

Draft: 4/1/26

Producer Licensing (D) Task Force
March 23, 2026

The Producer Licensing (D) Task Force met March 23, 2026. The following Task Force members participated: Vicki Schmidt, Chair, represented by Monicka Richmeier (KS); Scott A. White, Vice Chair, represented by Richard Tozer (VA); Heather Carpenter represented by Kayla Erickson (AK); Charles Bassett represented by Lori Dreaver Munn (AZ); Ricardo Lara represented by Charlene Ferguson (CA); Michael Conway represented by Rolf Kaumann and JT Thompson (CO); Trinidad Navarro represented by Susan Jennette (DE); Dean L. Cameron (ID); Ann Gillespie represented by Sara Stanberry (IL); Sharon P. Clark represented by Shawn Boggs (KY); Timothy J. Temple represented by Matthew Stewart (LA); Marie Grant represented by Mary Kwei (MD); Robert L. Carey represented by Timothy N. Schott (ME); Angela L. Nelson represented by Marjorie Thompson (MO); Mike Chaney represented by Vanessa C. Miller (MS); Jon Godfread represented by Susan Daou (ND); Eric Dunning, Kevin Schlautman, Martin Swanson, and Connie Van Slyke (NE); Alice T. Kane represented by Vanessa DeJesus (NM); Judith L. French represented by Chrstina Reeg (OH); Glen Mulready represented by Erin Wainner and Courtney Khodabakhsh (OK); Elizabeth Kelleher Dwyer represented by Rachel Chester and Mariel Garcia (RI); Larry D. Deiter (SD); Amanda Crawford represented by Jodie Delgado and Matthew Tarpley (TX); Patty Kuderer represented by Andrew Davis (WA); Nathan Houdek represented by Jamie Adams (WI); and Allan L. McVey represented Robert Grishaber (WV).

1. Adopted its Feb. 25 Minutes

The Task Force met Feb. 25. During this meeting, it took the following action: 1) adopted its 2025 Fall National Meeting minutes (*see NAIC Proceedings – Fall 2025, Producer Licensing (D) Task Force*); 2) discussed its 2026 priorities; 3) discussed NAIC website updates and enhancements; and 3) discussed its meeting schedule.

Stewart made a motion, seconded by Miller, to adopt the Task Force’s Feb. 25 minutes (Attachment One). The motion passed unanimously.

2. Received an Overview of its 2026 Priorities

Richmeier provided an overview of the Task Force’s priorities for 2026: 1) continued review and potential updates to the 18 U.S.C. §1033 written consent processes; 2) completion of the comprehensive review of the *State Licensing Handbook*; 3) administration of the annual survey assessing state licensing uniformity and reciprocity; 4) evaluation of the security and oversight of remote producer licensing examinations; 5) review and potential revisions to the continuing education (CE) course guidelines; 6) review of adjuster licensing guidelines, including Designated Home State (DHS) issues; and 7) advancement of uniformity for appointment terminations for cause and state-to-state transfers.

3. Heard a Report from NIPR on its Initiatives

Director Deiter said the National Insurance Producer Registry (NIPR) Board of Directors met March 22. He said NIPR experienced a strong operational and fiscal year in 2025, including record revenues of more than \$100.8 million and processing of more than \$1.38 billion in state fees. Director Deiter said NIPR received and approved a clean audit report as presented by the NIPR’s independent auditor.

Eric Saul (NIPR) provided updates on the following NIPR initiatives:

- Uniform Licensing Application: The implementation of adopted amendments to the NAIC Uniform Licensing Applications is scheduled for April 10. NIPR has conducted extensive coordination with states and industry

Draft Pending Adoption

stakeholders to ensure a synchronized rollout, including multiple communications, technical guidance documents, and preparatory webinars.

- **Producer Licensing Zone Trainings:** The in-person Northeast Zone training is scheduled for May 19–21 in Boston, MA, and the Southeast Zone training is scheduled for June 16–18 in Louisville, KY. NIPR will fund attendance for up to two regulators per state.
- **State Support Initiatives:** NIPR continues to support state insurance regulators through expanded licensing capabilities and assistance. This includes supporting states by implementing new license classes, including pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs), appointment renewals, and preneed and adjuster licensing.
- **Product Enhancements:** NIPR plans to launch a redesigned “License Hub” platform during the summer, which will align licensing, reporting, and website platforms under a unified interface. NIPR plans a redesign of the Attachments Warehouse with opportunities for state input.
- **Strategic Planning:** NIPR is developing its next three-year strategic plan and emphasized continued engagement with regulators and the Producer Licensing (D) Task Force during that process.

