U.S. Solvent Scheme Designers Share AIRROC Run-off Award

By Nigel Montgomery, Sidley Austin

At the gala dinner on October 17, 2011, Sidley Austin LLP was proud to present the AIRROC Run-off Person of the Year Award to Andrew Rothseid of RunOff Re.Solve LLC and Gary Lee of Morrison Foerster LLP. Both gentlemen received the coveted designation for their diligent work on the first-ever Rhode Island Commutation Plan for GTE Reinsurance Company Limited. This was particularly appropriate given Sidley Austin’s practice in Schemes of Arrangement in the UK, and the fact that Nigel Montgomery, who represented Sidley in the Award presentation, had worked with those advising the Rhode Island Insurance Department in the creation of the Commutation Plan legislation.

Mr. Rothseid congratulated and thanked his co-recipient, Mr. Lee, and Mr. Lee’s client Deputy Director and Superintendent of Insurance...
R&Q, the specialist non-life insurance investor, service provider and underwriting manager

For all your strategic moves...

For further information or to discuss any of our services contact either:

Alan Quilter  Telephone  +44 (0) 20 7481 1010  email  alan.quilter@rqih.com
Mike Palmer  Telephone  +44 (0) 20 7780 5893  email  mike.palmer@rqih.com


**Message from Publications Committee Co-Chair**

### AIRROC Matters in Transition

This has been a year of change for AIRROC with our new Chairman of the Board of Directors, Art Coleman, and his Vice Chairs, Kathy Barker and Marianne Petillo, who have helped lead AIRROC from the beginning and are now embracing new ways of conducting the business of AIRROC and moving us into the future. The hiring of CINN to assist with administrative functions and allow Trish Getty the ability to focus all of her efforts on membership retention and development is just one example of the changes being made to improve the organization for all of our members. Over the past year, AIRROC Matters also found a new approach through technology by sending an e-blast to convey recent news and announce the coming of a Special Edition. And, most recently at our annual Commutation Event, everyone in attendance experienced different types of Educational Sessions with the use of immediate response feedback technology.

As newly elected members of the Board and as Publications Committee Chairs, we are proud to be associated with the great product and service that AIRROC Matters provides.

We are only able to enjoy these positive changes due to the consistency of dedicated leadership, committed membership and a strong sense of volunteerism, which positions us well for continued growth and upgrading and updating of AIRROC and its services. As newly elected members of the Board and as Publications Committee Chairs, we are proud to be associated with the great product and service that AIRROC Matters provides. In review, the Publications Committee, led by its Editor-in-Chief Peter Scarpato, delivered four wonderful editions, yet again, in 2011. The polished Rendez-vous Edition was produced by Editor Jim Veach at the helm last January, followed by a strong Spring Edition encompassing all of the sections we have come to know and rely upon. Next was a high point of the very well received Special Edition on Insolvencies by prolific Special Editors, Mark Megaw and Connie O’Mara, which was professionally succeeded by the Fall Edition, with the roundtable interview on Managing Legacy Business feature. We would like to sincerely thank all of our contributors, editors, and volunteer Publications Committee members, who made 2011 another great year for AIRROC Matters.

Looking forward to next year and beyond, the committee will be entertaining new design and delivery options, which should produce some interesting results. Summarized below, the responses to our AIRROC Matters Survey during our annual Commutation Event revealed true appreciation for AIRROC Matters and some desire to have it delivered via various mediums.
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Joe Torti III and the staff of the Rhode Island Insurance Department, for their support and work on the plan. He also acknowledged that novel solutions such as this cannot be accomplished without the help of many contributors, including Mr. Rothseid’s client and GTE RE’s ultimate parent, Verizon Communications, Marsh Bermuda, GTE RE’s run off manager, actuarial consultants and outside counsel.

Mr. Rothseid serves as the Commutation Plan Advisor for GTE RE, the first solvent US property and casualty insurer or reinsurer to implement an accelerated closure plan under the Rhode Island statute entitled “Voluntary Restructuring of Solvent Insurers.” He designed, drafted and implemented the GTE RE Commutation Plan and negotiated the terms with the Rhode Island Insurance Department and GTE RE’s cedents.

Mr. Lee is co-chair of Morrison Foerster’s Bankruptcy & Restructuring Practice Group. He advises clients on domestic and international restructuring and insolvency matters in the U.S., UK, and continental Europe. Mr. Lee has been heavily involved in the implementation of foreign liquidations and schemes of arrangement in the U.S. and has been closely involved with issues arising under Chapter 15 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code.

The Rhode Island statute contains a procedure by which commercial insurers and reinsurers in run-off, or no longer writing new business, may honor creditors’ claims, liquidate future exposure to those claims, and terminate operations. Although enacted in 2002, and effective in 2004, the statute had never been applied prior to the GTE Plan. The Department of Business Regulation had responsibility for reviewing and commenting on the proposed Commutation Plan so that it could be presented to the Superior Court.

