

2022-9-16 Meeting Agenda



Date

16 Sept 2022

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.



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=Q1FGcFhUQk5RMEpkaVIFTWtXb09jQT09>

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

Libby Crews

[peter antley](#)

[Nathan Southern](#)

[Jefferson Braswell](#)

[Susan Chudwick](#)

[James Madison](#)

Bourjali Hi

Reggie Scarpa

[Ash Naik](#)

[George Bradner](#)

[Dale Harris](#)

Mike Nurse

Jenny Tornquist

Brian Hoffman

A. Intro by Mr. Antley

1. Greetings
2. LF Anti Trust Statement

B. Agenda

1. Reconciliation - Ms. Chudwick
 - a. Reconciling reporting to financials on a state/company/by line basis. Avail usually by end of March, but don't go out to stat agents til May /June usually. Takes time given volume. Question: what does/not have to be done.
 - b. Lots of ways to build to become more timely, and many checks and balances. We don't want to wait to reconcile before we report
 - c. Her team builds into a big access spreadsheet. Smaller insurers do reconciliation & pose questions where differences exist. Larger companies do spreadsheet as well.
 - d. When we talk about when financials become available - re: AAIS - this is when they receive info from NAIC (Antley). For data: Ms. Chudwick clarified that they submit monthly, usually before they have reconciliatory information. It is official because it is their books and records. NAIC has it by state by company or by line by company but not all three on a quarter (which is what one needs)
 - e. Ms. Tornquist: Question - does it happen at company level or the level of the group? Ms. Chudwick: they reconcile at group level. Mr. Nurse: clarified that @ The Hartford they reconcile at state level and company level (both). One for NAIC and one for stat agents. Done quarterly but at a company level.
2. Mr. Antley asked Mr. Nurse to clarify his process at the Hartford
 - a. When they book premiums/losses, they break out by individual companies (for every NAIC code). Take info from financial system, and balance statutory to financials on a monthly basis. If there is an out of balance, they have an explanation
 - b. Reconciliation happens both end of quarter and end of year.
3. Discussion of column formats on spreadsheets
 - a. Mr. Nurse offered to share documentation
 - b. Said Kevin Petruzielo designed this spreadsheet
 - c. Mr. Antley asked Ms. Chudwick for a sanitized version of reconciliation document from Travelers with 'dummy data.' Just wants to look at columns. Can we come up with standard excel file with line of business, states, etc.

- d. Mr. Chudwick: we already have this from Travelers from 2020.
 - e. Mr. Hoffman: clarified why openIDL would need this. Mr. Antley confirmed that if he receives such a document, he's not able to share with anyone.
 - f. Ms. Chudwick: this request is difficult (maybe impossible) given the limitations of proprietary information from Travelers, and the differences in requirements/exclusions from carrier to carrier
 - g. Mr. Antley: he's trying to figure out how to reconcile your stat report if I can't see your raw data. If a carrier has a group of records to repr. auto and NAIC numbers, there will be differences. He would like a way to record detailed exceptions to account for differences. Mr. Nurse pointed out that this could potentially be very problematic. Mr. Hoffman agreed.
 - h. Mr. Antley: goal - seeking formula that asks does reconciliation + adjustments = NAIC?
 - i. Mr. Hoffman expressed discomfort with this idea/plan. Uncertain about this strategy.
 - j. Mr. Harris: better to get certification from a traveler that reconciliation has occurred.
 - k. Mr. Antley: if in the HDS we had raw records as one table, and then an adjustment table, we could sum records and adjustments and make sure it equals NAIC #s.
 - l. Mr. Harris: doesn't believe we can automate this. Doesn't believe it's necessary if within specified tolerance limits. Several others agreed
 - m. Mr. Madison: asked how costly/time consuming non-idl reconciliation is on its own. Is it even worth going too far down this path?
 - n. Mr. Antley: it is labor intensive and time consuming, yes.
 - o. Ms. Chudwick: this is done on an individual company basis. Not done in aggregation.
 - p. Mr. Madison: with all of security measures, does it make sense to put this material in the Harmonized Data Store? Would people be comfortable putting that level of table out there.
 - q. Mr. Harris: but we won't know if it's been accepted by AAIS. Those are 1:1 conversations that need to happen with AAIS.
4. Mr. Madison asked what requirements this would entail on an architectural level - does table just stay in HDS forever or is it put back again and again?
 5. Mr. Antley - presented two options moving forward
 - a. We continue down the road we're on re: 1:1 carrier conversations with AAIS, human interaction
 - b. Tables put in Harmonized Data Store and we develop automated algorithms to do reconciliations, between stat data and NAIC data
 6. Ms. Chudwick: doesn't believe it will take that much time.
 7. Mr. Madison proposed that we put reconciliation on hold for now and reserve it for 'Day 2,' when rest of system is established.
 8. Clarification: data load level of granularity.

C. Recap

1. Reconciliation will be done as it is now, with 1:1 interpersonal relationship with AAIS and crude checksums
2. Will not be automated for the time being.

D. Looking ahead - Mr. Antley mentioned that the 9/30 meeting and 10/7 may be suspended but the 9/23 meeting will likely occur.

Goals

Meeting Minutes

Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	Notes

Notes

Action items

