

REINSURANCE
PRACTICE AND
THE LAW

BARLOW LYDE & GILBERT

informa

BARLOW LYDE & GILBERT LLP

Barlow Lyde & Gilbert LLP has a long history as a leading insurance and reinsurance law firm, having been closely involved with the insurance and reinsurance markets for more than 125 years. Its award-winning reinsurance practice comprises the largest and most widely experienced group of reinsurance lawyers in Europe, with expertise in every form of reinsurance, whether facultative or treaty, finite, life, ART or more traditional reinsurance contracts, and in every aspect of reinsurance dispute resolution both in London and internationally. They also have extensive expertise in restructuring and legacy, ART and structured solutions, regulatory and compliance issues, and work closely with other specialist insurance lawyers in the firm, including the insolvency, outsourcing and technology, competition, and corporate practice areas to provide a comprehensive service in all areas of reinsurance law. The firm's wide experience of all classes of business also compliments the reinsurance practice, providing in-depth knowledge of the underlying risks involved. In addition to the firm's overseas offices in the Asia-Pacific region, the firm plans to open an office in Sao Paolo in 2009, and also works closely with a wide network of correspondent lawyers and reinsurance contacts around the world to provide a truly international service.

Barlow Lyde & Gilbert LLP
15 St Botolph Street
London
EC3A 7NJ

Tel: +44 (0) 20 7247 2277
Fax: +44 (0) 20 7071 9000

www.blg.co.uk

Other Offices: Hong Kong; Singapore; Shanghai; Oxford.

Barlow Lyde & Gilbert means Barlow Lyde & Gilbert LLP and/or its affiliated undertakings.

OUTLINE CONTENTS

PART 1—REINSURANCE CONTRACTS, MARKETS AND PARTICIPANTS

1. INTRODUCTION TO AND OVERVIEW OF REINSURANCE
2. THE PARTICIPANTS AND COMMON REINSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS
3. GLOBAL REINSURANCE MARKETS
4. TYPES OF REINSURANCE CONTRACTS
5. TYPES OF REINSURER, AUTHORISATION AND REGULATION
6. UNDERWRITING AGENTS
7. THE REINSURANCE BROKER

PART 2—MAKING THE REINSURANCE CONTRACT

8. ESSENTIAL INGREDIENTS OF A REINSURANCE CONTRACT
9. JOINT AND COMPOSITE POLICIES AND REINSURANCE FOR COMMON ACCOUNT
10. UTMOST GOOD FAITH AT PLACEMENT: DISCLOSURE AND REPRESENTATIONS
11. MAKING THE CONTRACT: PLACEMENT
12. RECORDING THE CONTRACT: THE SLIP AND THE WORDING
13. BROKER'S COVER NOTES
14. CONTRACT CERTAINTY

PART 3—INTERPRETING THE REINSURANCE CONTRACT

15. GENERAL RULES OF INTERPRETATION OF TERMS
16. INCORPORATION OF TERMS
17. TYPES AND CLASSIFICATION OF TERMS
18. COMMON TERMS THAT DELIMIT THE SCOPE OF COVER AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS CLAUSES
19. DUTIES BETWEEN PLACEMENT AND THE MAKING OF CLAIMS
20. CHOICE OF LAW

PART 4—PREMIUM, BROKERAGE AND COMMISSION

21. PREMIUM
22. BROKERAGE AND COMMISSIONS

PART 5—LLOYD'S

23. LLOYD'S

PART 6—REINSURANCE ALTERNATIVES

24. ALTERNATIVE RISK TRANSFER

PART 7—CLAIMS

25. CLAIMS NOTIFICATION, CO-OPERATION AND CONTROL PROVISIONS
26. GOOD FAITH AND CLAIMS
27. CLAIMS ALLOCATION
28. AGGREGATION
29. LOSS SETTLEMENT PROVISIONS
30. INSPECTION PROVISIONS
31. MARKET PRACTICES AS TO PRESENTATION AND SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS
32. SET-OFF, OFFSET AND FUNDING
33. LETTERS OF CREDIT AND OTHER SECURITY PROVIDED BY REINSURERS

