

# C-3 Alignment, Part III

Life Risk-Based Capital (E) Working Group

September 11, 2025

# About the Academy

2



## **Mission:**

To serve the public and the U.S. actuarial profession



## **Community:**

Serving over 20K MAAs & public stakeholders for 60 years



## **Standards:**

Setting qualification, practice, and professionalism standards



## **Impact:**

Delivering over 300 insight-driven publications & resources annually

Visit [www.actuary.org](http://www.actuary.org) to learn more.





## Objectives of Discussion

3

- Outline set of current C-3 framework recommendations.
- Highlight framework decisions where further analysis is recommended.
- Discuss when framework elements would be implemented.
- Solicit feedback on the above from regulators and interested parties to be used to inform future Field Test and Model Office analysis.



# Summary of Key Framework Proposals

4

- **Adoption Date and Phase-in**: Adopt for a yet-to-be-determined year-end with a three-year phase-in period, dependent on field testing and model office schedule.
- **Product Scope**: All current products subject to C3 Phase 1 and C3 Phase 2 will transition to new methodology. FIA will be included in scope of C3 Phase 1.
- **Scenarios**: Use new Generator of Economic Scenarios.
- **Discounting**: Leverage C3 Phase 2 discounting, i.e., Net Asset Earned Rate or Direct Iteration.
- **Assumptions and Models**: Use PBR models with prudent estimate assumptions where possible. Otherwise, continue to use CFT models with moderately adverse assumptions.
- **Factor-based C-3 Floor**: Factors will be revisited at a future date and will remain unchanged for now.
- **Aggregation between C3P1 and C3P2**: Will be revisited once methodologies are finalized.

## Framework Proposals where Additional Feedback is Requested

5

A Field Test (FT) and a Model Office (MO) analysis are expected to provide additional information to inform these framework decisions.

- **Metric:** MO measures run on the bank and stress testing results and will be used to determine whether an asset-based metric sufficiently captures RBC interest rate risk, or whether projection of a working reserve and use of a surplus-based metric is needed. Note the field test will likely only measure results for well-matched companies. Model office can analyze metrics for other ALM scenarios.
- **Scalar:**  $YY\% \times (\text{CTE } XX \text{ less Reserves})$ , where YY and CTE XX will be informed by further analysis.
- **Time Horizon:** To be informed by further analysis and choice of metric and scalar.
- **Default Costs:** Explore materiality of double counting of default costs between C1 and C3 and approaches to address if material.
- **Stochastic Equity:** Determine if material and degree of effort required to capture.

**Should any of the above components be included in the FT/MO analysis before a decision is made, implemented or deferred to a later date? Are there other components that should be considered?**



## Feedback Request

6

**We request preliminary feedback in the following areas so that the Academy can work towards designing analysis for model office testing and field testing.**

- Are there any components of the proposal that regulators would like to be implemented for year-end 2026 (with implementation of GOES and VM-22), year-end 2027 or at a future date?
- What components should be included in model office testing or a broader field test before a decision is made?
- Any analysis or components of the proposal that should be deferred?
- Are there any other components not captured in the current proposal that should be added to the analysis?



## Questions?

7

For more information, please contact  
**Amanda Barry-Moilanen, Policy Project Manager, Life**  
**[barrymoilanen@actuary.org](mailto:barrymoilanen@actuary.org)**

# Appendix – Prior Presentations



# C-3 Alignment, Part II

Life Risk-Based Capital (E) Working Group

May 1, 2025

## About the Academy

10



The American Academy of Actuaries is a 20,000-member professional association whose mission is to serve the public and the U.S. actuarial profession. For 60 years, the Academy has assisted public policymakers on all levels by providing leadership, objective expertise, and actuarial advice on risk and financial security issues. The Academy also sets qualification, practice, and professionalism standards for actuaries in the United States.

For more information, please visit:

[actuary.org](https://actuary.org)



## Summary of Key Framework Proposals

11

- Adoption Date and Phase-in: Adopt for year-end 2026 with a three-year phase in period, but dependent on field testing schedule.
- Product Scope: All current products subject to C3 Phase 1 and C3 Phase 2 will transition to new methodology for year-end 2026. FIA will be included in scope of C3 Phase 1.
- Scenarios: Use new Generator of Economic Scenarios
- Discounting: Leverage C3 Phase 2 discounting, i.e., Net Asset Earned Rate or Direct Iteration



## Summary of Key Framework Proposals

12

- Assumptions and Models: Use PBR models with prudent estimate assumptions where possible. Otherwise, continue to use CFT models with moderately adverse assumptions.
- Factor-based C-3 Floor: Factors will be revisited at a future date and will remain unchanged for now.
- Default Costs: Explore an optional credit to offset the double counting of default costs between C1 and C3.
- Aggregation between C3P1 and C3P2: Will be revisited once methodologies are finalized.



