

# STRUCTURING MULTINATIONAL INSURANCE PROGRAMMES: CURRENT CHALLENGES IN THE ASIA PACIFIC REGION

**Suresh Krishnan and Brendan Hammond**



insured.™

# STRUCTURING MULTINATIONAL INSURANCE PROGRAMMES: CURRENT CHALLENGES IN THE ASIA PACIFIC REGION

Suresh Krishnan and Brendan Hammond

July 2013

## 1. Multinational Programmes – An Overview

There is a continuing debate in the Asia-Pacific insurance industry about how to effectively provide seamless, cost-effective and compliant insurance across national borders to multinational enterprises.

When developing a global insurance programme, multinational clients seek outcomes that balance 3 core factors: maximise global insurance capacity; minimise cost; and maintain centralised control over their insurance programmes. Sophisticated buyers take advantage of both of their expertise in monitoring loss development, and the predictable nature of their loss profile to structure multinational insurance programmes that keep much of the risk within the corporate umbrella structure. To do so, they leverage companies' central control of insurance terms, limits and retentions. This outcome is influenced by access to consolidated loss information, consistent loss control procedures, use of corporate buying power to obtain favourable risk transfer terms and pricing and the simplified centralized placement of global insurance coverage.

This report introduces and provides an overview of many of the regulatory and execution challenges faced by multinational companies purchasing globally coordinated insurance programmes, analyses the laws of Australia, Singapore, Hong Kong, Malaysia and New Zealand with respect to the concept of insurable interest, applies that concept to multinational insurance programmes, and, finally, provides a check list of questions that underwriters, brokers and clients in the region should consider when designing and implementing a measurably compliant multinational insurance programme.

## 2. Current Challenges to Multinational Insurance Programmes

The ideal solution to cross-border regulatory, tax and execution challenges would be to issue a single policy to cover the multinational company's risks (including those of its world-wide subsidiaries, affiliates and joint ventures) around the world which could be claimed upon where the claim occurred. Yet this is neither realistic nor materially compliant – notwithstanding some moves towards international harmonization of insurance legislation (such as the European Union's 'passporting' regime).

Many countries impose prohibitively cumbersome conditions on domiciled residents or entities from purchasing insurance from anyone except an insurer which is locally established, authorised or licensed ('admitted'). Other countries, (including Australia) whilst allowing insurance to be purchased from 'non-admitted' insurers, impose market-driven conditions such as the use of a local broker to export local risks to an unlicensed insurer - that must be satisfied before this is permitted and yet others impose tax penalties or other restrictions on those who elect to do so. Countries that are most restrictive about the procurement by a local resident of "non-admitted" insurance include Argentina, India, China, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Switzerland and Russia. Countries that are more permissive about procurement of non-admitted insurance, subject to market conditions, include Brazil, Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Colombia, Chile and Peru.

The multinational parent company's ability to obtain worldwide consistency of coverage type, amount and risk transfer terms is affected by a variety of factors, including language and regulatory differences which will render it generally impossible to categorically ensure that the terms of each local policy are consistent with the terms of all of the other policies, including the master policy issued as part of the programme. Additionally, given the significant number of countries and policies often involved in multinational programmes, limits offered on the local policies may aggregate to an amount larger than a single insurer or group would be willing to underwrite.

For example, policies insuring 100 affiliates with an average limit of AU\$10 million would result in aggregate exposure of AU\$1 billion – a sum which is likely to far exceed the parent company's insurance needs for its worldwide operations and which will impose unacceptable costs.

Multinational insurers have typically fulfilled the parent company's request for worldwide coverage and consistent limits by offering the parent a master 'broadform' policy. These policies are intended to operate excess of and in addition to the local policies insuring the parent's foreign subsidiaries, affiliates and joint ventures by filling any coverage gaps of the local policies (Differences in Condition--DIC) and to provide consistent limits (Differences in Limit--DIL). However, the underlying expectation within this framework is that, in exchange for a single premium, the global exposures of the whole multinational enterprise will be covered and where the risk is not covered by a local policy this would be covered by the local insured's claim against the master policy and paid in the local country where the claim arose.