In April, 2011 the Providence County Superior Court decided that the Rhode Island Statute permitting Commutation Plans was constitutional under both the United States and Rhode Island Constitutions and gave the Plan the go-ahead. As noted at the time by Superintendent Torti: “the Court recognized that the exhaustive review and analysis of the Plan by the DBR provides important safeguards to protect the interests of all policyholders. We are pleased that the Court sustained the constitutionality of this innovative law and are committed to exercising a meaningful role in overseeing this and future commutations.”

For an excellent overview of the GTE RE commutation
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Welcome and Opening Remarks

Conference Chairs
Jonathan Bank, Locke Lord LLP
Kathy Barker, Excalibur Re/Armour Risk Mgmt

Education Session Summary

Part VII Transfer – The Practical Guide

Summary by Peter A. Scarpato, Conflict Resolved, LLC

The opening educational session at this year’s Commutation Event was “Practicalities of Part VII Transfers,” presented by a distinguished panel of Steven Goodlud, Nigel Montgomery, Tom Taylor, Stuart Shepley, Kenneth Wylie and Jim Moran.

After noting the usual skepticism over the word “Scheme” and defining a Part VII transfer as the process governing the transfer of insurance business from one company to another, Steve Goodlud asked the audience to express via electronic vote their views of the Part VII process. The results included a surprising 48% “generally supportive” and 24% “skeptical of the motives” of the process.

According to Nigel Montgomery and Stuart Shepley, the advent of Solvency II fueled the recent spike in the number of court applications for Part VII transfer approvals.

According to Nigel Montgomery and Stuart Shepley, the advent of Solvency II fueled the recent spike in the number of court applications for Part VII transfer approvals. The regulations forced large European insurance groups to identify and consolidate pockets of trapped capital in inefficiently managed run-off business, thinly spread across their various sectors and subsidiaries. As an example, Tom Taylor noted his company’s March 2011 completion of a large scheme involving the consolidation of three books of business and four companies, including one formed in 1790. According to Steve Goodlud, there have been 100 Part VII transfers of non-life business from well-known companies (ACE, AIG, Allianz, Berkshire Hathaway,
CNA, Hannover, R&Q, Swiss Re, Travelers, Zurich) – 50% involving run-off – since they were introduced in 2001. Notably, there were no regulatory failures of any of the involved entities post-transfer.

Discussion shifted to the responsibilities and roles of the independent expert (“IE”) in the Part VII procedure. Stuart Shepley explained that the IE must be “robustly independent with a good CV in the business.” The IE must be familiar with the relevant business mix; not “an actuary’s actuary,” but someone who can assess the business model and claims settlement philosophies of both the transferor and transferee. The IE must ensure that their report analyzes whether all impacted policyholders will be properly notified, and the commercial impact of the transferee’s plans on three groups of policyholders: (1) those left behind in the transferor (2) those moving to the transferee and (3) those already in the transferee. As Stuart Shepley described, the IE report is “the most important way to communicate to everyone what the Part VII transfer will do.”

The IE must carefully exercise its substantial discretion. For example, it need only share “relevant” data with the FSA, but can have private meetings with regulators to address questions not discussed with the companies. It can rely on data and materials provided by the companies but is obliged to “check the data” for accuracy. It is, by definition, “independent,” but can be paid by only one of the companies. Picking up on this point, Kenneth Wylie noted the differences between the roles of the neutral Part VII IE and partisan US expert witness. Nigel Montgomery characterized the IE as “someone without a client,” who must be fair, transparent and subject to challenge if necessary. According to Stuart Shepley, since the IE is an officer of the court, any objections are taken very seriously by the presiding judge.

Jim Moran noted that the presiding judge must see that companies have made every possible effort to effectuate notice, especially for transfers involving US policyholders where state-by-state notice regulations may differ.

The panel next addressed the requisite scope of notification to policyholders and reinsurers. Steve Goodlud re-emphasized the critical importance of this requirement, noting that all three categories of policyholders and every reinsurer must be notified in writing, individually. Other than in a very few, unique situations (i.e., waived for the millions of policyholders in the Equitas books of business),
When Experience Counts
The theme of this highly distinguished panel of insurance regulators, elicited by questions from Norris Clark, was that the regulatory world has evolved due to changing attitudes, tools, and expertise and the regulatory climate is more favorable for run-off as opposed to more traditional receiverships and liquidations.

What are the regulatory considerations in allowing a voluntary run-off? Mr. Johnson voiced what appeared to be a consensus among panel members that tools created since 1989 by the NAIC for solvency monitoring have spawned a new mindset among regulators. Now that they have the tools to detect problems earlier and to monitor a company’s financial condition, they are more likely to allow run-off. They now have more sophisticated stress-testing capabilities that provide for more effective solvency monitoring. They understand that run-off businesses need to be managed differently from ongoing concerns and they want to see managers that develop and manage a business plan specifically focused on run-off. They put regulatory resources to work to oversee the implementation of run-off plans and to monitor the effectiveness of a company’s ability to achieve those run-off business plan objectives. This process is further advanced by a previously unseen level of regulatory cooperation facilitated through the NAIC.

