

Swiss Re AG SWX:SREN

FY 2020 Earnings Call Transcripts

Thursday, March 18, 2021 1:00 PM GMT

S&P Global Market Intelligence Estimates

	-FY 2020-			-FY 2021-
	CONSENSUS	ACTUAL	SURPRISE	CONSENSUS
EPS Normalized	(1.39)	(3.04)	NM	7.11
Revenue (mm)	41249.78	40321.00	▼ (2.25 %)	40894.23

Currency: USD

Consensus as of Mar-18-2021 11:00 AM GMT




Table of Contents

Call Participants	3
Presentation	4
Question and Answer	6

Call Participants

EXECUTIVES

John Robert Dacey
Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

Philip Long
Head of Actuarial Control

Thomas Bohun
Head of Investor Relations

ANALYSTS

Andrew James Ritchie
Autonomous Research LLP

Iain Pearce
Crédit Suisse AG, Research Division

James Austin Shuck
Citigroup Inc., Research Division

Simon Fossmeier

Thomas Fossard
HSBC, Research Division

Vikram Gandhi
Societe Generale Cross Asset Research

Vinit Malhotra
Mediobanca - Banca di credito finanziario S.p.A., Research Division

Presentation

Operator

Good morning or good afternoon. Welcome to Swiss Re's Annual Results 2020 Conference Call. Please note that today's conference call is being recorded. At this time, I would like to turn the conference over to John Dacey, CFO. Please go ahead.

John Robert Dacey

Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

Thank you and good afternoon or good morning to those of you calling in from the Americas. Welcome to today's Q&A call. Joining me from Swiss Re are Philip Long, our Chief Actuary; and Thomas Bohun, the Head of Investor Relations.

Today, we published the 2020 annual report, which includes our EVM results and our Swiss Solvency Test reporting. We also published our P&C loss ratio development triangles and our sustainability report. As last year, we have prepared a presentation focusing on the most relevant points of our disclosure, and we will briefly take you through this in the next few minutes.

First, on the economic results. On Slide 5, we reported negative contribution to economic net worth of \$434 million in 2020. This includes a pretax COVID impact of USD 4.6 billion. Excluding COVID-19, we would have reported a strong contribution to economic net worth of \$3.3 billion.

On Slide 6, we provide an overview of the key differences between this economic result and our U.S. GAAP net loss of \$878 million. The largest difference was a strong new business generation in Life & Health Reinsurance, which is recognized in the EVM profit upfront. EVM also benefited from more positive investment income since it reflects the mark-to-market gains on fixed income as well as equities. On the other hand, the EVM calculation captures an ultimate view of COVID-19, which is more than what we would have reflected in the U.S. GAAP earnings for 2020. Details of the EVM figures and how these break down into the performance of each business segment can be seen on slides 7 to 11.

Moving on to the section of the economic earnings track record. We've demonstrated significant economic earnings strength over time, providing the basis for our capital generation, our dividends and the reinvestment capacity of the group. As you can see on Slide #14, we have generated, on average, \$2.9 billion of economic earnings per annum over the last 5 years, generally a challenging time for the industry. This has been driven by strong EVM profits from new business, representing the value of new business written in each year after earning for our cost of capital as well as the regular capital cost releases for underwriting and investments. While there can be movements from prior year developments or other items such as debt and taxes, these are expected to average close to 0 over the long term.

On Slide 15, we show that the EVM profit from previous years, excluding the impact of COVID-19, amounted to a negative \$1.8 billion, significantly more than the 0 we would expect on average. The large majority of this figure relates to nonunderwriting items such as capital costs, counterparty credit risk and asset liability management. Lower interest rates impacted all 3 of these negatively. Note that there is a partial offset of \$0.5 billion reported in the investment result, thanks to a long duration position we took to help mitigate the effect of lower rates. In addition and importantly, note that the net impact from actual reserve movements across the group was near 0.