### 3. A Changing Regulatory Environment

Recent specific regulatory developments, as well as a general trend towards increased regulatory and tax scrutiny, have cast serious doubt on the ability of master policies with "broad-form" named insured clauses to satisfy their original objectives. Since the landmark decision of *Kvaerner plc v Staatssecretaris van Financiën*<sup>1</sup> the insurance industry has been left in no doubt that increased interest and scrutiny in revenue generated from premium taxes and other parafiscal charges in the multinational risk arena is likely to become more commonplace, even in those countries where insurance arrangements had not been the subject of tight regulation. Routine audits of insureds in many countries, most recently the tax audit of a European multinational's Indian affiliate as reported in the *Wall Street Journal* in March 2011<sup>2</sup>, and an understanding of how global multinational programmes are currently structured will make the availability of this revenue apparent where it has not been remitted to revenue authorities.



In light of these matters a closer analysis of the structure and implementation of multinational programmes is necessary in an effort to ensure that regulatory and tax risks are not inadvertently assumed by insureds, insurance brokers and insurers so that the various participants understand their respective obligations to comply with local insurance and tax laws in the various jurisdictions implicated by the programme.

### 4. Insurable Interest: A Prudent and Reasonable Solution

What might be an effective solution for multinational companies that are headquartered in one jurisdiction may not work for companies in other jurisdictions. However, removing from the master policy coverage of a parent company's subsidiaries, affiliates, and joint ventures located in jurisdictions that are restrictive to non-admitted insurance as additional insureds will significantly reduce the risk that the insured under a master policy will be deemed by the local regulator to have improperly procured non-admitted insurance without satisfying local conditions governing the procurement of such insurance and that the insurer has somehow conducted insurance business by directly insuring risks in those jurisdictions. Accordingly, simplifying the master policy and its "broadform" coverage is an important and prudent first step in designing a global programme that may withstand international regulatory and tax scrutiny.

An important element of this approach is to rely upon the basic legal concepts of "insurable interest" (or "economic and pecuniary interest" under Australian, Singaporean and Hong Kong law). As described below, the insurable interest approach enables coverage and terms to be provided that are substantially similar to current 'broadform' master policies while mitigating the risk to insureds, brokers and insurers of being deemed to be participating in "unauthorized" insurance business.

#### a. Australia

Under Australian law, the policyholder must have a sufficient pecuniary or economic interest in the subject matter of the insurance to support a valid and enforceable policy. Although Australian law does not recognise a parent as holding such an interest in the physical assets of its subsidiaries, affiliates and joint ventures, it is generally accepted that a parent company does have an insurable interest in its financial interest in those entities. "The effect of Australia's Insurance Contracts Act" according to Dean Carrigan, a partner at Clyde & Co in Sydney, "is that the pecuniary or economic loss is not necessarily limited to the value of a parent's shareholding or dividends.

For example, where a parent is a shareholder in its subsidiary but also has an obligation to arrange insurance for that subsidiary's property, the parent's pecuniary or economic loss as a result of the property being damaged or destroyed can be made referable to the value of the loss to the damaged or destroyed property for which the parent is obliged to arrange insurance. This concept is equally applicable to a liability exposure that takes the form of casualty or professional liability."

#### **b. Singapore, Hong Kong, Malaysia and New Zealand**

In Singapore and in Hong Kong, although there is no settled legal insurable interest requirement for non-life or non-marine policies, insurable interest is deemed to exist if the policyholder (a) has legal or equitable title to the subject matter, (b) is in possession of the subject matter, or (c) is not in possession of the subject matter but may be either responsible for, or suffer loss in the event of, any damage to the subject matter<sup>3</sup>. Under both Singapore and Hong Kong law, according to Simon McConnell, a partner at Clyde & Co's Hong Kong office, "legal obligations include any legal or contractual indemnity from the parent to its subsidiary. Both Singapore and Hong Kong law look to English law for precedent and on that basis it is settled that, where a person has assumed a legal obligation to indemnify another against loss of or damage to property, he has an insurable interest therein to the extent of his possible liability."