4. Heard a Presentation from SILA on Appointment Terminations for Cause

Sherri Coleman (SILA) provided an overview of the organization and its membership, which includes state insurance regulators, insurance carriers, industry associations, and technology solution providers. Coleman said SILA members raised concerns regarding appointment terminations for cause, prompting the formation of a dedicated task group in 2025. Coleman said the task group developed a comprehensive state-by-state chart illustrating the lack of uniformity in termination-for-cause requirements, processes, and timelines.

Kelly Darmetko (John Hancock Life Insurance) presented a draft standardized termination-for-cause notification form. She said the proposed form is intended to: 1) provide consistent, upfront notification to all states in which an individual is licensed or appointed; 2) improve transparency regarding alleged misconduct, investigations, and potential consumer harm; 3) reduce administrative burdens for carriers and regulators; and 4) enable more timely regulatory review and response. Darmetko described current challenges faced by carriers, including inconsistent state requirements, multiple submission methods, limited data standardization, and inefficiencies that can delay regulatory awareness. She said the proposed form would allow state insurance regulators to quickly assess whether additional follow-up or investigation is warranted.

Ferguson raised questions regarding confidentiality and the handling of sensitive information contained in termination notifications. Coleman and Darmetko responded by explaining that future objectives of SILA include the development of a secure, limited-access submission platform. Tozer recognized challenges associated with receiving termination notifications through multiple channels and difficulties identifying appropriate carrier contacts. Swanson emphasized the value of receiving timely information related to consumer harm caused by appointed producers to support prompt investigative decision-making.

Richmeier said the advancement of uniformity for appointment terminations for cause would remain a priority for the Task Force.

5. Discussed the 18 U.S.C. §1033 Written Consent Template – Definition of Conviction

Tozer introduced the agenda item addressing the definition of “conviction” within the 18 U.S.C. §1033 written consent template. Lisa Brown (American Property Casualty Insurance Association—APCIA) said the APCIA is concerned that the current draft of the template could create compliance challenges due to differing state definitions of conviction, particularly with respect to sealed or expunged records. Brown requested additional NAIC guidance to clarify how multistate licensing determinations should address these legal differences.

Draft Pending Adoption

Tozer described recent legislative changes in Virginia that prohibit state insurance regulators from accessing or considering sealed records and recognized that this might have nonresident licensing implications in other states. Ferguson said California's long-standing interpretation of 18 U.S.C. §1033, requires the disclosure of nolo contendere pleas, no-contest pleas, sealed, expunged, or dismissed convictions. Ferguson emphasized the importance of full disclosure to allow each state to apply its own legal standards.

Brown said there continues to be concerns regarding conflicting legal obligations when resident states, such as Virginia, prohibit the collection of sealed-record information. Tozer said the Task Force may need to survey states regarding their treatment of sealed and expunged records in licensing decisions. Tozer concluded the discussion by noting that additional analysis and potential template revisions would be required.

6. Adopted the Reports of its Working Groups

A. Adjuster Licensing (D) Working Group

Chester said the Working Group is continuing its review of DHS qualifications for adjuster licensing, with particular attention to inconsistencies among state requirements and the impact those differences may have on non-resident licensure. Chester noted that the Working Group is discussing opportunities to improve data accuracy, consistency, and usability of adjuster licensing data in the NIPR Producer Database (PDB). Chester said the Working Group has identified more than 200 state-specific, non-uniform application questions that warrant further review.

B. Producer Licensing Uniformity (D) Working Group

Schlautman said the Working Group is continuing its chapter-by-chapter review of the *State Licensing Handbook* (Handbook), focusing on identifying areas where state practices diverge from NAIC-adopted uniform standards. Schlautman said the Working Group has compiled and organized Uniform Licensing Standards (ULS) across multiple Handbook chapters and has begun assessing state compliance with those standards. This analysis is intended to provide greater transparency regarding areas of uniformity, as well as persistent gaps. Schlautman said the Working Group plans to complete its review of the remaining Handbook chapters and state compliance with the ULS this year.