Mr. Clark’s question about a state statutory basis for allowing run-off drew a response from the panel that surprised many audience members. The panel did not appear to favor some type of “Model Act” as a regulatory basis for run-offs. Their opinion was that such an act might “box-in” regulators just when flexibility was needed to deal with each situation.

Absent a state regulatory mandate, how did members of the panel deal with the risk that guarantee funds could assert they had made a “lousy decision” if the
run-off ultimately fails and the company needs to be formally liquidated? Panel members discussed the need to communicate effectively with guarantee funds from the outset, to elucidate their logic in allowing the run-off (not to ask for approval, because statutes are clear that it is the state insurance commissioner that has responsibility for the decision or to make the decision to ask a court to make that decision). They need to discuss the “what ifs” and work with guarantee funds to provide needed information as the run-off progresses so they are ready and “teed up” in position to better protect and service policyholders if a liquidation eventually becomes necessary.

Would there be a benefit to having at least some statutory accounting practices that deal specifically with run-off situations? The consensus was that tailored accounting practices should be fact specific and allow regulators to see appropriate options for each company to facilitate a successful run-off.

With regard to the recent GTE Voluntary Restructuring in Rhode Island, the panel was asked whether they felt the mechanism would encourage companies to re-domesticate to Rhode Island to do a “solvent scheme of arrangement.” Members of the panel discussed how it made sense to accelerate the settlement of all claims to save administrative costs. While the process will only work on a company with a well-developed book of business and stable reserves (and no material IBNR), panel members seem to think now that one company has done it, others may utilize this route. Whether other states are likely to enact such legislation depends on the political climate.

In response to Mr. Clark’s question on how they evaluate the management team for a run-off, whether that of an acquiring company or a third party administrator, the panel said they don’t want “toll-takers” (staff paid a set fee to handle the business) but rather prefer management to have “skin in the game” and be vested in reducing expenses, making money on investments, etc. Whether a company is looking to buy a company to reactivate a line of business that was in run-off, or to consolidate run-off portfolios, the regulators want to see the plan for making a profit and be comfortable that the run-off management has the experience to make the plan work.

How do you evaluate the quality of the data in a run-off? The panel agreed that when a buyer is doing diligence, they tell them about the data issues previously discovered by their respective departments. The panel felt expertise in seeing the skeletons in the closet and knowing how to deal with them was all part of the criteria in evaluating a potential management team to run-off a business.

In sum, the panel evinced a willingness to take risks and exercise regulatory “creativity” as long as they could protect policyholders.
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This year’s luncheon speaker, the head of the New York Liquidation Bureau, came to the Bureau from a successful political career. From 2002 until just after the New York State Legislature adjourned this past June and Governor Andrew Cuomo appointed him Special Deputy Superintendent in charge of the Bureau, Jonathan Bing served as the Assemblyperson for Manhattan’s 73rd Assembly District. The 73rd District covers the Upper East Side and East Midtown Manhattan in New York City. (Think Museum Mile, Sutton Place, Grand Central Station, and Turtle Bay.)

**Mr. Bing’s Background**

Mr. Bing, a graduate of New York University School of Law, resigned from the Assembly in the middle of his fifth term in order to spend more time with his wife, four year-old daughter and new baby who is expected in December 2011. While in the Assembly, Mr. Bing wrote more than 85 pieces of legislation which passed the Assembly, 35 of which also passed the Senate and were signed into law by four New York Governors.

Insurance-related laws authored or sponsored by our speaker included statutes that lightened the regulatory load for insurers doing business in New York. For example, Mr. Bing authored the law that reduced the required number of directors for property/casualty insurers from thirteen to seven. Another law allowed insurers to amend and correct certain policy forms without the Superintendent's approval. Mr. Bing also authored the law that extended statutes of limitation for workers’ compensation claims filed by responders exposed to smoke and other hazards during the 9/11 World Trade Center clean-up efforts.

**The Bureau**

With respect to his new position, Mr. Bing pointed out that the Bureau is unique in that it “runs off its own power,” i.e., without direct taxpayer funding, although with the support of guaranty funds and using the assets of New York State-domiciled insurance entities in receivership and under the Bureau’s supervision.

The Bureau differs from insurance receivers in other states in that the Bureau handles both claims handling and payment functions as well as the receivership functions for the estates under its supervision.

Mr. Bing pointed out that the Bureau is unique in other respects. For example, the Bureau is not considered a New York State agency. As a result, the New York State Comptroller cannot audit the Bureau. Nor is the Bureau subject to New York State’s Freedom of Information Laws.

The Bureau operates pursuant to NYIL Article 74 as the entity that carries out the responsibilities of the Superintendent of Financial Services in his capacity as Receiver, and subject to the oversight of various New York State Supreme Court Justices. As Mr. Bing put it in describing the Bureau’s status: “We know what we are not, it’s hard to figure out what we are, but at least we know what we are not.”