Today, we also published the group SST ratio as of 1 January, 2021, which stood at 215%. This includes the proposed regular dividend we expect to pay in April. As shown on Slide 18, the SST ratio is well within our new target range of 200% to 250% in spite of the impact of COVID-19 and represents a very strong level of capitalization. This is especially true if you factor in the low level of interest rates that existed at the end of the year. The increase in long-term rates during the first quarter of 2021 has lifted the group SST to approximately the midpoint of the range in spite of some modest rerisking of the asset portfolio.

On Slide 19, we show the moving parts in the group SST ratio. You can see the modestly negative contribution from our economic earnings, the strong positive impact of closing the ReAssure sale, the impact of capital we deployed into the business, some increases in supplementary capital and the attractive level of repatriation to shareholders. The biggest negative driver, however, was the combination of lower interest rates and higher market volatility in equities and credit

spreads. This increased our capital requirements without actually impacting the network of the firm. Having an SST target range allows for these types of passive impacts, both upwards and downwards.

I'd also like to point out Slide 22 on which we highlight our financial flexibility, particularly through our prudent approach to leverage and the strong access to diversified funding sources. This continues to include the \$2.7 billion of contingent capital, which does not currently count as SST capital.

We have updated the overview of dividend upstreams to the group for you on Slide 23. Note that the \$4 billion of liquid funds we have at group level at the end of 2020 indicates a very comfortable position.

I'd like to conclude my introduction with some comments on our reserves. The materials we published today include, as usual, the P&C loss ratio development triangles. While we leave the detailed analysis of these to you, I would like to observe that our overall reserving confidence has increased, thanks to reserving and underwriting actions taken by the group, particularly on the casualty business. This is supported at year-end by higher IBNR levels. Corporate Solutions is also showing clear evidence of improved experience.

Finally, on sustainability, we continue to make progress towards achieving our net zero ambitions across underwriting investments and our own operations. As part of this, we have announced this week our intention to reduce the carbon intensity of our investment portfolio by 35% by 2025. On the underwriting side, we are accelerating the phase out of thermal coal. And on operations, Swiss Re has become the first multinational company to introduce a triple-digit carbon levy.

With that, I hand it over to Thomas, who will introduce the Q&A session.

Thomas Bohun
Head of Investor Relations

Thank you, John, and hi to all of you from my side as well. [Operator Instructions]
With that, operator, if we could please take the first question?

Question and Answer

Operator

The first question comes from the line of Andrew Ritchie with Autonomous.

Andrew James Ritchie
Autonomous Research LLP

I just wanted to explore a bit more the confidence you're stating that you believe your reserve buffers have gone up. And you mentioned the higher IBNR. I mean if I look at the stock of IBNR and calculated out, I mean, I have gone up about \$1.9 billion, but most of that is in property lines. I would have expected the IBNR to be very high given COVID. And there's maybe about \$400 million in casualty. So I guess I'm trying to understand, why do you feel the IBNR levels have gone up so much ex COVID? And is there not just -- I mean, one would have expected the IBNR to go up as it has been for a lot of your peers because of the effect of COVID. So just a bit of granularity behind why you're making the statement so strongly.

A second question, I'm a bit confused. I'm just not clever enough to understand fully your EVM roll forward. I'm just a bit confused, what exactly happened with the capital costs in the life business that was that significant negative? And I presume that means there will be a bigger unwind of capital costs in future years.

Thomas Bohun
Head of Investor Relations

Thank you, Andrew. Philip, would you like to take the first question around reserving?

Philip Long
Head of Actuarial Control

Yes. Your observations are correct. But maybe I can just wind back a little and just tell you about our philosophy and what we did during this year, including on COVID, I think, that may help -- be helpful. You know we do -- we have a best estimates philosophy. We don't have any prudence explicitly in our margins. But where there is uncertainty, we do maintain more caution in reserving. In reserving, we do put more weight on recent experience, particularly for liability, the higher social inflationary environment. And by doing so, by putting more weight, this mechanically -- or actually, it's not just mechanically. We do look at it properly. Implicitly, this higher inflation is projected into the future.