C. Uniform Education (D) Working Group

Delgado said the Working Group is reviewing continuing education (CE) reciprocity provisions and identifying areas where additional clarity or consistency may be beneficial for both state insurance regulators and licensees. Delgado said the Working Group is revising relevant *State Licensing Handbook* chapters, including sections addressing webinar-based and classroom-based CE courses. Delgado said the Working Group has been reviewing the NAIC Standardized Instructor Form for potential revision to develop more uniform criteria across jurisdictions.

Swanson made a motion, seconded by Munn, to adopt the reports of the Adjuster Licensing (D) Working Group, including its March 18 minutes (Attachment Two); the Producer Licensing (D) Uniformity Working Group, including its March 17 (Attachment Three), Feb. 17 (Attachment Four) and Dec. 18 (Attachment Five) minutes; and the Uniform Education (D) Working Group, including its March 11 (Attachment Six) and Feb. 24 (Attachment Seven) minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Discussed the Use of the Updated NAIC Uniform Applications for Adjuster Licensing

Greg Welker (NAIC) said committee support undertook a review of legacy and duplicative adjuster application forms that were still accessible through the NAIC website. Welker said the outdated forms created potential confusion for applicants and state insurance regulators and were no longer aligned with current Task Force policy

Draft Pending Adoption

or uniformity objectives. Welker reported that committee support coordinated with relevant working groups and stakeholders to confirm that the revised Uniform Application adequately addressed regulatory needs and that the outdated adjuster applications were removed from the NAIC website.

8. Discussed Producer Licensing Examination Pass Rates

Tozer said committee support collected 2025 examination pass rate information across states, including a comparative review of remote and in-person testing. Tozer said this information is collected to better understand examination outcomes and identify potential trends in pass rates. Tozer said the data indicated that overall pass rate patterns were generally consistent across testing formats but said states may want to conduct further review of testing environments. Tozer said the pass rate data has been posted to the NAIC weblink of the Uniform Education (D) Working Group for informational purposes as states evaluate examination security, remote testing protocols, and potential future enhancements to licensing examinations.

Having no further business, the Producer Licensing (D) Task Force adjourned.

SharePoint/NAIC Support Staff Hub/Committees/Committee Folders/D CMTE/2026 Spring/PLTF



Draft: e-Notification Form

Agent Termination of Company Appointment for Cause

Complete form when notifying state(s) checked below of appointment termination, **for cause only**. All other appointment changes must be electronically processed using NIPR (National Insurance Producer Registry).

Agent/Advisor Information

Agent name as it appears on NAIC NPN (National Producer Number)

Agent's City/State of Residence Last four digits of SS#

Agent's City/State of Residence State License #

Carrier Information

Name of Insurance Company NAIC

Address of Insurance Company

Documents Attached

Agent's termination letter Y/N (dropdown)

Other Y/N (dropdown)

Additional Information

Effective Date of Termination Date:

Was the agent notified of the termination? Y/N Date Notified:

Was an investigation conducted on this agent? Y/N Date of Investigation:

Was a fraud referral filed on the agent? Y/N Which state(s):

Were other agents identified in your investigation? Y/N

Which firm was agent contracted with at time of misconduct/investigation?

Is there a complaint history with this agent?

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION / FINDINGS:

If you require additional information related to this termination for cause action, please send your inquiry directly to the Company Fraud Contact listed on the second page of this document.

1 of 2

States listed below are being notified of a termination for cause action against agent/advisor listed on this document.

Dropdown lists of states here, LOB, book of business within that state and any consumer impact.