The Bureau differs from insurance receivers in other states in that the Bureau handles both claims handling and payment functions as well as the receivership

---

continued on next page
functions for the estates under its supervision. Also, unlike other states’ insurance receivers, New York requires direct court approval for claims that the Bureau allows.

Mr. Bing’s Bureau is also quite large. The Bureau employs 260 persons and oversees $3 billion in receivership assets. In fact, the Bureau employs more persons than many state insurance departments, though its staff has been reduced by half since its peak.

Accomplishments

Mr. Bing addressed the work underway at the reinsurance unit headed up by Robert Sherwood and reported on some of the Bureau’s recent accomplishments.

Record Keeping. The Bureau, during the intake of an estate, identifies and secures the required data to continue the day to day operations of the liquidated estate at the Bureau site while inventorying all other documentation to be sent offsite.

Reinsurance Recovery. For the better part of the last four years, the reinsurance division has focused on collecting reinsurance on estates other than Midland. In that period of time $100 million has been collected, with more than 30% of that balance being reinsurance recoveries on estates other than Midland. The previous two years showed reinsurance recoveries of a little over 5% of the total collected relating to estates other than Midland.

Increased payments. Crediting his predecessors, Mr. Bing reported that $110 million had been distributed to claimants and policyholders thus far in 2011. Mr. Bing also noted a reduction in the amount of money held on deposit in other states.

New Lease and Technology. Thanks to a new fifteen year lease, the Bureau recently moved from 123 to 110 William Street and to nicer quarters, although at a reduced cost per square foot. The Bureau took advantage of the move to upgrade its technology, e.g., adding a web-based payroll and increasing network storage capacity. The Bureau also recently reduced its staff by 15% thus saving $4 million in payroll.

Goals

Mr. Bing announced that his goals included increasing and expanding “external relationships” with organizations such as AIRROC and the National Organization of Life and Health Guaranty Associations (NOLHGA). “I know from my years as a fundraiser that it’s easier to ask for help from people when you have met them before.”

Mr. Bing announced that his goals included increasing and expanding “external relationships” with organizations such as AIRROC and the National Organization of Life and Health Guaranty Associations (NOLHGA).

Mr. Bing intends to continue commutations with all estates where those commutations will benefit the estates. “Discounted cash in hand is worth more than an open receivable.” To that end, the Bureau intends to identify open balances of a particular reinsurer across all estates, using its new Accounts Receivable Module, thereby increasing its effectiveness in settling balances with those reinsurers. Mr. Bing also wants to increase expertise on the Bureau’s reinsurance collections panel, particularly with respect to certain parts of Europe, Asia, and Latin America.

Our speaker concluded with his take on the new Department of Financial Services, which he believes will allow New York to remain the financial capital of the world. Mr. Bing arrived just as New York merged the State’s Departments of Banking and Insurance to create a new

continued on page 30
Rendez-vous 2011 Gala Dinner
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With over 100 dedicated insurance lawyers, Mayer Brown is at the forefront of legal solutions for the run-off market. We advise clients on how to enter the run-off market, buy and sell portfolios and entities, manage discontinued operations, and achieve exit strategies. When needed, we represent clients in dispute resolution. www.mayerbrown.com/insurance
Women’s Networking Luncheon
AIRROC Welcomes Keynote Speaker Karen Weldin-Stewart

Summary by Jeanne Kohler, Edwards Wildman Palmer LLC

The Women’s Networking Luncheon was held on Tuesday of the October 2011 Commutations and Network Event and, as with the lunches of other years, men were also welcome to attend, and did in fact attend the lunch, which was sponsored by Edwards Wildman Palmer LLP. The luncheon drew a crowd of over 80 men and women.

After a delicious lunch, Trish Getty, AIRROC’s Founding CEO and Executive Director, and currently AIRROC’s Executive Membership Director, welcomed the keynote speaker, Karen Weldin-Stewart, the Insurance Commissioner of the State of Delaware Insurance Department.

A native of Delaware, Commissioner Stewart was elected to a four-year term as Delaware Insurance Commissioner in 2008. By way of background, after a 22-year career as a retail executive and entrepreneur, Commissioner Stewart first came to work for the Delaware Insurance Department as a Deputy Receiver in 1989, and served in this capacity until 1993. Following her departure from the Delaware Insurance Department in 1993, Commissioner Stewart opened the Weldin Group, Inc., an insurance and reinsurance consulting company. In 1997, she then joined Reinsurance Solutions International, a subsidiary of Marsh McLennan, as Vice President on regulatory matters.

In her address, Commissioner Stewart looked back on her first two years in office and on her successes to date as Delaware Insurance Commissioner. She explained how she is trying to build the insurance business in Delaware due to what she considers to be certain positive aspects of the state: its location, its laws, its government, its corporate tax and its captive statute. According to Commissioner Stewart, the fastest growing business in Delaware is insurance. In fact, after only two years, Delaware is the eighteenth largest captive domicile in the world.

Commissioner Stewart commented for the attendees on what it is like to be in an elected position, particularly as a female, and the challenges she faced when she was elected. She noted, however, that despite its challenges, she loves what she does, and always remembers the people and the consumers she has helped.