Now if I think about COVID, any COVID-related lower-than-normal reporting is assessed whether that happens on a portfolio-by-portfolio basis. And if we do believe that there is lower-than-normal reporting, we will ignore this in setting our development factors for reserves. We -- people talk about good COVID secondary impacts. A lot of [indiscernible] talk about that. We do not allow for this generally because we consider what they say, but we set our own IBNR. We only recognize variable development when it emerges from the actual versus expected of losses reported to us.

When we think of COVID impacts, they are due to, let's say, reduced exposure, claims not happening or a slowdown in claims processes, let's say, the courts are closed. We look at historical [AVSSE] against maybe 1 or 2 standard deviations. We try to isolate noise versus any abnormalities, perhaps due to COVID. And we look at these portfolios bottom up. So for example, we may release reserves for property because it's an exposure issue. If a fire doesn't happen, the fire doesn't happen. So we can release some reserve there, while we don't necessarily do it for liability accident & health, where we see lower reporting because of the claims and operationing environment slowdown.

Then we move on to the more recent underwriting years. We have -- you may observe some strengthening in APIs. Actually, it's quite heavy strengthening for underwriting years 2018 and '19. There, we have chosen to move away from what was CorSo. And it's really because we're not slow to take action when we feel we need to.

When we look at underwriting in 2020, which is -- and we then feel that actually, rate adequacy is better. We see pricing improvements, allowing for social inflation. We saw the pruning of large corporate risks. And for CorSo, we don't have umbrella in excess on surplus anymore. We see [liquid] limits are reduced appropriately or terms and conditions have improved. And of course, we observed that the market rate hardening from the second half of 2019, increasing to 2020. So we feel 2020 underwriting year is lower, but we feel comfortable.

We do have higher indicated IBNR levels. Of course, a lot for property due to COVID. But even if I strip out COVID, we have higher IBNR levels in most, if not all of lines of business. We also try to perform on adjusted chain ladder calculations and try to look at it against our booked reserves. We see an increase in the chain ladder indication compared to last year, but we see a bigger increase in our booked reserves as well. So there's a bunch of different sense checks we have. And we also look at coverage of survival type ratios IBNR will pay in a year. And we remain within the 60 to 80 percentile overall. So again, that's comfort there.

So I don't know if I've kind of told you a bit of a long story, but I do feel a lot more comfort, given the uncertainty around social inflation and those aspects this year relative to last year as things progress. So that's all I have to say, Thomas.

Thomas Bohun
Head of Investor Relations

Thank you, Philip.

John Robert Dacey
Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

That's a lot, I think. And I'm pretty sure that you answered Andrew's first question on multiple dimensions. On the second question, Andrew, your instinct is exactly right. The -- there's a higher capital cost on the 2020 bookings of the new business of \$1 billion. We would expect that to unwind. It reflects a combination of where the rates were, but also the duration of the business that we brought on to the book.

Operator

The next question comes from the line of Vinit Malhotra with Mediobanca.

Vinit Malhotra
Mediobanca - Banca di credito finanziario S.p.A., Research Division

Yes. So the first question is just looking again back at this topic of U.S. liability and social inflation, given you could discuss that. I'm just curious in -- I mean, as simple words as possible, I remember the comment that U.S. liability is adequately reserved, and I checked this morning, maintained at that level. Do you see social inflation getting much worse with COVID or sort of stable? And you said that we do factor in higher inflation going forward -- higher social inflation. I'm just trying to understand the drivers because when we read from the outside, we see about out-of-court settlements because people don't want to drag on court cases, which will take longer. So I would have thought that social inflation topic might even have some [indiscernible] but I'm quite curious to hear your thoughts.

And second question is just on the life new business profits on the EVM. So if I look back a few years, they've been sort of steady at roughly \$1 billion level, minus last year and -- which had a big pickup because of some transactions. But is that the level that we should be thinking about? And also I'm surprised a bit that none of the COVID losses happened from the life new business of 2020. I mean for a primary insurer, I can understand that, maybe. But from your reinsurance perspective, is that something we should have expected? And any comments on life's new business would be great.

