Linux Foundation
openIDL
Regulatory Reporting Data Model Working Group
2021 October 29 Meeting Minutes

Attendees

Stephen (Me)

openIDL Community, Daniela Barbosa (Host)

Dina Burgess

Dale Harris

Ruturaj Waghmode

Brian Hoffman

Ken Sayers

Kristian Farner

Lori Dreaver Munn

Megan Ebling

Peter Antley

Robin Westcott

Satish Kasala

Susan Chudwick

Truman Esmond

Meeting Minutes

1. Antitrust policy reviewed
2. Review Charter
   a. Draft. Goal: Set the context of these meetings, working group
   b. Reviewed bullets of the charter proposal
      i. Truman: include what it looks like to our stakeholders. Who are the actors, for whom is this a standard?
      ii. Brian: Bias from data perspective, what it means to each viewer
      iii. Ken: That's a data architecture. It's more than one model, a connection over the TSC
      iv. Ruturaj: Proposed additional point to the charter: Identify perspectives/views that are applicable for a given data model
      v. Brian: suggest moving "regulatory reporting" ahead of data model in 1st bullet. as it shows in 2nd bullet.

      vi.   Robin: Parentheses around the standards? Is the model supporting the open standard or is it supporting the open standard?

     vii.   Truman: Purpose of the model: What is the data model that allows interaction between two models? Enterprise Model -> openIDL Model -> Regulatory Model. At rest, at query, at visualization

   viii.   Ruturaj proposes additional language: Data models discussed, created & documented are published as open source (in the context of openIDL membership)

     ix.   Truman asks about C2PA.org specification for defining assets, assertions, etc.

      x.   Robin questions openSource for view but not for use.

     xi.   Brian: We want to create a pipe and let people run through it but there might be a paywall for some aspects

     xii.   Truman: Yes, for example connecting to the openIDL "pipe" might cost money

    xiii.   Dale: Is this charter for openIDL or for the data model?

    xiv.   Robin: Technical Steering Committee would have to bless

     xv.   Truman: Building data logical structures. From RRDMWG to TSC to openIDL board

  c.   Agreed to post as draft and let it sit for a week, then have this committee and then regulatory committee approve it.

      i.

3.   Define key stakeholders

  a.   Truman: we need to decide the voters, who has right to vote

4.   Automobile Statistical Data Model Overview

  a.   Peter Antley showed the Auto Coverage Data Model

      i.   Table by table

     ii.   Nine tables: line of business, policy, subline, transaction, transaction code, state, coverage, claim detail, premium detail

    iii.   State table: Also have territories that need addition

    iv.   Ruturaj: This data model is the extraction pattern data model for getting data needed for regulatory reporting

  b.   Data Dictionary

      i.   Field, table, attribute, definition

  c.   Q&A

      i.   Dale: This is just the auto data report model?

     ii.   Also, where is carrier dimension?

         1.   We plan to add a carrier table in, probably on the policy

    iii.   Susan: Compared to list of NAIC required codes. She has the list and has started a compare.

         1.   Territory but may not get distinct to zip code.

         2.   Territory, state, zip are all required NAIC codes.

         3.   Dale: Address is PII and Travelers does not want to disclose

4. Susan showed her analysis of NAIC vs openIDL auto – PL Auto -AAIS v NAIC.xlsx
   a. Dale: On claim detail, do we want to add claim number? Agreed
5. Walk through Data Dictionary Draft
   a. Ruturaj: What is the feedback on the data dictionary?
   b. Susan: What is PK, FK? Primary key, foreign key. Can add footnote
   c. Dale: What are the acceptable values? Where do we show that?
      i. Ruturaj: That is the enumeration list. That is to be done. Also likely to add some rules, too.

Action Items

- Susan to share her gap analysis (NAIC vs auto data model)
- Peter to add acceptable values (enumeration lists) and rules