## Key Focus of Today's Discussion

13

- Recap of Default Costs
- Stochastic Equity Risk
- Metric, Scalar, Working Reserves and Time Horizon
- Next Steps

# Recap of Default Costs




## C-3 Default Costs

15

- C-1 RBC for fixed income assets, such as bonds and commercial mortgages, is based on the difference between the value of severely adverse default costs and the value of default costs assumed to be covered in reserves.
- For assets that cover more than the assumed level of defaults, under the relevant reserve or C-3 testing framework, RBC factors double-count the value of the portion of the default costs between the assumed coverage levels in the C-1 models and the actual coverage levels in the reserve or C-3 models.
- Recommend updating default cost assumptions in C-3 Phase 1 to more conservative CTE70 level to allow the same default assumption to be used for reserves and capital.
- CTE70 is a generally accepted standard for prudent estimate default costs and required for PBR and C-3 Phase 2.
- Because of difference with default assumption in C-1 capital, results in potential additional margin on C-1 risk capital.

# Default Costs Illustration\*

16



\*Not to scale





## C-1 Risk Capital Credit

17

- Generally, adjustments are not made in the RBC framework for potential deficiencies or excess in other components.
- If an adjustment is included, a possible recommendation is a factor-based credit applied to the assets included in C-3 testing to offset the C-1 risk capital margin.

Asset category	Estimated factor credit <sup>1</sup>
Bonds – investment grade bonds	20%
Bonds – below investment grade	15%
Commercial mortgages	Double bond credit

- Recommend further study to explore an *optional* credit that would address the double counting.

<sup>1</sup>From the 2021 Moody's Analytics C-1 Bond RBC report

# Stochastic Equity Risk



## Stochastic Equity - Background

19

- Historically, the intent of the C3P1 is to address asset/liability mismatch (ALM) risk due to interest rate risk for annuities and single premium life.
  - Disintermediation risk when selling assets at the depressed value to support policyholders' obligations, or
  - Reinvestment risk that investment returns will decline to the point that they are unable to service on-going policyholders' obligations.
- The addition of equity risk in the C3P1 calculation was tested as a part of the VM-22 PBR field test. The introduction of stochastic equity returns could introduce interim deficiencies.



## Stochastic Equity – Issues

20

- Similar to default costs, the introduction of stochastic equity could introduce a double count in capital that is already covered by C-1 equity risk charge.
  - The current C-1 common stock equity factor was based on the 94<sup>th</sup> percentile worst loss over twenty-four-month periods.
  - The 2013 study continues to use a two-year loss horizon and retained the same 30% factor that was originally proposed in 1993.
  - The interim deficiencies that occur in the first two years of the C3 calculation as a result of unfavorable equity returns under GOES are already reflected in C1.

# Stochastic Equity – Proposal

21

Type of Equity Exposure	Proposal
<b>Equity instruments to hedge predictive liabilities cash flows</b> (e.g., FIA index hedge or indexed GIC, etc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Exclude stochastic equity risk from C3P1.</b></li> <li>• Assume hedges are effective and reflect the same index hedge error margin for reserve and capital for additional conservatism.</li> </ul>
<b>Equity instruments on general account assets</b> (e.g. equities backing long-duration contracts such as SSC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Develop a prudent estimate levelized return to avoid exacerbating capital requirement.</b></li> <li>• Option 1 -- The prescribed levelized equity return equals the gross wealth factor (GWF) at specified CTE level for the projection years that reflect the average liability duration and then appending the new levelized return for the remaining years which equal to the GWF at the same CTE level at projection year 50 (See next slide for illustration).</li> <li>• Option 2 -- Use AG-53 compliant assumption for general account equities<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>
<b>Equity instruments to hedge the unpredictable liability cash flows</b> (e.g., FIA with GLWB, etc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Model stochastic equity, but allow hedge modeling simplification.</b></li> <li>• Unlike VA, the liability cash flows are mostly exposed to the policyholder behavior assumption risk rather than equity risk.</li> <li>• Optional credit adjustment to account for double counting of risk reflected in the C1 equity risk charge and the C3 calculation.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup>: An equity-like instrument under AG53 assumed to have higher value at projection year 10 or later than under an assumption of annual total returns, before the deduction of investment expenses, of 4% for the first 10 projection years after the valuation date followed by 5% for projection year 11 and after.

