**rEQUEST FOR NAIC mODEL lAW dEVELOPMENT**

This form is intended to gather information to support the development of a new model law or amendment to an existing model law. Prior to development of a new or amended model law, approval of the respective Parent Committee and the NAIC’s Executive Committee is required. The NAIC’s Executive Committee will consider whether the request fits the criteria for model law development. Please complete all questions and provide as much detail as necessary to help in this determination.

**Please check whether this is:** **[ ]  New Model Law or** **[x]  Amendment to Existing Model**

**1. Name of group to be responsible for drafting the model:**

Receivership Law (E) Working Group of the Receivership and Insolvency (E) Task Force to complete the drafting. Referred by the Restructuring Mechanisms (E) Working Group.

**2. NAIC staff support contact information:**

Jane Koenigsman

jkoenigsman@naic.org

816-783-8145

Dan Daveline

ddaveline@naic.org

816-783-8134

**3. Please provide a brief description of the proposed new model or the amendment(s) to the existing model. If you are proposing a new model, please also provide a proposed title. If an existing model law, please provide the title, attach a current version to this form and reference the section(s) proposed to be amended.**

* ***Property and Casualty Insurance Guaranty Association Model Act (#540)***

In 2019, the Financial Condition (E) Committee formed the Restructuring Mechanisms (E) Working Group who was charged with the following:

1. Evaluate and prepare a white paper that:
	1. Addresses the perceived need for restructuring statutes and the issues those statutes are designed to remedy. Also, consider alternatives that insurers are currently employing to achieve similar results.
	2. Summarizes the existing state restructuring statutes.
	3. Addresses the legal issues posed by an order of a court (or approval by an insurance department) in one state affecting the policyholders of other states.
	4. Considers the impact that a restructuring might have on guaranty associations and policyholders that had guaranty fund protection prior to the restructuring.
	5. Identifies and addresses the legal issues associated with restructuring using a protected cell.

Background for Proposed Change

This proposed change is being precipitated by discussions within the NAICs Restructuring Mechanisms (E) Working Group initiative, which is focused on documenting in the form of a White Paper, the various issues related to insurance business transfers (IBT) and corporate division (CD) transactions. The number of states adopting laws that permit either of these transactions is still relatively low, however one of the most significant issues that has been discussed during the meetings of the Working Group is the need for policyholders of such transactions to retain guaranty fund coverage. Representatives of the National Conference of Insurance Guaranty Funds (NCIGF) have suggested that an amendment to a state’s guaranty fund act, or other related law is necessary to address this issue. They have specifically suggested that the NAIC update the Property and Casualty Insurance Guaranty Association Model Act to incorporate specific language they have developed to address this issue. This will better enable those states that have incorporated #540 into their laws to update their laws for this important issue. This change is needed to ensure policyholders in all states retain their coverage, which is necessary regardless of how few states adopt changes to their laws to allow IBT and CD transactions.

Scope of the Proposed Revisions to Model 540

The scope of the request is limited to addressing the issue of guaranty fund coverage and as a result would be limited to specific suggestion of additional language within the definition of “Covered Claim” within #540. The following is the additional language (underlined language) that is being proposed to be added to Section 5, Definitions, within #540.

H. “Covered claim” means the following:

1. The claimant or insured is a resident of this State at the time of the insured event, provided that for entities other than an individual, the residence of a claimant, insured or policyholder is the State in which its principal place of business is located at the time of the insured event; or
2. The claim is a first party claim for damage to property with a permanent location in this State.
3. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, an insurance policy issued by a member insurer and later allocated, transferred, assumed by or otherwise made the sole responsibility of another insurer, pursuant to a state statute providing for the division of an insurance company or the statutory assumption or transfer of designated policies and under which there is no remaining obligation to the transferring entity (commonly known as “Division” or “Insurance Business Transfer” statutes), shall be considered to have been issued by a member insurer which is an Insolvent Insurer for the purposes of this Act in the event that the insurer to which the policy has been allocated, transferred, assumed or otherwise made the sole responsibility of is placed in liquidation.
4. An insurance policy that was issued by a non-member insurer and later allocated, transferred, assumed by or otherwise made the sole responsibility of a member insurer under a state statute described in subsection (a) shall not be considered to have been issued by a member insurer for the purposes of this Act.

**4. Does the model law meet the Model Law Criteria?** **[x]  Yes or** **[ ]  No (Check one)**

**(If answering no to any of these questions, please reevaluate charge and proceed accordingly to address issues).**

**a. Does the subject of the model law necessitate a national standard and require uniformity amongst all states? [x]  Yes or [ ]  No (Check one)**

 **If yes, please explain why:**

This proposed change is needed to ensure policyholders in all states retain their guaranty fund coverage, which is necessary regardless of how few states adopted changes to their laws to allow IBT and CD transactions.

It should be noted that with respect to guaranty fund coverage for life and health insurance, the National Organization of Life and Health Insurance Guaranty Associations are suggesting a different approach in addressing the same issue which centers around the need for such transaction to require the assuming or resulting insurer to be licensed in all states where the issuing insurer was licensed or ever was licensed to retain the needed coverage for policyholders.

1. **Does Committee believe NAIC members should devote significant regulator and Association resources to educate, communicate and support this model law?**

**[x]  Yes or [ ]  No (Check one)**

**5. What is the likelihood that your Committee will be able to draft and adopt the model law within one year from the date of Executive Committee approval?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[x]  1** | **[ ]  2** | **[ ]  3** | **[ ]  4** | **[ ]  5** | **(Check one)** |

**High Likelihood Low Likelihood**

**Explanation, if necessary:**

**6. What is the likelihood that a minimum two-thirds majority of NAIC members would ultimately vote to adopt the proposed model law?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[x]  1** | **[ ]  2** | **[ ]  3** | **[ ]  4** | **[ ]  5** | **(Check one)** |

**High Likelihood Low Likelihood**

**Explanation, if necessary:** See previous discussion.

**7. What is the likelihood that state legislatures will adopt the model law in a uniform manner within three years of adoption by the NAIC?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[x]  1** | **[ ]  2** | **[ ]  3** | **[ ]  4** | **[ ]  5** | **(Check one)** |

**High Likelihood Low Likelihood**

**Explanation, if necessary:**

At this juncture, the changes in concepts being considered are simple and because they have the potential to reduce expenses incurred by receivership estates, we believe such changes will be widely supported by all parties.

**8. Is this model law referenced in the NAIC Accreditation Standards? If so, does the standard require the model law to be adopted in a substantially similar manner?**

Not referenced in Accreditation Standards.

**9. Is this model law in response to or impacted by federal laws or regulations? If yes, please explain.**

No.