Malaysian law follows a similar approach. According to Sagadevan Thangavelu, an insurance partner in the Kuala Lumpur law firm of Shearn Delamore & Co, "offshore insurance is defined under the Income Tax Act of 1967 and consistent with that Act, if an insurance policy is issued to a resident of Malaysia to insure the pecuniary or economic loss of the insured in Malaysia and such loss is indirectly attributable to a foreign subsidiary or affiliate of the insured, such foreign entity loss may be indemnified in Malaysia and would not be characterized as insurance of a foreign loss".

New Zealand also recognizes the concept of insurable interest. According to Haydn Wong, insurance partner at Bell Gully in Auckland "even though the insured in New Zealand is not required to have an insurable interest in the subject matter of the insurance policy the insured must be able to show that the policy provides cover against a pecuniary or economic loss in order for the policy to be classed as a 'contract of indemnity against loss'."

### **5. The Practical Impact on Global Programmes**

In all these countries, the parent's insurable interest need not be reflected merely in a full ownership interest in the foreign entity – it may arise by having partial ownership interest coupled with a contractual obligation either to indemnify the foreign entity or to arrange for that entity's insurance coverage. Therefore, an Australian master policy may cover the parent's financial or economic interest (through its shareholding or other discernable insurable interest) in its subsidiaries, affiliates and joint ventures, rather than insuring such entities directly<sup>4</sup>. After collecting the claimed amount, the parent may, at its discretion and upon consultation with its tax and financial advisers, elect to reimburse its subsidiaries, affiliates and joint ventures.

It is essential to clearly define the parent's insurable interest and the mechanism by which its subsidiaries', affiliates' and joint ventures' property damage and liabilities will be determined. In Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, Hong Kong and Malaysia, a viable solution to the challenges identified above is to adopt the principle of an "agreed value" policy whereby the parent agrees in advance to the basis on which the value of the parent's insurable interest in its subsidiaries', affiliates' and joint ventures' losses is to be calculated is a prudent and reasonable approach to indemnifying the parent for an amount equal to the loss suffered by a subsidiary, affiliate or joint venture. Under this structure, since no direct cover is provided to those subsidiaries, affiliates and joint ventures located in countries where the conditions by which non-admitted cover may be procured are not satisfied, consistent with the insurer's domiciliary regulations, no parent policy premiums would be allocated to those entities and claims would be paid in-country to the parent for its insured losses.

In addition, because this approach clearly identifies the jurisdictions in which the insurance is being provided, the amount and allocation of premium taxes and other parafiscal charges among the insurer, the producer and the insureds is readily identified.





## 6. Alignment of Interests

The outlined approach leads to a multinational insurance programme, which aligns the interest of insureds, brokers and insurers. It satisfies a multinational corporation's demands for consistent coverage and limits for their worldwide operations, whilst at the same time placing both insured, broker and insurer in a rational position to safely navigate the waters of increased international regulatory scrutiny over cross-border insurance including those which arise from issuing, selling or purchasing unauthorised insurance in highly restrictive jurisdictions.

By insuring only the parent company under the master policy and not its subsidiaries, affiliates and joint ventures in jurisdictions that are highly restrictive about non-admitted insurance, this structure should significantly reduce the risks to insureds, producers and insurers associated with non-compliant, unlicensed insurance. Although any assumptions attributing one hundred percent of all losses suffered by a subsidiary, affiliate or joint venture to the indemnity provided to the parent for such losses should be carefully evaluated on a country by country basis, this multinational solution lends itself to widespread application in the Asia Pacific region (as well as in the USA and Europe in accordance with applicable insurance regulations) where large multinational groups are concentrated.