# Stochastic Equity -- Levelized Return (Option1) Illustration 22

- Assume the following:
  - 30 years projection
  - C3P1 metric is based on the CTE90 (it is similar to 95<sup>th</sup> percentile)
  - Average liability duration = 10
- Based on the latest GOES equity GWFs (see right table)
- Annualized levelized return:
  - First 10 years:  $-0.7\% = 0.93^{(1/10)} - 1$
  - Remaining 20 years:  $4.4\% = (2.22/0.93)^{(1/20)} - 1$

S&P 500	1 Yr	5 Yr	10 Yr	20 Yr	30 Yr
Min	0.50	0.23	0.17	0.09	0.17
1.0%	0.71	0.59	0.58	0.73	1.12
2.5%	0.77	0.71	0.77	1.07	1.60
5.0%	0.83	0.82	0.93	1.40	2.22
10.0%	0.89	0.94	1.16	1.87	3.26
25.0%	0.99	1.19	1.58	2.92	5.45
50.0%	1.10	1.50	2.16	4.50	9.37
75.0%	1.20	1.82	2.88	6.78	15.68
90.0%	1.29	2.14	3.67	9.59	23.92
95.0%	1.35	2.37	4.25	11.72	30.79
97.5%	1.40	2.57	4.86	13.85	37.57
99.0%	1.46	2.83	5.66	17.28	47.69
Max	1.81	4.14	9.45	34.11	136.91



## C-1 Risk Capital Credit – Stochastic Equity

23

- Ignore the first two years of projection in GPVAD (surplus) calculation.
- Factor-based credit applied to equity assets included in C-3 testing to offset the C-1 risk capital margin.

Asset category	Estimated factor credit
Common stock	30%
Other equity-like assets	TBD

- TBD

# Metric, Scalar, Working Reserves, Time Horizon



## Metric and Scalar

25

- Consideration for measurement of the risk is ongoing, but will hinge on the defined metric while using the following formula:
  - **$YY\% \times (\text{CTE } XX \text{ less Reserves})$**
- YY% and CTE XX to be finalized with support of field-testing results.
- The projection length, or time horizon, will also be dependent on whether a working reserve is included.
- Prior to PBR, statutory reserves were formulaic, so interim reserves could easily be calculated. With PBR, a first principles interim reserve would require a nested stochastic projection, which may be onerous.
- The choice between a short-term **surplus** measure vs a long-term **asset** measure is dependent on what risk is intended to be captured. That is, a short-term surplus measure captures more disintermediation on deferred annuities risk vs the long-term asset measure capturing more reinvestment risk

# Greatest Present Value of Accumulated Deficiencies (Surplus)

26

- C-3 Phase 1 currently uses a GPVAD (**surplus**) measure.
- This measure focuses on projecting the statutory surplus, which accounts for future reserve changes. The measure inherently accounts for interim deficiencies by reviewing how future reserve changes could impact surplus.
- Due to the requirement of projecting future reserves, this measure may present computational challenges when reprojecting PBR reserves at future points in time. Particularly if those reserves are currently determined using stochastic scenarios.
- Approximations can be made by assuming the working reserve is equal to CSV, factor of formulaic reserve, actuarial present values or other simplifications for nested simulations.
- If this approach is taken, a shorter time horizon would likely be recommended.
- An interim surplus measure would capture more short-term disintermediation risk on deferred annuities.
- As noted earlier in the presentation, if stochastic equity is required, interim deficiencies on assets would be impacted, which would not have occurred in the current calculation methodology.

