



Date: 25/01/2021

Attendees: 5 x Coverholders

1. Meeting Notes:

1.1 Clarifying post-it content:

Compliance – multiple requests for the same information coming from different syndicates – (compliance)

- Lead follow: Lack of trust for the lead organisation who is responsible for compliance and review. Follow uses separate lead review and all of their needs are different. The lead syndicate should publish their compliance review and the following can view and file, so they don't duplicate it again. (CH3)
- Every contract has different compliance requirements, difficult to follow that. It should be standardised. (CH4)
- Lack of understanding of US requirements. Atlas is not trustworthy, the constant need to double check if the information is correct.(CH5)

What's your take on the lack of understanding of US requirements that Coverholder 5 mentioned?

- CH3 example: when Lloyd's have new working requirements, it is difficult to understand and get the filing process around it and it usually happens at the last minute. (CH3)
- Usually have to satisfy both. The FCA regulations from Lloyd's (EU), do the anti money laundering and sanction checks and plus need to follow US restrictions as well. (CH2)
- The US compliances seem easier. The licencing process is not aligned for example on the E&S (speciality marker: Excess & Surplus lines). Lloyd's requirements need to sit on the top, above the local requirements. (CH5)



Coverholder 4 mentioned earlier that reports and BDX are not based on the live data, and are usually months behind what is the solution for that?

- Frustration that reports and the format is backdated. US coverholders have the ability to transact data in real time but the reporting and BDX are a couple months back.
- This is a big issue in contract renewals too, usually sending out 90 - 120 days prior renewal data, but the coverholder relies on data that is a couple of months backdated than it's supposed to be. Live data is a key in these processes too. (CH4)

What do you think drives the significant delays?

- Using old technology, the infrastructure and the system, reporting capability haven't caught up to the transaction yet. Improving technology is essential. (CH4)
- There is a need for data in real time that reflects every part of the process.

Time to taken to join new coverholders , time taken to bring a new proposition to market (Access business, create product)

- It's easier to bring a new product to Lloyd's market than to others (CH4)
- Access to business and creating a product driven by your Lloyd's broker. DA process not aligned centrally that gives a consistent experience. (CH3)

1.2. Discussion on most voted post-it:

Having to request renewal every year with potentially different terms/conditions (Annual renewal)

- This is where the DA market is different mostly from domestic carriers. Uncertainty of what changes need to be made every year. In domestic carriers they analyse through the year and if they notice any trends in particular geographical areas they notify the market participants. The DA market needs to be able to adjust to changes and it shouldn't be annual. (CH1)



What do you think of the concept of evergreen contracts?

- It depends on the risk, if something has a high risk they probably don't want to run it for long – risk assessment. Negotiation and contract wording is important. (CH1)

Separate compliance audit for multiple contract (Lloyd's compliance)

In the new world what would you like to see: an improved Atlas or a new tool that joins information with everything?

- Probably Atlas can go there but Lloyd's need improvement (CH1)
- It's not just the system issue, it's the philosophy and terminology behind it. Lloyd's should standardise and make trading easier across the globe. (CH4)