## 7. Checklist and Conclusion

Before designing and underwriting a multinational insurance programme, participants in the programme should consider the following check-list, which recommends designing and implementing a measurably compliant multinational insurance programme from a “bottom-up” perspective—requirements for local policies as well as a “top-down” perspective—ensuring potential gaps in those local policies are covered by a master DIC and/or DIL excess policy.

- 1) Is local coverage required and if so, is it adequate? Is Difference in Conditions (DIC) excess policy needed?
- 2) Is local limit adequate? Is Difference in Limit (DIL) excess policy needed?
- 3) If DIC/DIL is needed, has it been compliantly procured and documented (policy, premium, claims, tax) in the jurisdiction where the parent is located?
- 4) If yes, are conditions such as the requirement for a local broker for the placement or the remittance of premium taxes satisfied with respect to who will calculate, collect and remit such payment?

- 5) If no, how may a master DIC/DIL excess policy be compliantly issued to meet expectations?
  - a) What risks are or are not insured?
  - b) How is premium allocated and paid?
  - c) Where will premium taxes and/or other fees and surcharges be paid?
  - d) How will claims be adjusted and paid?

Clearly, multinational policies are crucial for international groups—a way to ensure group wide coverage where the group is operating in many jurisdictions. Yet for the insured, broker and insurer, the jurisdictional spread embedded in these programmes introduces increased regulatory and fiscal risk. The proposed solution keeps multinational policies straight-forward, transparent and marketable while ensuring that the parties are not inadvertently brought onshore in a country that disallows non-admitted insurance for tax and regulatory purposes.

“If designed and administered with the issues outlined in this paper,” Mr. Carrigan added, “this reformed master policy provides a reasonable and prudent approach to purchasing and selling multinational insurance and should withstand legal challenges under Australian Law and under the laws of a number of Asian countries with respect to providing unauthorized insurance, allocation of premium, and payment of applicable taxes and fees.”

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Suresh Krishnan** is General Counsel for the ACE Group's Multinational Client Group, where he has global legal oversight for matters connected with the company's multinational products and services. With more than 20 years of experience in the insurance industry, Mr. Krishnan most recently served as General Counsel of ACE USA and ACE Financial Solutions. He joined ACE in 1999. Prior to his tenure with ACE, he held various legal positions with the Gerling Group and the Swiss Re Group.

**Brendan Hammond** is Deputy General Counsel for ACE Insurance Limited (Australia) with legal oversight for multinational insurance business within the wider ACE Asia Pacific Group. Prior to joining ACE in 2008, Mr. Hammond worked extensively on insurance related matters in private practice both in Australia and the UK.

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Case C-191/99, *Kvaerner plc v Staatssecretaris van Financiën*, 2001 E.C.R. I-4447, [2001] STC 1007.

<sup>2</sup> See *Structuring Multinational Insurance Programs: The Emerging Regulatory Challenge to Non-admitted Insurance* at [http://gps.acegroup.com/WhitePaper\\_MediaCenter.html](http://gps.acegroup.com/WhitePaper_MediaCenter.html) (last visited 27 June 2013).

<sup>3</sup> *Sharpe v Sphere Drake Insurance, the Moonacre* [1992] 2 Lloyds Rep 501; *National Oilwell (UK) Ltd v Davy Offshore Ltd* [1993] 2 Lloyds Rep 582; *Feasey v Sun Life Assurance Co of Canada* [2003] EWCA Civ 885.

<sup>4</sup> *Wilson v Jones* (1867), L.R.2 Ex. 139 at 144; *Macaura v Northern Assurance Co Ltd* [1925] AC 619.

## Broad Capabilities, Deep Expertise

---

For more than 25 years, ACE has been helping multinational companies manage risk around the world. Our breadth of products, depth of expertise and appetite for risk make us a valued partner for global companies.