# Greatest Present Value of Accumulated Deficiencies (Assets)

27

- C-3 Phase 2 metric uses an GPVAD (**asset**) measure (working reserves are set to zero). This change was made as a part of VA Reform project.
- The metric focuses on claims payment ability and does not look at interim surplus deficiencies due to long-term reserve changes.
- Due to the computational simplicity relative to GPVAD (Surplus), the projection horizon can be set long enough to capture the life of the business.
- For PBR business, the same model may be leveraged for both reserve and capital setting.
- It was noted as part of VA Reform that the use of working reserves discouraged hedging due to the accounting mismatch between assets and liabilities.
- A long-term asset measure would capture more reinvestment risk, which could offset short term disintermediation risk.

# Example Illustration: Baseline

28

## Assumptions

- 10-yr contract with a bullet payment at the end of 10 years.
- Asset earned rate: 2.0% for Yrs 1-5 and 5.5% for Yrs 6-10
- Guaranteed AV credited rate of 5.0%
- CARVM Stat Val Rate of 4.0%

Balance Sheet	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Assets</b>											
Bonds	110.04	112.24	114.49	116.78	119.11	121.50	128.18	135.23	142.67	150.51	158.79
<b>Liabilities and Surplus</b>											
CARVM	110.04	114.44	119.02	123.78	128.73	133.88	139.24	144.81	150.60	156.62	162.89
CSV	100.00	105.00	110.25	115.76	121.55	127.63	134.01	140.71	147.75	155.13	162.89
Surplus	-	(2.20)	(4.53)	(7.00)	(9.62)	(12.39)	(11.06)	(9.58)	(7.94)	(6.11)	(4.10)

# Example Illustration: Baseline

29

- 1 For the first 5 years, the change in liabilities (CARVM reserves) exceeds the change in assets, which results in deficiencies in early years. This relationship changes after year 6 when the asset earned rate increases.
- 2 This results in the C3 requirement under the surplus measure to peak at year 5, despite the liability payment only being in year 10. This is due to the C3 requirement being used to fund interim deficiencies as the reserve changes outpace the asset changes.
- 3 The C3 requirement under the asset measure is driven by focusing on whether the assets can pay the liability that is due in year 10.

GPVAD Scenarios	0	1	2	1	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Working Reserves = CARVM</b>												
Surplus	-	(2.20)	(4.53)	(7.00)	(9.62)	(12.39)	(11.06)	(9.58)	(7.94)	(6.11)	(4.10)	
GPVAD (Surplus)		(2.16)	(4.36)	(6.60)	(8.89)	(11.22)	(9.50)	(7.80)	(6.12)	(4.47)	(2.84)	
C3	(11.22)											
<b>Working Reserves = \$0</b>												
Surplus = Assets	110.04	112.24	114.49	116.78	119.11	121.50	128.18	135.23	142.67	150.51	(4.10)	
GPVAD (Surplus)		110.04	110.04	110.04	110.04	110.04	110.04	110.04	110.04	110.04	(2.84)	
C3	(2.84)											

# Example Illustration: Interest Rate Spike

30

Assume spike in rates of 3% in year 5.

- 1 As a result of the interest rate spike, 20% surrender is assumed. This resulted in an outflow of \$25.53.
- 2 Assets are sold at a loss due to the market value decrease. Higher level of assets (\$46.35) need to be sold to fund the book value liability, thereby resulting in negative surplus.

Balance Sheet	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Assets</b>											
Bonds	110.04	116.09	122.48	129.22	136.32	75.14	79.28	83.64	88.24	93.09	98.21
<b>Liabilities and Surplus</b>											
CARVM (WR)	110.04	114.44	119.02	123.78	128.73	107.11	111.39	115.85	120.48	125.30	130.31
CSV	100.00	105.00	110.25	115.76	121.55	102.10	107.21	112.57	118.20	124.11	130.31
Surplus	-	1.65	3.46	5.43	7.59	(31.96)	(32.11)	(32.21)	(32.24)	(32.21)	(32.10)

# Example Illustration: Interest Rate Spike

31

The example below illustrates that even under an interest rate spike and excess surrenders scenarios, the GPVAD (surplus) and GPVAD (assets) both work as intended to capture their respective risks.