John Robert Dacey
Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

Why -- Vinit, why don't I try to answer both those, and Philip might want to come in subsequently on the U.S. liability after that. But our view is social inflation continues to be a material force in what will be a higher cost of claims settlements in the United States. There may have been some respite during the calendar year 2020, but we don't believe that this is in any way making a material dent in the long-term trend. We have not assumed an acceleration of that trend because of COVID, but simply a continuation and with no obvious end in sight. So we expect this to be increasing the cost of settlements year-on-year for the future. And we've reserved according to that expectation.

I think, anecdotally, we have heard that in 2020, claims adjusters have been able to settle claims with cash payouts, especially for more modest-sized awards. My expectation is where there were large legal battles brewing, especially but not only those funded by consortiums, they have continued in the same way. And there may have been some slowdown of payments or settlements or decisions because of the logistics of courts operating during the pandemic. But again, we don't see this is going to be getting better, and our reserves reflect that.

With respect to the life new business, your question, is \$1 billion, plus or minus, a reasonable place to be, the answer is probably yes. I do point out, on the U.S. premium side, the U.S. GAAP premiums, this is a business which continues to grow. We rate new business at increasing levels year-on-year-on-year. So I would hope, over time, that \$1 billion will also grow. But it's a single-digit percentage, not anything dramatic that we see. So I think you should assume that franchise building continues, and we look forward to playing.

On the COVID losses themselves, this is just the nature of the bookings with -- in the EVM framework. The vast majority of the losses also on the P&C side show up in prior years rather than in 2020.

Thomas Bohun
Head of Investor Relations

Thank you, Vinit. Could we have the next question, please?

John Robert Dacey
Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

Maybe before -- Philip, did you want to add anything to the first part on U.S. liability inflation?

Philip Long
Head of Actuarial Control

No. Just to reiterate what you said, I think we remain cautious about social inflation. You can see it that we have increased the A-priori loss ratios that will -- that has a big impact on determining what our underwriting year '18 and '19 results would be. At the same time, like John says, of course, 2020 has been a strange year and so we have been very cautious in view of that. Anecdotally, of course, as John said, and due to -- I think the smaller cases, they have got settled quicker. But I don't think that the larger cases -- I think people are also waiting out. So we have just continued to remain cautious on that front overall.

Operator

The next question comes from the line of Iain Pearce with Credit Suisse.

Iain Pearce
Crédit Suisse AG, Research Division

Just following up on the liability books. I'm looking at the ultimate loss ratio for 2020, you booked that at 95. And obviously, you're sounding quite cautious on sort of continued social inflation trends. So I'm just wondering, with the re-underwriting actions that you're taking in line exits, do you expect that ultimate loss ratio for '21 to come down into a more acceptable level? Or with the trends that you're sort of highlighting, it sounds like you've been quite a bit more negative and that there's quite a lot of work to get from that 95 down to an acceptable loss ratio. So I'm just wondering if you could comment on sort of appetite for liability business going forward. And also on liability, if you could provide a percentile level of confidence. I think you provided on -- in the past the U.S. liability reserves as well, that would be really useful.

And then a second one just on COVID losses. Based on the losses that you've included within the SST, it looks like you're estimating about \$200 million in life and health. Based on the sensitivities you provided, that looks a tad low given U.S. x of mortalities. So I'm just wondering if you could comment on expectations there as well.

John Robert Dacey
Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

Sure, Iain. Let me try both of those. With respect to the casualty portfolio, we showed a month ago that we had actually shrunk materially on the January 1 renewals, 17%, in spite of material price increases on casualty. And the reduction was especially strong with respect to large corporate risks, where we're down more than 50%, actually, just in the course of 1 year, I think. So we do have that more conservative portfolio. Philip also mentioned the aggressive withdraw we made in '19 on CorSo of these risk positions.