After Commissioner Stewart’s address, the attendees had the opportunity to ask the Commissioner questions regarding her views and what she foresees in the future for the state of Delaware. In looking toward future goals, in addition to having more captives in Delaware, one of the things that Commissioner Stewart mentioned she would like to see in Delaware is a reinsurance exchange. According to Commissioner Stewart, she believes that

continued on next page
the Delaware government’s flexibility and pro-business attitude would make Delaware a good jurisdiction for such an exchange. The discussion was enlightening for all who attended as to Commissioner Stewart’s challenges and successes in her position, as well as what future goals she has for the state of Delaware.
For 35 years, the attorneys in Barger & Wolen’s Reinsurance Practice have served clients from our offices in:

- New York
- London
- San Francisco
- Los Angeles
- Newport Beach
The afternoon educational sessions opened with the Industry Leader Forum, during which senior executives from five major organizations discussed the challenges of managing the assets and liabilities of discontinued operations. Moderated by Lloyd Gura (Mound Cotton Wollan & Greengrass LLP), the panel of speakers included Pat Fee (President, Hannover Finance Inc.), Norbert Lommer (Global Head of Finance, Global Discontinued Business Division, Allianz Life Insurance Company), Scott Belden (M.D. Risk & Reinsurance, Travelers Insurance Company), Mindy Kipness (SVP, Chartis Global Reinsurance Division) and Steve Agosta (SVP & General Counsel, XL Reinsurance America Inc.).

The panelists began by debating whether a live operation that includes run-off business is best served by separating those runoff liabilities into a different legal entity. Pat Fee identified various advantages that flow from concentrating run-off in a separate entity, including encouraging a singular focus by employees, limiting conflicting goals within the organization, and avoiding competition for the attention of the claim manager or the actuary. The approach also permits run-off personnel to conclude “reasonable deals at reasonable speed,” Fee explained, and eases a later sale of the business. Fee acknowledged some potential disadvantages to the approach, such as the potential for capital inefficiency and heightened concerns over employee morale. To overcome the latter disadvantage, Fee stressed the importance of ensuring that employees understand that another job is available for them within the organization once run-off goals are achieved.

Norbert Lommer provided a different perspective, explaining that while the entities for which he is responsible include both run-off liabilities and ongoing business, employees share “one vision, one mission.” Emphasizing the importance of transparency where ongoing operations are involved, Lommer noted that his organization avoids potential governance issues that could arise from this business model by establishing appropriate authority limits within which the run-off group can operate independently.

Moderator Lloyd Gura pressed the speakers as to whether separation into different legal entities truly insulated run-off employees from business pressure by current clients of the ongoing operations. Pat Fee assured Gura that it did in his organization, as the separate fiduciary duties of the entities were respected and understood. Fee explained that the entities “all have corporate reputations that are critical,” and ignoring those corporate responsibilities is “just not part of the game plan.”

The speakers then addressed multiple issues associated with negotiating and concluding commutations of discontinued business. The divergent commutation goals and approaches of run-off and live organizations were considered and the senior executives provided insight into their organizations’ varying metrics for tracking run-off progress.

continued on next page
The panel also identified critical commutation risks. Referencing the Trenwick decision (Trenwick Am. Reinsurance Corp. v. W.R. Berkley Corp., No. UWYX01CV094019148S, 2011 WL 1565889 (Conn. Super. April 1, 2011)), Steve Agosta emphasized the potential uncertainty arising from commutation wordings, particularly the common practice of relying on the phrase “including but not limited to” rather than listing only those companies and contracts being commuted. Similarly, Mindy Kipness impressed upon the audience that “it’s critical to find out what is in your [organization’s] population as part of the negotiation process,” explaining that “a comprehensive view of what you’re actually commuting” is required to truly understand the exposure. Norbert Lommer added that his organization now has best practices in place to ensure that commutation of ongoing and run-off business is done cohesively.

The speakers also considered the question of how actuaries are, and should be, involved in the commutation process. Pat Fee extolled the benefits of a good actuary – “a good actuary is worth his or her weight in gold” – and encouraged companies to involve the actuary from the beginning of and throughout the commutation process. Fee also suggested that negotiations between the actuaries of commuting parties can be productive: “If you have them actually sit down and talk, if you get the two of them together, they will often come within a range of reason that the business people can then straddle if they want to.” Mindy Kipness reminded the audience that an executive’s best partner in commutation negotiations is the actuary who handles the reinsurance portfolio, and Norbert Lommer agreed, explaining that actuaries often develop expertise about claims from preparing ultimates and modeling APH claims.

Mindy Kipness reminded the audience that an executive’s best partner in commutation negotiations is the actuary who handles the reinsurance portfolio, and Norbert Lommer agreed, explaining that actuaries often develop expertise about claims from preparing ultimates and modeling APH claims.