1

2

GPVAD Scenarios	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Working Reserves = CARVM</b>											
Surplus	-	1.65	3.46	5.43	7.59	(31.96)	(32.11)	(32.21)	(32.24)	(32.21)	(32.10)
GPVAD (Surplus)		1.56	3.11	4.63	6.13	(24.46)	(23.29)	(22.14)	(21.01)	(19.89)	(18.79)
C3P1	(24.46)										
<b>Working Reserves = \$0</b>											
Surplus = Assets	110.04	116.09	122.48	129.22	136.32	75.14	79.28	83.64	88.24	93.09	(32.10)
GPVAD (Surplus)		110.04	110.04	110.04	110.04	57.50	57.50	57.50	57.50	57.50	(18.79)
C3P1	(7.79)										

1

2

# Comparison of Options

32

## GPVAD (Assets)

### Pros

- Focus on solving for level of assets that would result in the defeasement of future liabilities.
- Can support a longer projection length and could leverage same model runs as was used for reserving, particularly on PBR business. A longer projection is more conservative.
- Consistency with current C3 Phase II methodology.
- May be more optimal for hedging as removes the misalignment of market-sensitivity between economic and statutory funding requirements.

### Cons

- Does not consider interim surplus deficiencies, and therefore, will not fully capture future adverse scenarios where PBR reserves could dramatically increase.

## GPVAD (Surplus)

### Pros

- Focuses on funding future claims and reserve funding requirements.
- Considers interim deficiencies, which ensures capital accounts for both economic and statutory insolvencies.
- Maintains current methodology on C3 Phase I.

### Cons

- Calculating a projected reserve, especially under PBR, would be computationally intensive due to nested stochastic calculations. The impact from the types of approximations for future PBR requirements have not been explored yet and therefore unclear.
- Discourages hedging due to accounting mismatch between hedge assets and working reserves.
- Would require a shorter projection length given the computational requirements.



# Next Steps

## Next Steps

34

- Confirm field testing time horizon
- Recommend an evaluation of consistency of C-1 methodology between PBR and capital be performed, and adjust recommendations as necessary
- Review field test specifications based on feedback from discussions
- Perform field test and leverage output to assist regulators in making final decisions



## Questions?

35

For more information, please contact  
**Amanda Barry-Moilanen, Policy Project Manager, Life**  
**[barrymoilanen@actuary.org](mailto:barrymoilanen@actuary.org)**

# Prior Presentation

3/24/2025



## Background

37

- C-3 Phase 1 applies to Single Premium Life and Non-Variable Annuities (excluding Fixed Index Annuities – FIA) and has not been updated in decades.
- C-3 Phase 2, which applies to Variable Annuities including Registered Index Linked Annuities, was recently updated and tested.
- Our purpose is to propose how to harmonize C-3 Phase 1 and C-3 Phase 2 methodology.



## Approach to C-3 Alignment


38

- C-3 Phase 2 methodology was reviewed by the NAIC over the past 8 years.
- Where possible, C-3 Phase 1 will adopt changes to align with C-3 Phase 2.
- Given the scale of changes, we propose a phased approach with some changes being reflected by year-end 2026.
  - This would include the adoption of the new Generator of Economic Scenarios (GOES) which will also be the prescribed generator for C-3 Phase 2 and PBR.
- Other changes may be deferred due to feasibility, magnitude of impact, and to avoid unintended consequences.



## Timeline, Adoption, Phase In Period

39





## Timeline, Adoption, Phase In Period

40

- We anticipate a field test during 2025 and adoption effective year-end 2026.
- We propose a three-year phase-in period for changes that are effective at year-end 2026.
- We propose that other C-3 changes are phased in during future years and will be outlined in the rest of the presentation



# Scenarios

## Economic Scenarios

42

- C-3 Phase 1 scenarios have a high Median Reversion Point (MRP) and do not include equity returns.
- C-3 Phase 2 scenarios have a formulaic MRP weighted toward recent rates and include equity returns.
- Propose using the new GOES that is expected to be adopted for an effective date of 2026.

# Product Scope

# Product Scope

44

The ultimate goal is a C-3 framework with consistent scenarios, metrics, and legal entity level aggregation for all products. We propose reviewing other products at a future date.