PART 8—EXPIRY AND TERMINATION OF THE REINSURANCE CONTRACT

34. EXPIRY, EXHAUSTION AND TERMINATION OF THE REINSURANCE CONTRACT
35. COMMUTATIONS AND NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENTS

PART 9—TRANSFER, RUN-OFF AND INSOLVENCY

36. RUN-OFF
37. TRANSFER OF THE REINSURANCE RISK
38. INSOLVENCY PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES IN REINSURANCE
39. CROSS-BORDER INSOLVENCY

PART 10—REMEDIES AND RESOLVING DISPUTES

40. REMEDIES FOR BREACH OF DUTIES AND CONTRACTUAL TERMS
41. LOSS OF REMEDIES
42. LIMITATION
43. METHODS OF RESOLVING REINSURANCE DISPUTES
44. ARBITRATION PROCEDURE
45. LITIGATION IN THE COMMERCIAL COURT
46. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION
47. JURISDICTION AND JURISDICTION DISPUTES
48. EFFECTIVE LITIGATION MANAGEMENT
49. ENFORCEMENT OF COURT JUDGMENTS AND ARBITRATION AWARDS
50. REINSURANCE DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN THE UNITED STATES
51. REINSURANCE REGULATION, LAW AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
52. THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE MARKETS IN SINGAPORE AND HONG KONG

PART 11—PROPOSALS FOR LEGAL REFORM

53. THE ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH LAW COMMISSIONS' PROPOSALS FOR REFORM

APPENDICES

DETAILED CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Foreword</i>	v
<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Contributors</i>	ix
<i>Barlow Lyde and Gilbert LLP</i>	x
<i>Outline Contents</i>	xi
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xliii
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	lxi
<i>Table of International Rules and Lloyd's Byelaws</i>	lxvii
<i>Table of Abbreviations and Acronyms</i>	lxix

PART 1—REINSURANCE CONTRACTS, MARKETS AND PARTICIPANTS

	<i>Para</i>
1. INTRODUCTION TO AND OVERVIEW OF REINSURANCE	
Introduction	1.1
What is Reinsurance?	1.4
Methods of Reinsurance	1.10
The Benefits of Reinsurance	1.13
The Reinsurance Market	1.17
Lloyd's and the London market	1.20
Reinsurance and Regulation	1.23
Reinsurance Intermediaries	1.36
Formation of Reinsurance Contracts	1.49
Utmost Good Faith and the Duty of Disclosure	1.74
Claims	1.84
The first proviso: The reinsured has acted honestly and has taken all proper and businesslike steps	1.87
The second proviso: Claims must fall within the terms of the reinsurance contract as a matter of law	1.90
Triggers and Aggregations	1.107
Originating cause/event/occurrence	1.114
Mismatch between underlying policy and reinsurance cover	1.127
Disputes	1.132
Choice of jurisdiction	1.132
Enforcement	1.148
Claims control and claims co-operation clauses	1.151

Inspection of documents	1.160
What effect will be given to an inspection clause?	1.162
Limitation	1.183
Arbitration	1.188
Cut-through Clauses	1.196
Alternatives to Reinsurance	1.203
Fronting	1.208
Protected cell companies	1.210
Financial reinsurance and alternative risk transfer	1.212
Financial reinsurance	1.216
The new wave	1.224
Securitisation	1.226
Insurance derivatives	1.233
Risk transfer and regulatory concerns	1.239
Insurance and the capital markets: a clash of cultures	1.244
Documenting the transaction	1.259
The future of ART	1.261
Regulation of finite reinsurance	1.262
2. THE PARTICIPANTS AND COMMON REINSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS	
Reinsureds and reinsurers	2.1
Brokers and Underwriting agents	2.9
The Subscription market	2.19
Line Slips	2.22
Underwriting Pools	2.29
Fronting Arrangements	2.44
3. GLOBAL REINSURANCE MARKETS	
Background	3.1
London	3.12
The market	3.13
The International Underwriting Association of London	3.16
Bermuda	3.20
Captives	3.21
Reinsurance	3.22
Europe	3.25
France	3.25
Ireland	3.26
Germany	3.29
Switzerland	3.30
North America	3.33
4. TYPES OF REINSURANCE CONTRACTS	
Introduction	4.1
Facultative Reinsurance	4.8
Ensuring reinsurance on the same terms as the original	4.10
Timing of placements and claims processing	4.12
Premium and claims accounting systems	4.13

