

Chart of ACLI Comments and Proposed Rulemaking Committee Response

ACLI Comments	Proposed Committee Response
Section 103(b)(2) – Practical Implementation of the “Complete Filing” Requirement	
<i>From a practical standpoint, it is unclear how the requirement to provide a “complete copy of the product filing” will operate given that a filing often evolves throughout the review process. Clarification would be helpful regarding how filers are expected to maintain and submit an updated “complete” version on an ongoing basis. While the inclusion of correspondence occurring outside of SERFF is understandable, information housed within SERFF should already be readily accessible to the Compact Office. It is not evident why a separate, complete copy of the filing is necessary. Additionally, the language refers specifically to a “complete copy of the product filing,” which raises the question of whether this process is intended to apply exclusively to product filings, as opposed to applications or other types of filings submitted to the Compact.</i>	A complete copy of the filing means a complete copy of the submission as it exists at the time of the submission for Intermediate Review. Yes, this would include any outside correspondence, should there be any that is not retained on SERFF.
Section 103(b)(3) – Submission of Applicable Uniform Standards	
<i>This subsection requires the carrier to provide a copy of the relevant Uniform Standards or Operating Procedures. It is unclear why this is necessary, as the Compact Office and Member Review Board presumably already have access to and familiarity with these materials. Clarification as to the purpose or intended use of this requirement would be helpful.</i>	If the filer provides a copy of the Uniform Standard or Operating Procedure used to create the items that are the subject of the Intermediate Review, then the Compact Office or the review body can confirm that the right document(s) was/were used in the creation of the filing. On rare occasions, there is an opportunity to redirect a filer to the correct instructions and thus resolve a conflict.
Section 103(c) – Submission Method and File Management	
<i>The cumulative size of the materials required to be submitted could become unmanageable, particularly if complete filings and extensive correspondence are required. Consideration should be given to whether links to documents may be provided in lieu of full copies, or whether submissions could be made through a dedicated portal rather than by email. Additionally, development of a standardized template for the Request for Intermediate Review could improve efficiency and consistency for both industry participants and regulators.</i>	We agree that submissions could become unmanageable. We would like to see how many requests for Intermediate Review and what materials are submitted before investing in a dedicated portal or other solution. Should the need arise, the Compact will likely take such action.

Chart of ACLI Comments and Proposed Rulemaking Committee Response

ACLI Comments	Proposed Committee Response
Section 103(d) – Discretionary Nature of Review Board Decisions	
<i>The discretionary authority of the Member Review Board to recommend or decline an Intermediate Review would benefit from additional transparency. Without any articulated criteria, examples, or guardrails, carriers may be unable to meaningfully assess whether submitting a Request for Intermediate Review is likely to be productive. Providing non-binding examples or illustrative factors could help conserve both industry and regulatory resources and reduce inefficient or unnecessary submissions.</i>	As the process has not yet been tested, we are unable to provide examples that can be used to assess whether a request for Intermediate Review will be productive. The discretionary authority provided allows the Review Board to refuse a frivolous request or to determine that a request would be more appropriately addressed in an alternate setting, such as a court of law.
Section 103(k) – Timing and Distribution of the Report	
<i>Clarification is requested regarding whether the distribution of the Report under this subsection occurs concurrently with the ten-business-day review period described in Section 103(j), or only upon expiration of that period. In addition, it is recommended that the Report be provided to the Requestor at this stage. In some cases, the Requestor may be a carrier represented by the Industry Advisory Committee, which further supports providing the Report directly to the Requestor when it is distributed.</i>	The Member Review Report will be provided to the Requestor and the Compact Office at the same time and both entities will have the same ten days to review and submit requests for changes or clarifications. At the end of the ten days, a redacted version of the report will be distributed to the members and designated representatives of the Commission, members of the Legislative Committee and Industry Advisory Committee.
Section 103(l) – Ability to Withdraw the Request	
<i>It is unclear whether the Requestor has the option to forgo this step if it is satisfied with the Report. As drafted, this provision could extend an “Agreed Written Extension” to 75 days or more, even where the Requestor may prefer to proceed with the filing. The procedure should expressly permit the Requestor to withdraw its Request for Intermediate Review at any time. There may be valid business or strategic reasons for doing so, and it would be reasonable to allow withdrawal even if the associated fee is forfeited.</i>	As with any appeal, a Requestor may withdraw the request at any procedural step prior the Report being final. The Committee would recommend an amendment in the pending <i>Interim Review OP</i> to add new section: <u>§103(o) The Requestor may withdraw its request for RIR at any time prior to the date the Report is final in accordance with §103 (m). In such event, the Review Board retains the discretion to refer the issue, that is subject to the RIR, to the Management Committee for rulemaking or other action as applicable.</u>

Chart of ACLI Comments and Proposed Rulemaking Committee Response

ACLI Comments	Proposed Committee Response
<p>Section 105(b) – Impact on Previously Approved Filings</p> <p><i>This provision raises several significant concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It is unclear whether this language could introduce litigation or regulatory risk for previously approved products and policies already issued, potentially creating a de facto “class” of impacted filings.</i> • <i>The provision appears to allow one filer’s Request for Intermediate Review to adversely affect other carriers’ existing books of business, raising concerns about unintended competitive or arbitrage impacts.</i> • <i>The requirement for filers to “update their products” is ambiguous. Clarification is needed regarding whether this applies to in-force policies. At a minimum, any such provision should expressly exclude in-force business and should incorporate reasonable minimum timeframes to allow carriers adequate time to implement updates, if required.</i> • <i>Given these concerns, it is recommended that implementation be limited to Section 105(c), thereby ensuring that material changes to Uniform Standards or Operating Procedures occur through the formal rulemaking process.</i> 	<p>If the Report impacts the Compact Office application of the Uniform Standards or Operating Procedures in previously approved filings, the Compact Office will issue a Filing Information Notice to explain the process for filers in updating their products and whether such updates are optional or required. The Filing Information Notice will provide specific information regarding how and when the change will affect forms that are not yet issued. There is no intent to utilize the Intermediate Review Process to require retroactive applications of the Report’s conclusions.</p>