Example: each state selected in dropdown will be notified via NAIC

ST	LOB	Business Sold in State?	Consume Harm/Impact?	Description/ Outcome
IL	Life, A&H	No	No	
ME	Life	No	No	
NC	Life, A&H	Yes	Yes	Client made whole
TN	Life	Yes	No	

*AH - Accident and Health Agent *LO - Life-Only Agent LI - Life-Limited to the Payment of Funeral & Burial Expenses
 *PR - Property Broker-Agent *CA - Casualty Broker-Agent AL - Limited Lines Auto Insurance Agent
 LA - Life and Disability Analyst CS - Cargo Shipper's Agent PL - Personal Lines Broker Agent MC - Motor Club Agent
 TA - Limited Lines Travel Insurance Agent PF - Part Time Fraternal Agent DO - Disability Only HP - Home Protection
 CI - Credit Insurance Agent TMR - Title Marketing Representative

Reason for Termination (add drop down menu for choices (NAC Producer Licensing Model))
 If a termination is for any of the reasons listed in Section 12, License Denial, Non-Renewal or Revocation of Model #218, insurers are required to submit a detailed report to the state and a copy of the report to the producer. See attached word document for denial reasons per Sec. 12.

Firm Contact:

Name of Firm Contact Title

Email Address

Attestation by Authorized Insurer/Representative

I attest and affirm that all statements on this form and any supporting documents are true and accurate, and to the best of my knowledge, and are made for the purpose of notifying the state(s) indicated to the change of appointment status, as indicated by this completed form.

Name of Insurer's Representative Title

Email Address

Mailing Address

Signature Date

Disclosure: This termination for cause notice is submitted in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations and may be shared with regulatory authorities and authorized parties as permitted by law.

2 of 2



Current Pain Points

- Lack of uniformity with current TFC reporting
 - Current forms and requested information is inconsistent
 - Multiple methods of notification: USPS, State Portal, Sharepoint External (SPOx), Email
- Many state systems do not allow TFC notification via NIPR reporting
- Level of detail currently reported at a high level which prompts state(s) to request additional information (e.g. consumer harm, investigative findings, etc.) which increases the amount of time necessary to process the termination



Process Improvements

- Consistency across states
- Reduce administrative burden
- Quicker and more accurate notification to states
 - Single notification for all states
 - Include summary of findings
 - Was business conducted?
- Strengthen consumer protection
- Ideal state: notification method automated and managed externally

Draft: 5/8/26

NAIC Survey: Feedback on the 1033 Written Consent Template and Definition of Conviction

This survey is intended to gather feedback from state producer licensing directors regarding the application of the 18 U.S.C. §1033 written consent process, with particular focus on definitions of conviction and consistency across jurisdictions. Responses will inform potential refinements to NAIC guidance and the 1033 written consent template.

1. Please provide the definition of “conviction” your jurisdiction uses for purposes of the 18 U.S.C. §1033 written consent or waiver process (provide any applicable Code/Regulation reference).
2. Which types of criminal justice outcomes does your state include in its definition of “conviction” (e.g., sealed records, expunged convictions, pleas in abeyance (nolo contendere, no contest), diversion programs), and what is the rationale for their inclusion or exclusion?
3. As a non-resident state, how would you treat an individual who has been licensed with or without a 1033 written consent in their home state that did not consider sealed or expunged convictions, pleas in abeyance, or diversion programs in its decision to issue a license/grant or not grant a 1033?

3A – If the home state did not issue a 1033 written consent due to its interpretation of the definition of conviction for issuing a 1033 written consent would your state issue a 1033 written consent, if your definition of conviction differed?

3B If the applicant did not disclose all their criminal history in your state due to the applicant’s home state not requiring disclosure, due to its definition of conviction, would your state take administrative action?

4. What unintended compliance consequences could arise from inconsistent definitions of “conviction” across states?
5. What additional NAIC guidance would be helpful regarding the treatment of sealed, expunged, or otherwise restricted criminal records?
6. What transparency considerations should be addressed when state insurance regulators may consider different levels of criminal history information when considering a 1033 waiver request?

Definition of “Conviction” in NAIC Documents

NAIC Uniform Producer Licensing Application

- “Convicted” includes, but is not limited to, having been found guilty by verdict of a judge or jury, having entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or no contest, or having been given probation, a suspended sentence, or a fine.
- You may exclude the following misdemeanor convictions or pending misdemeanor charges: traffic citations, driving under the influence (DUI), driving while intoxicated (DWI), driving without a license, reckless driving, or driving with a suspended or revoked license.
- You may also exclude juvenile adjudications (offenses where you were adjudicated delinquent in a juvenile court).