Double recovery	4.15
Treaty Reinsurance	4.16
Facultative obligatory treaty	4.18
Quota share treaty	4.25
Surplus treaty	4.39
Non-proportional reinsurances	4.45
Aggregation of losses	4.54
Sources of dispute concerning cessions	4.61
Portfolio transfers	4.64
Alternative Risk Transfer	4.69
5. TYPES OF REINSURER, AUTHORISATION AND REGULATION	
Introduction	5.1
Lloyd's	5.2
Insurance Companies Carrying on Business in the United Kingdom	5.3
The Financial Services and Markets Act 2000	5.3
The Reinsurance Directive	5.8
Lack of Authorisation	5.14
Authorisation of Agents	5.25
The Role of the Leading Underwriter	5.27
6. UNDERWRITING AGENTS	
Introduction	6.1
The Agent's Authority	6.3
Express authority	6.4
Implied authority	6.6
Apparent/ostensible authority	6.7
Termination	6.11
Ratifying actions	6.14
Delegation by agent	6.15
The Underwriting Agency Agreement	6.21
Obligation of reasonable skill and care	6.22
Underwriting	6.22
Selection of security	6.26
The underwriter's appointment	6.27
Records and inspection	6.29
Remuneration	6.36
Cash flow	6.37
Agent acting as if reinsurer	6.38
The Underwriting Agent's Personal Liability to Third Parties	6.40
FSA Regulation of Underwriting Agents	6.45
7. THE REINSURANCE BROKER	
Introduction	7.1
The Role of the Reinsurance Broker in the London Market	7.3
The Reinsurance Broker as Agent	7.7
The basic position: the reinsurance broker as agent of the reinsured	7.7
The authority of the reinsurance broker	7.8

Joint and Sub-broking	7.12
Joint broking	7.12
Sub-broking	7.14
The general duty of the agent not to delegate	7.14
Delegation and privity of contract	7.15
Liability of the reinsurance broker for the acts and omissions of the sub-broker	7.21
Liability of the sub-broker to the reinsured	7.22
The Types of Duty Owed by Reinsurance Brokers to the Reinsured	7.28
Contractual and tortious duties	7.28
Contractual duties	7.28
Tortious duties	7.29
Fiduciary duties	7.31
Breach of fiduciary duty	7.32
Conflicts of interest	7.36
Duty of confidentiality	7.40
Specific Duties of Reinsurance Brokers	7.42
Degree of skill and care imposed on a reinsurance broker	7.42
Duty to effect reinsurance	7.47
Duty to advise that reinsurance is not available or has not been obtained	7.52
Duty of good faith and disclosure on placing	7.54
Results of non-disclosure	7.62
Imputed knowledge	7.67
Choice of security	7.75
Duties prior to placement	7.76
Practical problems regarding the choice of security	7.83
Conflicts of duty	7.83
Unapproved security	7.84
Disclosure of documents	7.87
Joint broking	7.88
Broker's attempts to put responsibility on clients	7.89
Post-placement duties to alert and advise	7.93
Preparation of wordings	7.95
In general	7.95
Cover notes	7.101
Retention of documents	7.102
Reinsurance brokers' responsibilities	7.102
Duty to account	7.109
Brokers' lien on documents	7.112
Collecting claims	7.115
General	7.115
Fraudulent claims	7.118
Circumstances in which a Reinsurance Broker May Owe Duties to Others than the Reinsured	7.119
Exceptions to the basic rule that the reinsurance broker is the agent of the reinsured	7.119
Binding authorities	7.119
US intermediary clause	7.124