Audience members were enthusiastic about the opportunity to pose questions to the industry leaders. In response to one audience question regarding the impact of litigation on run-off activities, Pat Fee acknowledged that “litigation is the tool ultimately,” and, while no company enjoys paying attorney fees, “the reality is there comes a time when you do have to fight and have to let the other side know you’re serious.” Steve Agosta concurred, agreeing that a company “sometimes needs to mobilize and arbitrate, and put people to the proof as to why they are not paying you.” Scott Belden cautioned that, once a dispute moves into litigation, companies “tend to throw it to the lawyers,” who can become “emotionally attached to cases.” Belden, who had aptly noted earlier in the session that reinsurance claims are “not like an electric bill where you send out the bill and the customer pays . . . there often will be disputes,” advised companies to manage their outside counsel closely.

Also in the audience was Conference Co-Chair Jonathan Bank (Locke Lord LLP), who asked the executives whether, in their experience, arbitration panels have perceptions about run-off companies that disadvantage a run-off company in arbitration. Pat Fee responded with “a qualified no,” noting that Hannover’s ownership of Clarendon was well-known and “orphan organizations” might fare differently. Steve Agosta suggested that run-off entities may even have an advantage, in that those entities tend to “play in that space more, and there are advantages to be had in terms of relationships with counsel and arbitrators.” The speakers’ commentary provided a timely bridge to further discussion of the arbitration process in the next education session, “The Great Debate – Your Vote Counts.”
Moderated by Mary Lopatto of Chadbourne & Parke, this panel included Eric Haab of Foley & Lardner, Joe McCullough of Freeborn & Peters, Francis Mackie of Edwards Wildman Palmer and Brian O’Sullivan of Mayer Brown. The panel held energetic discussions on five issues related to the integrity of the arbitration process and of the arbitrators. Weaving into the discussion cases of interest to the industry and those that have reached the courts, this panel brought to life factual scenarios that engrossed the audience. Each of two panelists took a viewpoint for or against a topic culminating in an audience vote. What follows is the percentage of YES and NO votes for each of the five issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Issues</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Governing Law and Honorable Engagement Clauses</strong></td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How far arbitrators have to follow the law in deciding a dispute if the reinsurance contract clearly states what law applies, and there is no Honorable Engagement Clause.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No matter what the reinsurance contract says about governing law or interpreting the contract as an Honorable Engagement, do arbitrators always have the right to base the award on their own sense of fairness and business judgment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Consolidation</strong></td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the absence of a provision in the reinsurance contract permitting or requiring consolidation, when if ever, should a party be required to arbitrate a dispute in a consolidated arbitration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As posited in the hypothetical, should the panel order the six reinsurers to proceed with a single consolidated arbitration proceeding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Insolvency</strong></td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How, and to what extent should reinsurers of an insolvent insurer be permitted to “interpose defenses” or otherwise to associate in a receiver’s claims adjustment process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this procedure (whereby reinsurers will receive notice of each impending decision with respect to policyholders’ claims) give effect to reinsurers’ rights to “interpose” defenses or otherwise to associate in the defense of the claim?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Attorney-Client Privilege</strong></td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether ceding companies may withhold claim, coverage, allocation and ceding analysis from reinsurers that would otherwise constitute the “business of insurance” by claiming attorney-client privilege?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the Cedent’s assertion of privilege be upheld?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Arbitrator Disclosures</strong></td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it acceptable for parties and/or law firms to have “go to” arbitrators, as long as the arbitrators disclose these appointments and state on the record that they will be unbiased in deciding the case on the merits – and even though it might appear to outsiders that that arbitrator was a “captive” arbitrator?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The panel tweaked or added facts to some of the hypotheticals suggesting nuances that are typically found in the world of arbitrations. These were put to vote as well with attention-grabbing results.
For the 2011 Event, the Board retained electronic voting services to gather real-time information. With input from all Committees, questions were drafted and designed to garner data relevant to key topics on AIRROC’s agenda. Results were both immediate and automatically subcategorized by topic and responder (e.g., members, lawyers, etc.). A final report of the results will appear in the March 2012 edition of AIRROC Matters.

Marianne Petillo (ROM Re); Mike Zeller (AIG)
Surveys don’t hurt!!!

Closing Remarks/Wrap Up
James Veach and Lawrence Greengrass
Partners, Mound Cotton Wollan & Greengrass LLP

Save the Date
AIRROC/R&Q Commutation Event
October 15, 2012

Zurich HelpPoint
Zurich’s Centrally Managed Businesses is proud to sponsor the 7th annual Association of Insurance & Reinsurance Run-Off Companies (AIRROC) Commutation and Networking Event.