NAIC Guidelines for State Insurance Regulators to the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994

“Convicted”

- (a) Federal Law. Convicted is defined in federal law at 29 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1) and 29 U.S.C. § 1111(c)(1) and means that a person shall be deemed to have been “convicted” and under the disability of “conviction” from the date of the judgment of the trial court, regardless of whether that judgment remains under appeal. However, it appears that, under federal law, a person who is sentenced to some sort of deferred adjudication status may not be deemed to be “convicted” for purposes of these statutes and, thus, would not be a prohibited person. Although a deferred adjudication arises only after a finding of guilt, the federal judicial system generally views a person in a deferred adjudication status as still under indictment and, thus, not convicted.
- (b) State Law. State laws might contain similar definitions for the term “convicted” and may well impose deferred adjudication sentences similar to the federal system. Thus, when determining whether an individual convicted under state law is a prohibited person, one should research the law of the state in which the person was tried, comparing the type of sentence received to the definition for convicted and whether it is affected by any type of deferred adjudication status.

Draft Template for 1033 Written Consent Process

Conviction: Includes but is not limited to having been found guilty by verdict of a judge or jury, having entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or no contest, or having been sentenced to probation, a suspended sentence, or a fine.

Drafting Note: States should not consider for written consent a person who has successfully completed deferred adjudication and has not been convicted of a qualifying felony. States may include in the definition of “Conviction” a plea in abeyance, a diversion, a sealed, or an expunged conviction.



11/14/2025

Mr. Tim Mullen
Director, Market Regulation
NAIC
1100 Walnut Street, Suite 1000
Kansas City, MO 64106-2197

Re: Request for Comment on 1033 Template Written Consent Process

Mr. Mullen,

In response to your communication sent to the Market Regulation and Consumer Affairs (D) Committee members, interested regulators, and interested parties of the Committee regarding request for comment on 1033 Template Written Consent Process, the American Property Casualty Insurance Association (APCIA) wishes to submit an inquiry, which may be treated as a comment for review purposes if appropriate.

Section 3 of the 103 Template includes a drafting note which reads:

Drafting Note: States should not consider for written consent a person who has successfully completed deferred adjudication and has not been convicted of a qualifying felony. States may include in the definition of "Conviction" a plea in abeyance, a diversion, a sealed, or an expunged conviction.

APCIA wishes to inquire if consideration for differentiation of determination of a "conviction" has been considered between states? Particularly, the inclusion of a sealed or expunged conviction by one state, and not another.

For example, if a person were to seek and be granted licensure in a state that did not include sealed or expunged conviction in that state's definition of "conviction," and that person were then to work in a state that did include sealed or expunged convictions within its definition of "conviction" – how would that person be treated by the second (or non-home) state?

Having looked into this question, we note that Point 3 of the minutes of the August 24, 2024, meeting of the Producer Licensing (D) Task Force (Attached via email for reference.) includes information on discussion of the matter of inclusion of expunged convictions in the definition of "conviction." That discussion refers to the desire to have NAIC staff work with a SME group to issue a revised draft. However,

we have not been able to locate an updated version of the language (unless the circulated copy is a reflection of that discussion.)

3. Received Comments on the Draft 1033 Waiver Template“This term includes but is not limited to, having been found guilty by verdict of a judge or jury, having entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or no contest, or having been given probation, a suspended sentence or a fine.” Director Deiter said there is a separate statement, which is not used on the NAIC Uniform Licensing Applications, that “States may include in the definition of ‘Conviction’ a plea in abeyance, a diversion, or an expunged conviction.” This separate statement was added because there are differences in what states might consider as a “conviction.” Ferguson said the Producer Licensing Uniformity (D) Working Group will review the Handbook for possible revisions, including sections addressing 1033 waivers. Ferguson said she believes the Working Group will defer its review of the section addressing 1033 waivers until the Task Force has completed its work on the 1033 waiver template. Chester said most jurisdictions only require a waiver from home state license applicants. Hearing no further comments, Director Deiter requested that NAIC staff work with a small group of subject matter experts (SMEs) to issue a revised draft within the next 45 days for the Task Force’s review.

We wish to inquire whether any additional guidance exists regarding how different states’ determinations are to be treated. We also wish to note that insurers, in their review process, may not (and often will not) have access to information that is sealed by courts, such as sealed or expunged convictions.