Other circumstances where the reinsurance broker can incur liability to the reinsurer	7.129
Lloyd's brokers retaining documents for Lloyd's underwriters	7.132
The Regulation of Reinsurance Brokers	7.141
Introduction	7.141
The current regulatory regime	7.142
Lloyd's regulation of Lloyd's brokers	7.153

PART 2—MAKING THE REINSURANCE CONTRACT

8. ESSENTIAL INGREDIENTS OF A REINSURANCE CONTRACT

Introduction	8.1
Offer and Acceptance	8.4
Agreement on the essential terms	8.10
Intention to Create Legal Relations	8.12
Consideration	8.15
Consideration in fronting arrangements	8.17
Where no premium is paid	8.18
Insurable Interest	8.19
Introduction	8.19
Definition of insurable interest	8.21
Classification of policies	8.24
Life insurance	8.25
Indemnity insurance	8.27
Non-indemnity insurance	8.32
Marine insurance	8.34
Insurable interest in the reinsurance context: problem cases	8.37
Law reform	8.42
Formal Requirements of the Contract	8.44
Marine Insurance Act 1906	8.46
Life Assurance Act 1774	8.51
Other types of reinsurance contract	8.52

9. JOINT AND COMPOSITE POLICIES AND REINSURANCE FOR COMMON ACCOUNT

Introduction	9.1
Joint and Composite Policies	9.2
The distinction between joint and composite policies	9.2
Why does the distinction matter?	9.5
Reinsurance for Common Account	9.8

10. UTMOST GOOD FAITH AT PLACEMENT: DISCLOSURE AND REPRESENTATIONS

Role of Placing Information in a Reinsurance Transaction	10.1
Utmost Good Faith	10.4
What is utmost good faith?	10.4
Statutory expression of duty of utmost good faith: sections 17–20 of the Marine Insurance Act 1906	10.12

Extension of principles of Marine Insurance Act to non-marine insurance and reinsurance	10.14
A continuing duty of utmost good faith after placement?	10.17
Duty to be observed by reinsurer as well as reinsured	10.18
Materiality	10.25
What must be disclosed?	10.25
Actual inducement	10.30
A presumption of inducement?	10.36
Materiality in practice: proving materiality	10.46
Materiality in facultative risks	10.49
Materiality in treaty reinsurance	10.50
Decided cases on materiality	10.52
Reinsured's retention	10.53
Validity of retrocession agreement	10.54
Nature of risk underwritten	10.56
Dishonesty and "moral hazard"	10.61
Non-disclosure of fraud committed against the reinsured by its agent	10.65
Arbitrage underwriting	10.70
What need not necessarily be disclosed?	10.74
Facts not known to the reinsured	10.74
Any circumstance which diminishes the risk	10.83
Any circumstance known to the reinsurer	10.84
Information which has been waived	10.86
Materiality and the fronting reinsurer	10.91
When is the Duty of Disclosure Owed?	10.92
Prior to formation of contract	10.92
Where the reinsurer has a right of cancellation?	10.96
On the giving of provisional notice of cancellation?	10.97
Between acceptance and inception?	10.99
Practical issues arising on renewal	10.102
Misrepresentation	10.104
Representation of fact	10.105
Other requirements for a representation	10.108
Continuing misrepresentations	10.109
Practical Effect of the Obligations to Disclose and Not to Misrepresent	10.110
Need for the full facts	10.110
Practical difficulties	10.111
Effect on the slip	10.113
Summary of practical advice to reinsureds and their brokers	10.114
Each underwriter considered separately	10.115
Contracting out of or Limiting Effects of Duty of Disclosure	10.116
Excluding innocent and negligent misrepresentations or non-disclosures	10.123
Excluding the consequences of fraud by the reinsured or his agent	10.125
Excluding the consequences of breach of warranty	10.130
Conclusions to be drawn from <i>Rojak</i> and <i>Phoenix</i> decisions	10.131
Comparing the US approach	10.133
Reinsurance before Insurance	10.135