I think the challenge when you look at target loss ratios is they're a function of the premiums earned. And as the prices in the primary market continue to go up very strongly for U.S. casualty, there is an ability to correct here. And we think those price increases are absolutely necessary. In some places, they may be sufficient. In other places, they're probably not. And that's one of the reasons why we came off some of these risks. I'd also say there appears to be a little bit

of exuberance in the primary side about how important these price increases are and some attempts to adjust the commissions related to the reinsurance covers on them, which we think is not appropriate. We think we need to continue to get fairly price covers in place, and we'll see what happens.

So I think the underlying improvement in prices is an important dynamic. We will see what that actually plays out in loss ratios. But we will continue to be an important player in this market, but with a market share which is more in line with what we might expect of Swiss Re and not at all any overweight positions.

Your second question on COVID, the -- actually, if you disentangle the EVM numbers, you'll probably come up with around \$300 million of expected life and health COVID losses in the EVM calculation. With the sensitivity that we gave a month ago, we believe that's still valid, which says for every 100,000 excess deaths, the charge to the group [indiscernible] would be about \$200 million pretax.

I think the actual number of COVID deaths in the first quarter is unfortunately very high in the United States. January was probably the worst month ever. I think identified COVID deaths in February, not much better. We are seeing some important improvements now in March as the rollout of the vaccine seems to be correctly focused on the high-risk populations. And instead of 4,000 deaths a day, which is the numbers you saw in late January, we're down plus or minus 1,000 over the last week here. So let's see how this goes. But your instinct that \$200 million would feel light for what we've actually seen is probably coherent with what the numbers are today versus what they were in December when we put together the EVM calculations.

Operator

The next question comes from the line of James Shuck with Citi.

James Austin Shuck
Citigroup Inc., Research Division

So many might have been asked actually. So I just had a couple more left. Firstly, just if I look at the breakdown of the PYD historically between kind of property, casualty and specialty, and we talked at length about casualty and property as pretty self-evident. But in recent years, specialty lines have seen material releases in over the last 2 years. Those have gone away. We're actually now seeing pretty small additions. So can you just outline a little bit of what's happening on the specialty side in terms of trends, please?

And then secondly, it's my favorite question. I think I've asked you before, John, but I'm going to ask again. I'm just intrigued about the prospects of frequency benefits on the P&C Re side in particular. One would have thought that with less economic activity and less goods being transported around the world, that might actually lead to reduced frequency, so just leaving aside social inflation and thinking about some of the underlying trends driven by economic activity.

Thomas Bohun
Head of Investor Relations

Philip, do you want to take the first question around specialty reserves?

Philip Long
Head of Actuarial Control

Yes. I'm trying to kind of -- specialty includes aviation and marine. And I think you know of a particularly large aviation loss, which hit us. So that's an issue. And some of the net cats also will hit the specialty line in terms of the marine lines. We have had some large man-made losses also. So we've just had a couple of years where certain net cats and man-made losses have hit us harder than normal for specialty.

John Robert Dacey
Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

And I was going to say, the large aviation loss probably explains most of what you've seen here on that, James. With respect to the frequency benefits, the -- we take some comfort from the fourth quarter reporting of the primary industry on their experience as they closed out their years. But we've yet to see real data come through to us that would justify a strong view that there is a frequency benefit for reinsurance. Obviously, the one which is blatantly obviously everywhere is on motor. That, unfortunately, does not benefit us very much given the nature of our -- the motor covers that we do have in place, which are not particularly large. But to your point, on general economic activity, in some ways, there was

this reduction, but more in the service sector, more on travel and leisure, and frankly, a little less on places where heavier industries, home building, construction, other lines. So we'll look for it. If it comes through, that will be good for us. And I'll be the first one to credit you for correctly anticipating it. But right now, it's not in our numbers.

Operator

[Operator Instructions] And the next question comes from the line of Thomas Fossard with HSBC.