We are concerned that this may create problems for insurers seeking to do their due diligence, and require unforeseen adjustments due to inconsistencies in the treatment of the definition of “conviction” between the states.

As mentioned above, our primary intent in this response is to bring this matter to your awareness and to find guidance for insurers going forward. If guidance exists which resolves the potential conflict, we acknowledge that this may not rise to the level of a comment for the committee.

APCIA appreciates the opportunity to respond to the request for comments, and we look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL RICHMOND-CRUM

Michael Richmond-Crum
Senior Director, Personal Lines & Counsel
The American Property Casualty Insurance Association



Uniform Application for Business Entity License/Registration

Accessible print version prepared for Word review

Note: This is a print-and-mail application form. For applicants who can use the electronic process, the more accessible option is the NIPR online application: <https://nipr.com/licensing-center/apply-for-a-license>. This Word version improves reading order, headings, labels, and table structure for screen reader compatibility while preserving the form as a printable application.

Version note: Please verify you are using the current application version by checking www.nipr.com before distribution or submission.

Application type

- Resident License
- Non-Resident License
- Home State: _____
- New Application
- Additional Line(s) of Authority (state use, if applicable)

Section 1. Demographic information

Field	Response / Print Field
1. Business entity name	_____
2. Incorporation / formation date	Month ____ Day ____ Year ____
3. FEIN	_____
4. National Producer Number (NPN), if assigned	_____
5. FINRA Firm CRD, if applicable	_____
6. Other assumed, fictitious, alias, or trade names	_____
7. State of domicile	_____
8. Country of domicile	_____
9. Is the business entity affiliated with a financial institution or bank?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
10. Business address	_____
11. City	_____
12. State	_____
13. ZIP code	_____
14. Foreign country	_____
15. Phone number (include extension)	(____) _____ ext. _____
16. Fax number	(____) _____
17. Business website address	_____
18. Business email address	_____
19. Mailing address	_____
20. P.O. Box	_____

Field	Response / Print Field
21. City	_____
22. State	_____
23. ZIP code	_____
24. Foreign country	_____

Section 2. Designated/responsible licensed producer(s)

Name	Identifier	Notes
_____	SSN: __-__-__ NPN: _____	
_____	SSN: __-__-__ NPN: _____	
_____	SSN: __-__-__ NPN: _____	
_____	SSN: __-__-__ NPN: _____	

Instruction: Identify at least one designated/responsible licensed producer responsible for the business entity’s compliance with the insurance laws, rules, and regulations of the state. See the Matrix of State Requirements at www.nipr.com for jurisdictions that require this person to be an officer, director, or partner of the business entity.

Owners, partners, officers, directors, members, or managers

Identify all owners with 10% interest or voting interest, partners, officers and directors of the business entity, or members/managers of a limited liability company.

Name	Title	SSN/FEIN	Date of Birth	Owner? (Yes/No)	% Ownership
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Section 3. Background questions

Read carefully and answer every question. All written statements submitted by the applicant must include an original signature.

Important note for Questions 1a, 1b, and 1c: “Convicted” includes, but is not limited to, being found guilty by a judge or jury, entering a plea of guilty, nolo contendere, or no contest, or receiving probation, a suspended sentence, or a fine.

1. Has the business entity or any owner, partner, officer, director, member, or manager EVER been convicted of a misdemeanor, had a judgment withheld or deferred, or is currently charged with committing a misdemeanor?

Response: Yes No

If yes, attach: a written statement explaining each incident; a copy of the charging document; and official documents showing the final resolution or judgment.

2. Has the business entity or any owner, partner, officer, director, member, or manager EVER been convicted of a felony, had judgment withheld or deferred, or is currently charged with committing a felony? If there is a felony conviction involving dishonesty or breach of trust, indicate whether written consent under 18 U.S.C. 1033 was requested and granted.

Response: Yes No

N/A Written consent requested: Yes No

Written consent granted: Yes No

If yes, attach: a written statement and all supporting legal documents, including any approved 1033 consent if applicable.

3. Has the business entity or any owner, partner, officer, director, member, or manager EVER been convicted of a military offense, had a judgment withheld or deferred, or is currently charged with committing a military offense?