11. MAKING THE CONTRACT: PLACEMENT	
Introduction	11.1
Placement Methods	11.2
Personal placement	11.4
Electronic placement	11.9
Previous electronic placement initiatives	11.13
Timeline to electronic placement	11.16
New initiatives	11.19
Legal issues arising out of electronic placement	11.24
Other placement methods	11.28
Placing Information	11.31
Common Issues that Arise	11.37
Place where the contract is made	11.37
Jurisdiction/choice of law	11.39
Apportionment of risk	11.40
Evidence of a binding contract	11.41
Access to documents	11.44
Document retention	11.51
Accuracy of placing information	11.54
12. RECORDING THE CONTRACT: THE SLIP AND THE WORDING	
Introduction	12.1
The Slip	12.6
Introduction	12.6
Purpose and contents	12.7
Procedure: broking of the slip and the subscription market	12.11
Types of slip: slip policies, line slips and off-slips	12.22
Slip policies	12.22
Line slips and "off-slips"	12.30
An acceptance or an offer?: the legal effect of an underwriter's subscription to the slip	12.37
The <i>Fennia Patria</i> case	12.39
Leading underwriter clauses	12.46
Conclusions	12.47
Circumstances where underwriter's subscription does not constitute an immediate acceptance	12.48
Variation of terms of slip by underwriter before subscription	12.49
Quotation slips and promised lines	12.52
Reinsurance before insurance	12.56
Premium not agreed at time of subscription	12.59
Acceptance "subject to" certain conditions	12.63
Effect of variations subsequent to an underwriter's acceptance	12.67
Signing down	12.67
The facts of <i>The Zephyr</i>	12.72
Does English law recognise "signing down" as a binding practice of the reinsurance market?	12.80
Did the signing indication limit the reinsurers' liability to the reassureds?	12.81

Does an express signing indication create a legally binding relationship between the broker and the reinsurer?	12.82
Does an implied signing indication impose any binding legal relationship between the broker and the reinsurer?	12.85
What is the extent of the duties owed by the broker to the reinsurer in respect of an express signing indication and how is the reinsurer's loss measured?	12.89
Can the underwriter prevent the broker from signing down?	12.93
Is there any limit to the amount that the broker can oversubscribe?	12.94
Is the broker required to sign down proportionally?	12.96
Is the broker in breach of his duty to the reassured in giving signing indications?	12.99
Conclusion	12.100
Endorsements	12.104
Consideration	12.106
Duty of disclosure	12.110
The status of the slip after the execution of the wording	12.113
Legal problems arising from terminology commonly used in the slip	12.128
Leading underwriter clauses	12.128
"Subject to the same terms and conditions as original"—attempts to incorporate the underlying cover	12.132
The Wording/Policy	12.134
Market Processing of Contractual Documentation	12.149
The Lloyd's market	12.149
The companies market	12.151
13. BROKER'S COVER NOTES	
The Functions of Cover Notes	13.1
Reinsurance Brokers' Cover Notes	13.3
What is a reinsurance broker's cover note?	13.3
Contents of a broker's cover note	13.6
The terms of the placing slip	13.10
Security	13.12
Information	13.15
Signature and checking of cover notes	13.16
Joint Broking Cover Notes	13.18
US Intermediaries' Cover Notes	13.20
The Reinsured's Position with regard to Checking Brokers' Cover Notes	13.21
General	13.21
Contributory negligence by reinsureds with regard to checking cover notes	13.22
Conclusions	13.28
14. CONTRACT CERTAINTY	
Introduction	14.1
The Drive for a Reform	14.2
The FSA's challenge	14.2
Participants in the reform process	14.3
The aims of the reform	14.4