		Smallest step Option 1	<b>Recommended</b> Option 2 <sup>1</sup>	Option 3	Closest to Ultimate Goal Option 4
C3P1	Single Premium Life Single/Flexible Premium Annuity	Old C3P1 <b>New C3P1</b>	<b>New C3P1</b> <b>New C3P1</b>	Old C3P1 Old C3P1 <b>PBR Annuity to New C3P1</b>	<b>New C3P1</b> <b>New C3P1</b>
C3P2	VA RILA	C3P2	C3P2	C3P2	C3P2
Currently out of scope	FIA	<b>New C3P1</b>	<b>New C3P1</b>	<b>New C3P1</b>	<b>New C3P1</b>
	LTC	defer	defer	defer	<b>New C3P1</b>
	ULSG	defer	defer	defer	<b>New C3P1</b>
	Remaining Life & Health products	defer	defer	defer	defer
<b>Pro</b>		small manageable step	maintains existing aggregation	aligns reserving and capital models to PBR only business	closest to ultimate goal
<b>Con</b>		lose aggregation between life & annuity - which would ultimately be added back later	larger step, could be harder to execute quickly	inconsistent capital between in force and new business	most difficult to implement in one step

1: This option aligns with the timeline presented on slide 5

# Discounting

# Discounting

46

- **Background**

- Phase 1 uses one-year Treasury rate discounting. Inforce assets and reinvestment assets are typically longer in duration than one year and lower in credit quality than Treasuries, both of which tend to increase yields.
- Phase 2 allows discounting at the Net Asset Earned Rate (NAER), which likely produces better estimates of the amount of additional assets needed to eliminate a deficiency than does phase 1 discounting.
- Phase 2 also allows Direct Iteration which solves for the amount of additional assets needed to eliminate a deficiency, whereas Phase 1 does not.

- **Proposal**

- Use Phase 2 discounting rules which allow the use of NAER for discounting or Direct Iteration.

- **Rationale**

- Better estimate of the amount of additional assets needed to eliminate a deficiency.
- More principle-based.

# Assumptions and Models

## Current Assumptions and Models

48

- C-3 Phase 1: Cash Flow Testing (CFT)-based assumptions that are considered “moderately adverse.”
- C-3 Phase 2: Principles Based Reserve (PBR) prudent estimate assumptions.



# Short-Term Solution Starting Year-End 2026 (Recommended)

49

- **Proposal: bifurcated solution**
  - Use PBR models and assumptions for business subject to PBR (VM-20, VM-21, VM-22).
  - Use CFT models and assumptions for non-PBR business.
  - Potentially allow flexibility between the two approaches for business subject to PBR due to operational complexity.
  - Add other products if/when underlying reserve moves to PBR.
- **Pros**
  - Efficiency of using same underlying model for reserves and capital.
  - Similar to C3P2 for Variable Annuities.
- **Cons**
  - Need to maintain two sets of models/assumptions.

# Default Costs

## C-3 Default Costs

51

Current			Recommended		
	Non-PBR	PBR		Non-PBR	PBR
<b>Reserves</b>	Moderately adverse (approach varies)	CTE70	<b>Reserves</b>	Moderately adverse (approach varies)	CTE70
<b>Reserves (assumed in C-1 RBC)</b>	Mean + ½ standard deviation	Mean + ½ standard deviation	<b>Reserves (assumed in C-1 RBC)</b>	Mean + ½ standard deviation	Mean + ½ standard deviation
<b>C-3 Phase 1</b>	Expected Defaults	Expected Defaults	<b>C-3 Phase 1</b>	CTE70	CTE70
<b>C-3 Phase 2</b>	CTE70	CTE70	<b>C-3 Phase 2</b>	CTE70	CTE70

- Recommend updating default cost assumptions in C-3 Phase 1 to more conservative CTE70 level.
- CTE70 is a generally accepted standard for moderately adverse default costs and consistent with PBR and C-3 Phase 2.
- Because of difference with default assumption in C-1 capital, results in potential additional margin on C-1 risk capital.

## C-1 Risk Capital Credit

52

- Generally, adjustments are not made in the RBC framework for potential deficiencies or excess in other components.
- If an adjustment is included, a possible recommendation is a factor-based credit applied to the assets included in C-3 testing to offset the C-1 risk capital margin.

Asset category	Estimated factor credit
Bonds - investment grade bonds	20%
Bonds - below investment grade	15%
Commercial mortgages	Double bond credit

- Recommend further study to explore an *optional* credit that would address the double counting.