With ACE Group resources worldwide, we're an ideal partner for multinational companies. We have ACE-owned offices in all major markets - 53 countries to date - and a network of long-term partners committed to our high standards.

As a result, we provide indigenous expertise and world-class service in more than 170 countries. The breadth of our product line and the skill of our underwriting teams allow clients to consolidate their business with us, making for more efficient administration. With our worldwide network, we can respond to your needs quickly— moving premiums, issuing policies, resolving claims, and assisting you, post loss, in getting your business up and running again.

ACE's GPS<sup>SM</sup> platform represents a dynamic, client-focused approach to managing multinational risk. With a dedicated global team and a consultative way of working, we provide custom solutions for your needs around the world. We back our commitment with the many strengths of ACE: a strong international network, indigenous expertise, financial security and our industry-leading technology.



## Property and Casualty

As a global provider of commercial property and casualty insurance, the ACE Group team puts an international network of underwriting, claims and risk control professionals to work, helping businesses reduce risk and mitigate loss. We also advise on protection and hazard topics and provide tailored engineering services, all backed by the ACE GPS<sup>SM</sup> platform.

## Specialty

With our global footprint and our understanding of local market requirements, we provide tailored solutions that other insurers cannot. Practice areas include professional risk, financial lines, medical risk, environmental impairment, aviation, energy and many others.

## Accident and Health

Unlike most insurers, ACE views accident and health as a core business, and we underwrite it everywhere we operate. We cover the risks attendant to the employer-employee relationship with unique insight, knowledge of local market practices and expectations, and the global network to deliver our expertise in a cost-effective and compliant way. Through ACE GPS<sup>SM</sup> large multinational organizations can secure personal accident and business travel coverage for their employees worldwide.

## The Right Team, the Right Time

---

We've invested significant time and resources to become the premier client-oriented insurer for multinational companies. We back our ACE GPS<sup>SM</sup> platform with our top rated balance sheet — AA- from S&P & A+ from A.M. Best — and with our geographic array, underwriting expertise and claims resolution ability. ACE GPS<sup>SM</sup> cuts across products and geography. Our dedicated ACE Global Services Team works around the world to implement your global programme, manage the infrastructure, coordinate among offices and make sure that developments in technology keep pace with those in the business world.

If you manage risk, people, or both at a large multinational organization, you should talk to us and let us demonstrate how we can help.

THE OPINIONS AND POSITIONS EXPRESSED IN THIS ARTICLE ARE THE AUTHORS' OWN AND NOT THOSE OF ANY ACE COMPANY. THIS ARTICLE IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT LEGAL ADVICE. WE STRONGLY RECOMMEND THAT YOU REVIEW ALL INFORMATION WITH YOUR TAX, LEGAL AND FINANCE CONSULTANTS TO ASSESS THE STRUCTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF YOUR SPECIFIC SITUATION AND CASH FLOWS. ANY REFERENCES TO INSURANCE POLICY PROVISIONS ARE NOT INTENDED TO AMEND OR ALTER ANY FINAL POLICY OR CONTRACT. THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE ULTIMATE, FINAL POLICY OR CONTRACT WILL GOVERN THE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATION OF THE PARTIES

## CONTACT US

Peter Kuczer  
Global Client Executive  
ACE Asia Pacific  
Tel: +613 9623 7204  
Email: [peter.kuczer@acegroup.com](mailto:peter.kuczer@acegroup.com)  
[www.acegroup.com](http://www.acegroup.com)

### About ACE Group

---

The ACE Group is one of the world's largest multiline property and casualty insurers. With operations in 53 countries, ACE provides commercial and personal property and casualty insurance, personal accident and supplemental health insurance, reinsurance and life insurance to a diverse group of clients. ACE Limited, the parent company of the ACE Group, is listed on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE: ACE) and is a component of the S&P 500 index. Additional information can be found at: [www.acegroup.com](http://www.acegroup.com).

© Copyright 2013. ACE Group. All rights reserved.