Thomas Fossard
HSBC, Research Division

One question related to your liquidity or cash buffer, which you quantified at \$4 billion. I'm a bit surprised by this number because computing your cash buffer from the full year '20 account and using the numbers you presented a couple of weeks ago and using the equity of the consolidated item and redrawing the principal investment, I was getting more a number around \$2.5 billion. So just wanted to reconcile the \$2.5 billion and the \$4 billion presented on the slide today. And maybe if you could indicate how -- what the cash buffer that you are aiming to keep, if there is any?

And the second question will be related to any comments that you would like to do regarding maybe the Q1 claims environment regarding Texas, but also maybe regarding potential direct or indirect exposure to greenfield defaulting.

John Robert Dacey
Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

Sorry, I took my mic on. So I think it's Page 23 that you're referring to with respect to the liquid funds. I think this would have been coherent with the guidance that we had a month ago. The -- obviously, the -- these funds are net of the dividend that's being paid next month. And so we're -- again, our view is this is robust. We don't have or haven't communicated, frankly, a target number, but this is unambiguously above it. So I think I'd just reiterate to say that we're very comfortable with the overall group's liquidity and with the liquid funds that's already at the group level, providing a fair amount of flexibility to us, independent of any dividends coming from the subsidiary businesses.

Your second question was asking for any information we might be able to share on either the winter storms in the Southeast Texas, in particular, or the greenfield. On greenfield, so what I can say is we've not -- after looking across the businesses, we've not seen material exposures to us that would be triggered by what we understand today is the scale and scope of this problem. So we're continuing to work with some of our primary insurers to see if there's anything through the reinsurance book that might have been caught up in this. But at least, with the investigations, as they stand today, we've not seen anything significant.

With respect to Texas, I believe it's just premature to say anything. I think -- and I know we're all a little frustrated that we don't have a number that we would normally have after a big nat cat event. And now it's been about a month. But what's important to note here is that there's not a model for this loss, right? We're not talking about floodplains. We're not talking about historical wind patterns. We're not talking about a fault line where we've got the earthquake damage zone mapped out with detailed models. The damage that was caused, especially in Texas, was related to the provision or the interruption of power to homes and businesses. And to the degree that, that interruption of power then led to damage inside the homes and businesses and/or the inability for the businesses to move forward is a function, frankly, of understanding exactly the level of insulation of the building as well as the positioning of the internal plumbing and water tanks and the -- whether the heating was natural gas and/or electricity. And the whole thing just makes it highly, highly complicated.

What we have seen on top of that is the risk that this -- a little bit like the wildfires in California becomes a challenge of who's responsible. And in particular, the opportunities or likelihood of subrogation and to what degree the energy providers and the famous Texas grid player, ERCOT, assumes or is forced to assume responsibility for some of these losses, and then it becomes a casualty loss rather than a property and business interruption loss.

But this was a major event. There were more than 4 million residents without power in the state. There were 13 million households that were without water or potable water for some period of time. There were actually rolling outages in not only Texas, but we've calculated a total of 14 states. And so there's a lot to uncover here. We'll obviously have a number in our first quarter results when we come out on April 30. If we know something more definitive before that and we think it's important enough to share with the market, we would. But otherwise, we -- our teams are just working very, very hard with the primary companies to try to come to some reasonable calculation, both for the industry and for us.

Operator

The next question comes from the line of Vikram Gandhi with Societe Generale.

Vikram Gandhi

Societe Generale Cross Asset Research

Just one question from my side, and that's on life and health business. Given your guidance about some potential noise on the U.S. life business expected in the next couple of years, that's the [USP] in the business, I wonder how should we think about the position in EVM. I believe it's already accounted for, but would be great if you can confirm that.

John Robert Dacey

Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

Vikram, yes, your assumption is correct. We've -- when we made some major changes and adjustments in the portfolio, I think, in 2013, '14, we've already made some moves as we felt appropriate in EVM. And while we've done some true-up over the years, it's largely in place there. And so the pressure is on the U.S. cap accounts, and that's why we've said that we expect, COVID aside, for us to be able to maintain or reach the targets of 10% to 12% return on equity for the life and health business in the next few years. But we're likely to be towards the lower end of that.

