 22* in producing *Statement of Statutory Accounting Principles No. 62 on Property and Casualty Reinsurance* (SSAP 62). Furthermore, the NAIC has identified only the following 6 “significant” exceptions<sup>34</sup> between the GAAP guidance previously described and SAP guidance (as codified):

1. SAP continues to allow “netting” for unpaid case basis and IBNR loss and LAE reinsurance recoverables against the corresponding gross liabilities. GAAP requires that these balances be included in the reinsurance receivable asset.
2. SAP also allows “netting” of ceded unearned premiums against the corresponding gross liability. GAAP requires this to be reported as a prepaid asset.
3. SAP requires a gain on retroactive reinsurance to be recorded as a write-in gain in “other income” and the amount to be restricted as a special surplus account until the actual recoveries exceed the amount paid. GAAP requires the gain to be deferred and amortized over the settlement period.
4. Through Schedule F, SAP requires that a minimum liability be mechanically established (the “provision for reinsurance”) for certain unsecured and/or overdue reinsurance recoverables. GAAP only

---

<sup>34</sup> Statutory codification project Issue paper no. 75 “Property and Casualty Reinsurance”



requires that an appropriate allowance for uncollectible amounts be established.

5. Both SAP and GAAP require that for reinsurance contracts that contain adjustable features, the effect of the adjustable terms be reflected in the period in which the underlying loss event(s) giving rise to the adjustment occur. However, GAAP allows that this calculation may be computed based on the assumption that the reinsurance contract may be terminated early. SAP does not allow this assumption to be used.

For structured settlements where the insurer has not been released from its obligation, GAAP requires the deferral of any gain. SAP does not require such a deferral. It should be noted that claim reserves subject to a structured settlement often meet the GAAP and SAP criteria for discounting (e.g., fixed or reliably determinable payments). As a result, gains related to these transactions are often minimal thereby mitigating this SAP to GAAP difference.

In addition, subsequent to the NAIC's identification of these 6 differences, as described above SOP 98-7, *Deposit Accounting: Accounting for Insurance and Reinsurance Contracts That Do Not Transfer Insurance Risk* was issued in 1998. The deposit accounting outlined in SOP 98-7 differs from the SAP deposit accounting. GAAP requires that revenues and expenses be recorded over the settlement period in order to amortize the difference between the initial deposit and the expected recoveries. SAP requires that gains and loss-

es only be recorded at the end of the settlement period or when recoveries exceed the amount of the initial deposit.

### **Summary**

With only a small number of exceptions, codified SAP should correspond with current GAAP for property and casualty reinsurance accounting. Moreover, codified SAP for reinsurance accounting is essentially unchanged from the revised the *NAIC Accounting Practices and Procedures Manual for Property and Casualty Insurance: Chapter 22*. Accordingly, implementation of SAP codification in 2001 should have little impact on the reporting of property and casualty reinsurance transactions in the statutory financial statements of insurance enterprises. Nonetheless, the reinsurance market can rapidly respond to industry-wide and individual company pressures with innovative products. As such, application of the current guidance will continue to be difficult in some areas such as the evaluation of risk transfer, and additional guidance may become necessary.

### **Bibliography**

AICPA, SOP 98-7 *Deposit Accounting: Accounting for Insurance and Reinsurance Contracts That Do Not Transfer Insurance Risk*

FASB Original Pronouncements SFAS 5 *Accounting for Contingencies*

FASB Original Pronouncements SFAS 60 *Accounting and Reporting by Insurance Enterprises*

FASB, Original Pronouncements SFAS 113 “*Accounting and Reporting for Reinsurance of Short-Duration and Long-Duration Contracts*”

FASB Viewpoints. Schroeder, *Accounting for Reinsurance: Questions and Answers about Statement 113*

FASB, Emerging Issues Task Force, EITF 93-6 “*Accounting for Multiple-year Retrospectively Rated Contracts by Ceding and Assuming Companies*”.

Journal of Accountancy, March 1999, Hasnani, “*Insurance and Reinsurance without Risk Transfer*”

NAIC, *Accounting Practices and Procedures Manual [P&C]*

NAIC, *Draft Statement of Statutory Accounting Principles No. 62 Property Casualty Reinsurance*

NAIC, *Statutory Codification Project Issue Paper No 75 Property and Casualty Reinsurance*

*The American Insurance Regulatory System*, 1999, Studley

US Congress, *Failed Promises*, Insurance Company Insolvencies, A Report by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, US House of Representatives, February 1990

US Congress, *Wishful Thinking*, A World View of Insurance Solvency Regulation, A Report by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, US House of Representatives, October 1994