# Stochastic Equity Risk

- **Background & Considerations**

- Similar to default costs, double counting of RBC related to general account (GA) equity (or equity-like) assets is being reviewed
- Additionally, equity risk reflected in the current C-1 charge (based on 2013 historical experience measured over a 2-year exposure period) differs from the C-3 stochastic equity element captured over a set of real-world scenarios
- Considerations for companies with a material equity exposure in the GA are being discussed. Topics include:
  - Definition of the materiality threshold, e.g., 5% of GA for liquid liabilities or 15% for illiquid liabilities
  - Excluding equity-like assets in C-3 calculations from C-1 charge
  - Maintain C-1 charge, but allow for deficiency smoothing to address equity volatility, akin to SSAP 108 hedge accounting practices

# Aggregation of C3P1 and C3P2

# Aggregation

- **Background**
  - C-3 Phase 1 and C-3 Phase 2 are calculated separately with no aggregation.
- **Ideal Proposal**
  - No differences between C-3 Phase 1 and C-3 Phase 2 methodology and aggregation fully reflected.
- **Current Proposal**
  - Aggregation is permitted but not required (under certain conditions). Pros and cons reference this proposal.
- **Pros**
  - Reflects diversification between products, consistent with how a company manages interest rate risk.
- **Cons**
  - Requires consistency between C-3 Phase 1 and C-3 Phase 2 methodologies (dependent on outcome of other C3 – Alignment proposals)
  - Operationally complex; requires methodology for splitting VA market risk from aggregated interest rate risks.



## Aggregation - Continued

- **Parameters for Permitted Aggregation in 2026**
  - This will need to be revisited based on proposals for other topics, such as models, assumptions, and number of scenarios.
  - If there is not full consistency between C-3 Phase 1 and C-3 Phase 2, is there still some level of aggregation that can be used?
  - For example, if Company does not have alignment on interim reserves for CFT vs. PBR assumptions, can Company still reflect aggregation across scenarios if both C-3 Phase 1 and C-3 Phase 2 use the same 1000 scenarios?

# Factor Based C-3 Floor

## C-3 Floor Amount - Background

- The C-3 factors are meant to provide for a “lack of synchronization of asset and liability flows.”
  - Factors are from the 1991 study report. The “Low-Risk” category assumes a well-matched portfolio (1/8<sup>th</sup> of a year difference). The other risk category factors were developed by stochastic modeling of asset and liability cashflows.
- For companies that utilize the C-3 cash flow approach, there is a floor equal to ½ the standard factors.
- Assets, liabilities, and investment strategies are likely much different today than 1991, for many companies:
  - Assets – ABS, floating rate assets, equities
  - Liabilities – Embedded options in products
  - Investment Strategies – Using floating rate assets and/or equities to support some fixed rate liabilities

## C-3 Floor Amount - Recommendation

- C-3 Phase 2 does not have a floor
  - PBR applies to almost all VA products and such reserves are reset each quarter, with a floor.
  - C-3 Phase 2 is based on a high CTE level (CTE 98) to encourage tail hedging.
- Significant changes to C-3 Phase 1 are being proposed for year-end 2026
  - GOES scenarios
  - Equity risk
  - FIAs
- Given the timeline, we cannot support the effort to update the C-3 factors and/or review the appropriateness of the floor at this time
- **Proposal**
  - Retain the current factors and floors for year-end 2026.
  - To be reviewed in greater detail after efforts to adopt year-end 2026 recommendations are complete.

# Metric, Scalar, Working Reserves, Time Horizon

## Metric and Scalar

62

- C-3 Phase 1 metric is a **surplus** measure whereas C-3 Phase 2 uses an **asset** measure (working reserves are set to zero).
- Currently contemplating two Greatest Present Value of Accumulated Deficiency (GPVAD) methods:
  - GPVAD (**assets**) with projection horizon to sufficiently represent life of the business.
    - Set working reserves to zero and focus on claim payment capabilities – most aligned with C-3 Phase 2.
  - GPVAD (**surplus**) with shorter projection horizon, reasonable working reserve proxy and focus on reserve funding capabilities.
    - Working reserve proxy may range from Cash Surrender Value to Actuarial Present Value methods.

## Metric and Scalar

63

- Consideration for measurement of the risk is ongoing, but will hinge on the defined metric while using the following formula:
  - **YY% x (CTE XX less Reserves)**
- YY% and CTE XX to be finalized with support of field testing results.
- The projection length, or time horizon, will also be dependent on whether a working reserve is included.

# Next Steps



## Next Steps

65

- Provide recommendation on remaining topics:
  - Metric and Scalar
  - Working Reserves and Interim Measurement
  - Time Horizon
  - Stochastic Equity Risk
- Design field test