Operator

The next question is a follow-up from Mr. Ritchie with Autonomous.

Andrew James Ritchie

Autonomous Research LLP

Simple questions, I think. Well, actually, not simple, but not that controversial. The volatility impact for -- on SST was significant. I mean it's significant because even though some market factors improved in the second half, you still have quite a big market impact in the second half of '20. How quickly does that volatility -- I mean, on the big assumption that we have sort of normal-ish levels of volatility, whatever that is, from, say, now, how quickly does the volatility kind of uplift drop out of the, I guess, it affects the target capital?

Second question, I noticed in the annual report, there's quite a lot of new disclosure about average annual expected losses by region. I think that's new. Maybe that isn't new. Is that reflecting the latest portfolio shift as at 1/1? Or is that more historic?

John Robert Dacey

Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

So Andrew, on your first question, it's a -- you're essentially asking when volatility reverts to the mean, when does the SST volatility charge drop out or actually reverse as well. I think we don't have a good answer for that to share today. If we do ahead of the midyear announcements, which I guess, we do in September, we'll try to bring that to the market. But I agree with you, it was a large number, but it just reiterates that even if markets are recovering, that volatility is a challenge for us and reiterates one of the reasons why we felt that this range of \$200 million to \$250 million made a lot of sense.

On the second one, I think that those expected losses should be viewed as probably not including the January 1 renewals. I don't think we have time to bring that forward. We can follow up and confirm that. But I don't think a January 1 renewal would have changed that much in any case. The in-force book is what the in-force book is here. And we've got a whether -- were obviously some adjustments in the lines of business. I don't think geographically, we've got a real shift here. So you should feel comfortable going with that.

Operator

The next question comes from the line of Simon Fossmeier with Vontobel.

Simon Fossmeier

John, two more general questions, if I may. The first is on IFRS 17 and EVM. I assume that IFRS 17 is much closer to EVM than U.S. GAAP ever was. And I'm just wondering if it's right to assume that EVM results are a good indicator how results will look like under IFRS 17. Now I know it's 3 years out, but if you have a gut feel, I'd appreciate that.

And the second question is are you going to get a new chairman at the AGM. And it almost feels like a monarchy is ending. I'm just wondering, in your personal view, what do you think the new chairman will change?

John Robert Dacey

Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

So Simon, on the first question, your understanding is correct that IFRS 17 is likely to bring a much more economic view to the reporting that we will do for our accounting standards than U.S. GAAP does. I think it's premature to assume that EVM is a good proxy for it. There are unambiguously important differences between EVM and IFRS 17. We will, as we approach the implementation of this, provide real guidance and indications of how you should be thinking about our accounts, the balance sheet and the P&L. And we'll dry run 2023, as you would expect, to be sure that we're tracking any novelties. The interesting thing there is because we are coming from U.S. GAAP and not from IFRS 9, we will likely be bringing this on for our consolidation at the group level a year after many of our peers have already started reporting. So you'll get a sense from the marketplace of how this is looking before you'll get it from us, I think.

Your second question, I think I'm probably not going to have much to say other than I'd encourage you to listen when our new chairman speaks and get a strong sense from him of what his priorities will be.

Operator

The question next question is a follow-up from Mr. Malhotra with Mediobanca.

Vinit Malhotra

Mediobanca - Banca di credito finanziario S.p.A., Research Division

Just going back to the annual report, P&C Reinsurance section of the outlook says the upcoming renewals will show further market hardening with decreasing momentum due to increasing competitive environment. Do you think that this is sort of -- I mean, you have been a bit more vocal about the competition since maybe November as well. But do you see that this is a bit worse competition for -- between Japan and Florida ahead of us? Is it much worse than you thought? Or is it just reiterating this trend you've been always thinking about?