Sidley Austin LLP
- Worldwide team serving the insurance and financial services industry
- Transactional and dispute resolution services
- M&A, alternative risk transfer, structured finance, contingent capital, reorganization and insolvency
- One of the world’s premier law firms, with approximately 1,700 lawyers and offices in North America, Europe, Asia and Australia
AIRROC/R&Q Golf Day “Could Not Have Had a Better Day for Golf”

By Ed Gibney, CNA

For the 3rd consecutive year, the AIRROC/R&Q Commutations and Networking Event got started with many attendees teeing it up at the Royce Brook Golf Club in Hillsborough, NJ, only about 12 miles or so from the East Brunswick Hilton, on Sunday, 16 October. The weather cooperated once again. For this year’s AIRROC/R&Q Golf Day it was a spectacular fall afternoon and the course was in excellent condition, a true test of golfing skill. The team of Paul Mooney, Alex Keville and Tim Stalker took the top prize with a very impressive score of 8-under 64.

See box for the complete list of prize winners.

Everyone enjoyed a barbecue lunch upon arrival at Royce Brook as well as a buffet dinner and open bar after golf.

Team Scramble

1st Place – 64 - Alex Keville, Paul Mooney, Tim Stalker
2nd Place – 69 – Ricardo Cantilo, Rick Grant, Betsy Mitchell, Ron Smillie
3rd Place – 70 – Roger Flores, Frank Pecht, Andy Ward, Jeff Winters
Closest to the Pin – Rick Grant, Jeff Winters
Longest Drive – Ed Gibney, Jack Ignatowitz

Many thanks to Citadel Risk for sponsoring this event.
Run-Off Powerhouse

Freeborn & Peters.
What can we do for you?

Battle-tested. Trial-ready. Full service law firm.

Freeborn & Peters LLP

Reinsurance Dispute Resolution
Insurance Coverage Litigation
Insurance Insolvency
Corporate Insurance
Complex Commercial Litigation
Real Estate
Employment
Bankruptcy
Antitrust

www.freebornpeters.com

For further information, please contact Joe McCullough at 312-360-6327 or jmccullough@freebornpeters.com

Highly Skilled.

Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell gives insurance companies the legal guidance and protection they need. Our reputation for providing innovative thinking in mergers and acquisitions, transactions, litigation and arbitration is the result of deep experience, and highly skilled people.

Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell
www.lockelord.com

Atlanta, Austin, Chicago, Dallas, Houston, London, Los Angeles, New Orleans, New York, Sacramento, San Francisco, Washington DC

Citadel Risk operates in the international non-life insurance and reinsurance market. It has three distinct divisions:

CAPITAL
Investment in non-life insurance and start-ups.

REINSURANCE
A (A.M. Best) A-rated reinsurance carrier (Bermuda).

SERVICES
Back-office resources and facilities based in the US and UK.

Since its beginnings in the late 1970s, Citadel Risk has remained fiercely independent. Supported by a strong balance sheet and consistent profitability, Citadel Risk has expanded significantly beyond its original Bermuda base. Combining innovation, stability and experience, Citadel Risk now provides the non-life insurance and reinsurance sector with an established and well-respected range of REINSURANCE, SERVICES and CAPITAL products.

Range of services:
-· Audit and inspection
- Broker replacement
- Broker “finality” transfer
- Back office administration
- Captive/RRC management
- Claims management
- Consulting
- Commutations
- Debt purchase
- Exit solutions
- LOC solutions
- Reinsurance management
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AIRROC® Rendez-vous 2011

AIRROC Publications Committee

**Continued from Page 5**

Left to right: James Veach (Mound Cotton Wollan & Greengrass), Bina Dagar (Ameya Consulting), Trish Getty (AIRROC), Editor-in-Chief Peter Scarpato (Conflict Resolved), Co-Chair Leah Spivey (Munich Re), Vivien Tyrell (Reynolds Porter Chamberlain), Connie O’Mara (O’Mara Consulting), Nicole Myers (Myers Creative)

Not pictured: Co-Chair Colm Holmes (Zurich), Jonathan Bank (Locke Lord), Nigel Curtis, Dale Diamond, Marc Abrams (Wollmuth Maher & Deutsch), Joe Monahan (Saul Ewing), Mark Peters (Edwards Wildman Palmer), Gina Pirozzi (G. Pirozzi Consulting), Fred Pomerantz (Wilson Elser), Fran Semaya, Maryann Taylor and Mike Walsh (Boundas Skarzynski Walsh & Black) and Larry Zelle (Zelle Hofmann)

**AIRROC Run-off Award**

Continued from Page 5

plan and petition, please see Mr. Rothseid’s article in AIRROC Matters. A. Rothseid, The Rhode Island Solution, AIRROC Matters, Fall 2011, Vol 7, No. 3 at 18-21. In his acceptance speech, Mr. Rothseid commented that despite initial trepidations over the US market’s appetite for a solvent scheme, the plan survived two creditors’ challenges and ultimately garnered “overwhelming support from this community” because “it was fair, transparent, the court supervised process was clear,” and “[the Plan] was a rationale response to close exposures that were over thirty years old.”

While recognizing that time will tell if the GTE RE Commutation Plan is the harbinger of a new wave of accelerated closures for US legacy exposures, Mr. Rothseid believes that the GTE Re plan is “certainly a start in a new and different direction” or as he stated: “a new arrow in our quiver to resolve run-off exposures . . . demonstrating that, when done correctly, everyone wins.”

