

2021-11-5 Meeting Agenda

Date

05 Nov 2021

Antitrust Policy Notice

Linux Foundation meetings involve participation by industry competitors, and it is the intention of the Linux Foundation to conduct all of its activities in accordance with applicable antitrust and competition laws. It is therefore extremely important that attendees adhere to meeting agendas, and be aware of, and not participate in, any activities that are prohibited under applicable US state, federal or foreign antitrust and competition laws.

Examples of types of actions that are prohibited at Linux Foundation meetings and in connection with Linux Foundation activities are described in the Linux Foundation Antitrust Policy available at <http://www.linuxfoundation.org/antitrust-policy>. If you have questions about these matters, please contact your company counsel, or if you are a member of the Linux Foundation, feel free to contact Andrew Updegrave of the firm of Gesmer Updegrave LLP, which provides legal counsel to the Linux Foundation.



openIDL RRDMWG...1.05.2021.pptx

This is a weekly series for The Regulatory Reporting Data Model Working Group. The RRDMWG is a collaborative group of insurers, regulators and other insurance industry innovators dedicated to the development of data models that will support regulatory reporting through an openIDL node. The data models to be developed will reflect a greater synchronization of data for insurer statistical and financial data and a consistent methodology that insurers and regulators can leverage to modernize the data reporting environment. The models developed will be reported to the Regulatory Reporting Steering Committee for approval for publication as an open-source data model.

openIDL Community is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/98908804279?pwd=Q1FGcFhUQk5RMUpkaVIFTWtXb09jQT09>

Meeting ID: 989 0880 4279

Passcode: 740215

One tap mobile

+16699006833,,98908804279# US (San Jose)

+12532158782,,98908804279# US (Tacoma)

Dial by your location

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)
+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
888 788 0099 US Toll-free
877 853 5247 US Toll-free

Meeting ID: 989 0880 4279

Find your local number: <https://zoom.us/j/98908804279>

Attendees

- [Ruturaj Waghmode](#)
- [George Bradner](#)
- [@Dale Harris](#)
- [James Madison](#)
- [Ken Sayers](#)
- [@kristine McDonald](#)
- [Lori Munn](#)
- [Megan Ebling](#)
- [peter antley](#)
- [@Peter Weinstein](#)
- [@Ryan Blakeney](#)
- [@Stephen Lee](#)
- [Daniela Barbosa](#)

Agenda:

- Review any feedback on the proposed Charter and agree on any updates
- Approve the charter and refer it to the RRSC
- Confirm voting members from member & regulatory delegates or adopt a consensus-based model
- Peter Antley (AAIS) will provide an update on the Auto stat data model based on last week's discussions and feedback
- Refer to the NAIC handbook for stat reporting guidelines (PDF below)
- Review the gap analysis for the current & proposed data dictionaries for Personal Auto
- Any other business



NAIC Priv Passenger.pdf



PL Auto OpenIDL...AAIS v NAIC.xlsx

Recording



Regulat...11_5.mp4

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes (scribed by [Megan Ebling](#)- thank you!)

1. Antitrust policy reviewed
2. Review Charter on Wiki
 - a. Rururaj: The last meeting we looked at the data model and it is a very technical construct, we would like to keep this conversation (working group) more business friendly and business centric so, we are going to refer to the data dictionary to get a visual on the relationship.
 - b. Dale: Would like to add into the charter that we are only dealing with property and casualty and the end game is all lines of business that require statistical reporting.
 - c. Reviewed bullet points of the charter
 - a. Draft. Goal: Set the context of these meetings, working group
3. Working Group Basics: Organization and Voting
 - a. (Introductions of the group)
 - a. Subcommittee Members:
 - i. Dale Harris
 - ii. Peter Antley
 - iii. George Bradner
 - iv. Ryan Blakeney
 - a. Truman: Who gets to vote, we need the definition of who's in the working group that would constitute a quorum.
 - b. Rururaj: With regards to the Chair; we can rotate that so everybody gets to play the chair and contributes and doesn't just become an overhead for one individual.
 - c. Daniela: From the Linux Foundation side, that's the correct approach.
 - d. Rururaj: We can have a new chair every quarter.
 - e. George: Do we have a list of who are the Members of this Working Group now? Just so, we can get a sense of all the people who are apart of this group?
 - f. Daniela: I would recommend that we make a call to the list and say, I we would like to create a public right directory of Members. It's more appropriate to do this on the public mailing list then to share the list here and now.
 - g. Dale: Can we make introductions to everyone in this group now?
 - h. Daniela: Is anyone opposed to being listed in the regulatory reporting working group directory? I will make a call out for any other individuals that might not be on the call today or on previous calls to let us know if they want to be added.
 - i. Truman: Back to the chair part, who is eligible for a nomination?
 - j. Dale: We need a more robust charter to define that role of the Chair. I would suggest we have a subcommittee to build out the charter.
 - k. Truman: I agree.
4. Data Model and Data Dictionary:
 - a. Peter: We didn't have company listed on the data model last time so, that was added. Along with type of business and class. Most of the updates that has been done in the last week have actually been under the data dictionary page.
 - b. Rururaj: Want to have an explicit discussion about the company identifiers
 - c. Ken: Currently the multi tenant node does not use the company as an identifier.
 - d. Truman: Company listed is for operational purposes; the data is completely de identified.
 - e. Dale: Thinking of the future—if states start asking for data calls by companies this model will be helpful- a NAIC code would be added as an attributes
 - f. Truman: Would like to keep it—attribute as the company would know to help with respect to claims and central objects, creating a broader model
 - g. Rururaji: We'll give the data dictionary more time and attention—will send out offline updates---leaving 'company' in the model would like to know 'yes' or 'no'. We would like to get everyone together to vote the model.

Action items

- ☐ Daniela to reach out to mailing list about adding themselves to the member list for this WG
- ☐ Charter Sub-Committee to be formed and meet outside working group meetings, to present charter
- ☐ Peter to analyze the Company entity and kick off the next meeting with his alternative view