John Robert Dacey

Group CFO & Member of Executive Committee

Vinit, I don't think we've got a more pessimistic view. I think we've suggested that on U.S. casualty, we may be more cautious than some players in the marketplace. I think on property, we continue to see the primary market making important price improvements a bit early around the world, and we would expect those to continue. And we'll see renewal by renewal -- observed that one of the specialized player in Florida just recently announced a need to do some restatement and some negative impact on their loss picks. So it may be that there is a recognition -- a further recognition of the need for rate in Florida when that renewal comes in June. But we're working with our clients in Japan as we speak, but also there's a few other important people that will renew on April 1. We'll give you an update of that on April 30 of how that has gone. And we expect that the market will continue to show a hardening during the course of 2021.

Operator

[Operator Instructions]

Thomas Bohun

Head of Investor Relations

Otherwise, if there's no more questions, thank you very much for joining today's call. If you have any follow-up questions, please reach out to any member of the Investor Relations team. Thanks again. Thank you to operator, back to you.

Operator

Thank you for your participation, ladies and gentlemen. You may now disconnect.

Copyright © 2021 by S&P Global Market Intelligence, a division of S&P Global Inc. All rights reserved.

These materials have been prepared solely for information purposes based upon information generally available to the public and from sources believed to be reliable. No content (including index data, ratings, credit-related analyses and data, research, model, software or other application or output therefrom) or any part thereof (Content) may be modified, reverse engineered, reproduced or distributed in any form by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of S&P Global Market Intelligence or its affiliates (collectively, S&P Global). The Content shall not be used for any unlawful or unauthorized purposes. S&P Global and any third-party providers, (collectively S&P Global Parties) do not guarantee the accuracy, completeness, timeliness or availability of the Content. S&P Global Parties are not responsible for any errors or omissions, regardless of the cause, for the results obtained from the use of the Content. THE CONTENT IS PROVIDED ON "AS IS" BASIS. S&P GLOBAL PARTIES DISCLAIM ANY AND ALL EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ANY WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE OR USE, FREEDOM FROM BUGS, SOFTWARE ERRORS OR DEFECTS, THAT THE CONTENT'S FUNCTIONING WILL BE UNINTERRUPTED OR THAT THE CONTENT WILL OPERATE WITH ANY SOFTWARE OR HARDWARE CONFIGURATION. In no event shall S&P Global Parties be liable to any party for any direct, indirect, incidental, exemplary, compensatory, punitive, special or consequential damages, costs, expenses, legal fees, or losses (including, without limitation, lost income or lost profits and opportunity costs or losses caused by negligence) in connection with any use of the Content even if advised of the possibility of such damages. S&P Global Market Intelligence's opinions, quotes and credit-related and other analyses are statements of opinion as of the date they are expressed and not statements of fact or recommendations to purchase, hold, or sell any securities or to make any investment decisions, and do not address the suitability of any security. S&P Global Market Intelligence may provide index data. Direct investment in an index is not possible. Exposure to an asset class represented by an index is available through investable instruments based on that index. S&P Global Market Intelligence assumes no obligation to update the Content following publication in any form or format. The Content should not be relied on and is not a substitute for the skill, judgment and experience of the user, its management, employees, advisors and/or clients when making investment and other business decisions. S&P Global Market Intelligence does not act as a fiduciary or an investment advisor except where registered as such. S&P Global keeps certain activities of its divisions separate from each other in order to preserve the independence and objectivity of their respective activities. As a result, certain divisions of S&P Global may have information that is not available to other S&P Global divisions. S&P Global has established policies and procedures to maintain the confidentiality of certain nonpublic information received in connection with each analytical process.

S&P Global may receive compensation for its ratings and certain analyses, normally from issuers or underwriters of securities or from obligors. S&P Global reserves the right to disseminate its opinions and analyses. S&P Global's public ratings and analyses are made available on its Web sites, www.standardandpoors.com (free of charge), and www.ratingsdirect.com and www.globalcreditportal.com (subscription), and may be distributed through other means, including via S&P Global publications and third-party redistributors. Additional information about our ratings fees is available at www.standardandpoors.com/usratingsfees.

© 2021 S&P Global Market Intelligence.