Kudos to Andrew Rothseid and Gary Lee for this well-deserved recognition.

**AIRROC Matters in Transition**

Continued from Page 3

The results included the following items:

- Volunteers to write article on various topics, including arbitration disputes and contract interpretation issues;
- Suggestions for future Special Editions of AIRROC Matters covering run-off metrics and strategies for success, the economy’s impact on run off, “winners and losers” as determined by changes in liquidity and surplus, and an entire edition of “point/counterpoint” articles; and
- Communication with membership via LinkedIn and a blog.

If you did not get a chance to respond to the survey during the October event, please do not hesitate to communicate your ideas and any interest you may have in becoming part of the Publications Committee or authoring articles to any Board Member or Publications Committee Member.

The best is yet to come, please remember that AIRROC Matters and so do you!

**Practicalities of Part VII Transfers**

Continued from Page 9

the FSA wants every individual policyholder to be notified. Jim Moran noted that the presiding judge must see that companies have made every possible effort to effectuate notice, especially for transfers involving US policyholders where state-by-state notice regulations may differ.

Court-approved Part VII transfers have held up well. Nigel Montgomery was unaware of any court cases challenging them post-approval. In Jim Moran’s experience, many issues are resolved before the litigation stage with the objector’s business occasionally carved out via compensated settlements, after which the IE report is adjusted to reflect the change.

The balance of the presentation included discussions on the impacts (including to offsets) of moving the reinsurance asset for the reinsurer, newly reinsured company, and formerly reinsured company, and the 12 to 18 month time period and enormous cost to implement Part VII transfers, culminating with an audience vote on the question whether an equivalent to Part VII transfers will appear in the US. Response: 61% no; 39% yes.
As I write this at the end of October, I have interviewed 68 AIRROC member participants to gain insight into the values they find as an AIRROC member, their desires for education topics, their experiences using the Dispute Resolution Procedure (DRP), and much more. We will present an article in the upcoming first edition of 2012 to report the input from our members.

Speaking of the DRP, while several companies have used the process and are quite happy with it, many need to fully understand the DRP and/or be comfortable with its usage. We are therefore planning to present a mock DRP process in several cities. Watch for the locations!

There is a lot going on behind the scenes as we shake, shiver and rock-n-roll to make this association continue to flourish and provide you with meaningful education and services.

Once again, our hat is off to members of this fantastic Publications Committee who continue to deliver one excellent newsletter after another. Our special thank you to our Editor-In-Chief Peter Scarpato.

Happy New Year!  ■

Message from Executive Membership Director
Continued from Page 1

Special Deputy Bing
Continued from Page 15

Department of Financial Services under the leadership of a new Superintendent of Financial Services, Benjamin Lawsky. Mr. Bing reported that the new Department has divisions that will focus on financial fraud, consumer protection, real estate finance, and capital markets. Former Superintendent of Insurance James Wrynn will remain as the Deputy Superintendent of Financial Services.

Post Script

Mr. Bing attended the AIRROC/R&Q Opening Dinner on Monday night and remained with Mr. Sherwood the following day to experience AIRROC’s commutation meetings or, as he put it, “speed dating for reinsurers.” We expect to see him return to address us at future AIRROC educational events and to report on how he is faring in his new position and with respect to the goals he announced in his remarks.  ■
The right people in the right places

KPMG member firms offer a broad range of insurance restructuring services to clients around the globe.

Our Insurance Solutions teams in KPMG member firms have been providing insurance and reinsurance clients with guidance for over 20 years. We have a deep understanding of the challenges involved in dealing with discontinued business and our professionals work together to provide tailored solutions. Simply, we believe we have the right people in the right places.

Our regional insurance restructuring contacts

UK
Mike Walker  
T: +44 207 694 3198  
E: mike.s.walker@kpmg.co.uk

John Wardrop  
+44 207 694 3359  
E: john.wardrop@kpmg.co.uk

USA
Leslie Fenton  
T: +1 312 665 2754  
E: l.fenton@kpmg.com

Bermuda  
Mike Morrison  
T: +1 441 294 2626  
E: mikemorrison@kpmg.bm

Canada  
Elizabeth Murphy  
T: +1 416 777 8279  
E: elizabethmurphy@kpmg.ca

Germany  
Simon Thompson  
T: +49 89 9282 1346  
E: simonathompson@kpmg.com

France  
Noel Bugnet  
T: +33 1 78 66 04 33  
E: n.bugnet@kpmg.fr

kpmg.com
ESPECIALLY DESIGNED FOR SMALLER-SIZED AND LESS-COMPLICATED DISPUTES

PROCESS

• Single arbitrator
• Over 60 AIRROC approved arbitrators; Rate = $150/hour
• Arbitrator selection administered by AIRROC, if desired
• No discovery or live witness testimony (unless parties agree otherwise)
• Parties must agree to key terms and conditions of DRP

BENEFITS

• Fast
• Cost effective
• A return to professional dispute resolution

For more information, visit AIRROC’s website @ www.airroc.org