Response: Yes No

If yes, attach: a written statement and supporting legal documents.

4. Has the business entity or any owner, partner, officer, director, member, or manager EVER been named or involved as a party in an administrative proceeding, including a FINRA sanction or arbitration proceeding, regarding any professional or occupational license or registration?

Response: Yes No

If yes, attach: a written statement identifying the license type, all parties involved, and the circumstances; a copy of the notice of hearing or other charging document; and official documents showing the resolution or final judgment.

5. Has any demand been made or judgment rendered against the business entity or any owner, partner, officer, director, member, or manager for overdue monies, or has the entity EVER been subject to a bankruptcy proceeding? Do not include personal bankruptcies unless they involve funds held on behalf of others.

Response: N/A Yes No

If yes, attach: a statement summarizing the indebtedness and repayment arrangements.

6. Has the business entity or any owner, partner, officer, director, member, or manager EVER been notified by any jurisdiction to which you are applying of a delinquent tax obligation that is not subject to a repayment agreement?

Response: Yes No

If yes, attach: the jurisdiction(s) involved and supporting details. Jurisdiction(s):

7. Is the business entity or any owner, partner, officer, director, member, or manager a party to, or has it EVER been found liable in, any lawsuit or arbitration proceeding involving allegations of fraud, misappropriation or conversion of funds, misrepresentation, or breach of fiduciary duty?

Response: Yes No

If yes, attach: a written statement summarizing each incident; a copy of the petition, complaint, or other initiating document; and official documents showing the resolution or final judgment.

8. Has the business entity or any owner, partner, officer, director, member, or manager EVER had an insurance agency contract, securities broker contract, or other business relationship with an insurance company or securities business terminated for alleged misconduct?

Response: Yes No

If yes, attach: a written statement summarizing each incident, explaining why it should not prevent licensure, and copies of all relevant documents.

9. In response to a “Yes” answer to one or more of these questions, are you submitting—or have you previously submitted—documents to the NAIC/NIPR Attachments Warehouse?

Response: N/A Yes No

If yes, attach: If documents were previously loaded for the same type of application and same background question(s), the states identified on this application may receive an alert that supporting documents are available.

Reference for 18 U.S.C. 1033 guidance: https://www.naic.org/documents/prod_serv_legal_sir_op.pdf

Section 4. Applicant certification and attestation

- All information submitted in this application and its attachments is true and complete. Submitting false information or omitting material information may result in license/registration revocation and civil or criminal penalties.
- Unless provided otherwise by law or regulation of the jurisdiction, the business entity designates the Commissioner, Director, or Superintendent of Insurance (or an appropriate representative) in each jurisdiction as its agent for service of process regarding insurance matters in that jurisdiction.
- The business entity grants permission to each jurisdiction to verify information supplied with any federal, state, or local government agency, current or former employer, or insurance company.

- Every owner, partner, officer, director, member, or manager either does not have a current child-support obligation, or has such an obligation and is currently in compliance with it.
- The applicant authorizes jurisdictions to share information concerning the business entity or any individual named in this application, as permitted by law and in furtherance of official duties.
- The applicant understands that the business entity must comply with the insurance laws and regulations of the jurisdictions to which it is applying.
- For non-resident license applications, the applicant certifies that the business entity is licensed and in good standing in its home state for the lines of authority requested.
- Upon request, the applicant will furnish certified copies of documents attached to or requested in connection with this application.
- The designated responsible licensed producer(s) understand that they are responsible for the business entity's compliance with insurance laws, rules, and regulations of the state.
- Jurisdiction-specific attachments may be required. State-specific requirements and fees are available at www.nipr.com. Incomplete applications may be considered deficient.

Signature field	Print field
Date (Month/Day/Year)	_____
Signature of officer, director, partner, member, or manager	_____
Typed or printed name	_____
Title	_____
Address	_____

Accessibility and alternate format note

If you need this application in another format, need help with the print-and-mail process, or would prefer the electronic application path, use the NIPR online application: [Apply for an insurance license via NIPR](#).

Prepared as a best-effort accessible Word version for review. The page background is explicitly set to white, and text is kept dark for strong contrast. Before publication, run Microsoft Word Accessibility Checker and, if the document will be converted to PDF, verify the resulting tagged PDF as well.