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Speed to Market (EX) Working Group

Conference Call

August 30 and September 27, 2018

The Speed to Market (EX) Working Group of the Innovation and Technology (EX) Task Force met via conference call   
Aug. 30 and Sept. 27, 2018. The following Working Group members participated: Maureen Motter, Vice Chair (OH); Joanne Bennett and Wally Thomas (AK); William Lacy (AR); Shirley Taylor (CO); Keith Fanning (IL); Heather Droge (KS); Tammy Lohmann (MN); Mary Mealer and Angela Nelson (MO); Ted Hamby and Tim Johnson (NC); Frank Cardamone (NH); Marletta Bruner, Cuc Nguyen and Wayne Stewart (OK); Tashia Sizemore (OR); Mark Worman (TX); Phyllis Oates and Yolanda Tennyson (VA); and Gail Jones and Lichiou Lee (WA).

1. Discuss Speed to Market Measurement Tools

Ms. Motter said the plan is to discuss additional information available to analyze speed to market goals and discuss potential measurement tools using new metrics other than turnaround times (e.g., customer satisfaction, efficiency and effectiveness). She said some state government officials want customer satisfaction numbers, so the Working Group can discuss how to measure for insurance regulation. She said a secondary goal, while reviewing existing reports, is to discuss how states can efficiently create reports using NAIC tools or guidance to compare companies’ or groups’ SERFF filing data to industry benchmarks.

The Working Group discussed the content of each of the following existing SERFF reports: State Company Filing Synopsis Report, State Filing Workflow Report, State Overall Reviewer Status Report, Productivity Report, Status Summary Report, Type of Insurance (TOI) by Quarter Report, and the State Filing Turnaround Report (Attachment \_\_\_). Brandy Woltkamp (NAIC) described the content of each report. She said the state manual does not contain much information on the reports, so the Working Group might recommend the addition of instructions to explain how each report could be used. Ms. Jones said the reports look good, but states need to know what each number represents to be able to use the information correctly. Ms. Motter said an option is to explain the columns on the report itself when the column heading is not intuitive.

Ms. Motter said she does not use many of these reports and said she would ask others to explain how they use them.

Regarding the State Company Filing Synopsis Report, some said they were not aware this report existed. Ms. Nelson said the number of objections and the days to industry response would be helpful. Ms. Mealer agreed and said she uses other reports more frequently. Ms. Lohmann did not see a need for the report. Ms. Taylor said the report might be more useful if there were a group code search. The Working Group agreed.

Regarding the State Filing Workflow Report (Workflow Report) and the State Filing Turnaround Report (Turnaround Report), Ms. Woltkamp said the Workflow Report is for open filings, while the Turnaround Report is for closed filings.

Ms. Nelson said the level of granularity in the Workflow Report is overwhelming, but a summary at the front by primary reviewer with an overall snapshot in each category would be helpful for management. Someone suggested there are extra repetitive line items by company code showing, which might be impacting the ease of use. Ms. Motter said the extra data might be useful to do additional analysis or manipulation of data. Ms. Nelson said if the intent is to manage staff workflow, the repetitive nature makes it more difficult. Ms. Motter said it might be helpful if the information could be presented both ways. Ms. Woltkamp said it is possible to do. Ms. Mealer said the Workflow Report is her favorite report.

Ms. Motter said the Turnaround Report provides information about closed filings. She said the Working Group has spent significant time on this report in the past. Washington is now using this report for its performance evaluation. The 40-day standard was adopted many years ago. In years past there was some discussion about changing that turnaround time to be more or less than 40 days and/or vary the days by SERFF instance, but that is not currently being discussed. Commissioners see the aggregate data for their individual state at each National Meeting. Information for other states is not shared.

The State Overall Reviewer Status Report displays detailed aging information for open filings grouped by primary reviewer. The report can be run for one reviewer or all of the reviewers. Ms. Mealer said she uses it to document performance and she likes the current report. The report is also used by Colorado, New Hampshire, and Texas.

The Productivity Report displays the counts of filings grouped by state or SERFF status that are currently open or were submitted during the specified date range. The report can be run for one reviewer or all of the reviewers. She said it currently shows only the primary reviewer (similar to all reports). Ms. Droge uses the report and finds it useful to analyze daily work. She said it works well to analyze telecommuters’ productivity. Ms. Motter said when there is a filing being reviewed by multiple analysts, such as an actuary and a forms (contract) analyst, restricting the data to just the primary reviewerdoes not provide a complete picture of the actuary’s workload and performance since the actuary is not designated as the primary reviewer on dual review filing submissions.

Ms. Motter said the Status Summary Report provides a snapshot of the day. The report can be run for one reviewer or all of the reviewers. Kansas uses this report regularly to check the status and make sure the filing is getting close to closing in 30 days and for personnel performance evaluation. Kansas typically has just one reviewer unless there is training or a consulting actuary on the filing. Texas uses the report to check status and see if the filing is moving through the process. Oklahoma also uses the report.

Regarding the Type of Insurance (TOI) by Quarter Report, Ms. Motter said there is actually flexibility to the date selection to be a range or a year. The Working Group suggested changing the title of the report. Some said it would be beneficial to be able to select multiple TOIs. The report helps to answer which TOIs are being filed most often and to evaluate any timing trend for certain types of filings.

Ms. Motter asked Working Group members to propose any changes. She said a few changes discussed include having the option to select “anyone assigned” and not just the “primary reviewer;” fixing the title of the State TOI report and selecting multiple TOIs; and adding the recent data. Ms. Motter said there are considerations in the measurement of time. She said handling objections through “Notes to filers” will be calculated as time on the regulator side whereas sending an objection letter then switches the time to the filer side.

The Working Group asked NAIC staff to develop instructions and explain each report as to what is being measured and how to read the information. Once this is developed, the Working Group can then discuss the timelines for the desired enhancements to the existing reports. Once the instructions and enhancements are completed, the Working Group can better articulate and communicate to all states as to what efficiency, turnaround time, benchmarking and other potential measurements can be obtained from the current data and investigate the potential need for new ideas/reports. The aim is to be able to use the existing reports to their fullest potential.

Having no further business, the Speed to Market (EX) Working Group adjourned.
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