A market need	14.4
Relevance to the contracting parties	14.5
Reception of the reform by the insurance industry	14.7
The Contract Certainty Code of Practice ("CoP")	14.8
Principles and Guidance	14.9
System of control	14.23
Contract certainty and legal considerations	14.24
Contract certainty is no guarantee of contract sense	14.24
Subjectivities	14.25

PART 3—INTERPRETING THE REINSURANCE CONTRACT

15. GENERAL RULES OF INTERPRETATION OF TERMS

Preliminary Issues Concerning Interpretation: What Forum and Whose Rules?	15.1
The Process of Interpretation	15.6
Give effect to the parties' intentions	15.7
Interpret the contract in accordance with the natural and ordinary meaning of the language	15.8
Resolution of ambiguity	15.16
Implied terms	15.19
The efficacy test	15.22
The custom or usage test	15.25
Extrinsic evidence	15.35
Subsequent evidence	15.37
Meaning of express terms	15.38

16. INCORPORATION OF TERMS

Introduction	16.1
"Back-to-Back" Cover	16.10
Attempts to Incorporate Inappropriate or Inconsistent Terms from Original	
Cover into Reinsurance Cover	16.15
Attempts to Incorporate Broader Cover into the Reinsurance	16.26
Subsequent Alteration of Underlying Cover	16.39
Which Underlying Policy is the "Underlying Cover"?	16.46
Incorporation of Particular Terms	16.49
Introduction	16.49
Governing law provisions	16.51
Exclusive jurisdiction	16.63
Warranties	16.66
Period clauses	16.68
Arbitration clauses	16.72
Claims control clauses	16.80

17. TYPES AND CLASSIFICATION OF TERMS

Introduction	17.1
Warranty	17.4
Condition Precedent	17.11
Warranty Descriptive of Risk/Suspensive Condition	17.16

A "Bare" Condition	17.19
"Innominate Terms"	17.20
How Does One Decide into what Category a Particular Term Falls?	17.22
18. COMMON TERMS THAT DELIMIT THE SCOPE OF COVER AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS CLAUSES	
Introduction	18.1
Reinsuring Clauses	18.3
Clauses Limiting the Scope of Cover: Exclusion of Categories of Business	
"Written as Such" or "Unless Incidental"	18.5
Losses Discovered or Claims Made Clauses	18.11
Retentions (and Warranties in respect thereof)	18.20
Exclusion Clauses	18.31
War exclusion clauses	18.31
Nuclear risk exclusion clauses	18.46
Errors and Omission Clauses	18.53
19. DUTIES BETWEEN PLACEMENT AND THE MAKING OF CLAIMS	
Introduction	19.1
The Facts	19.3
The Legal Issue	19.6
<i>Bonner v. Cox</i> : a Difference between Proportional and Non-proportional Reinsurance?	19.11
Questions for Another Day	19.20
Conclusion	19.23
20. CHOICE OF LAW	
Introduction	20.1
The Legislative Framework	20.4
Choice of Law by the Contracting Parties	20.10
Express choice	20.11
Where a choice can be inferred	20.16
Standard form contracts	20.18
Jurisdiction/arbitration clauses	20.23
"Follow London" clauses	20.27
Reform	20.28
Can the parties' express choice be disregarded?	20.29
Choice of Law where the Contracting Parties Have not Made a Choice	20.36
The presumption: the law of the domicile of the "characteristic performer"	20.38
Displacing the presumption: closer connection to another country	20.42
Reform	20.48
What if Insurance and Reinsurance Contracts Covering the Same Risk have Different Governing Laws?	20.50
Drafting Choice of Law Clauses: Practical Guidance	20.60

PART 4—PREMIUM, BROKERAGE AND COMMISSION

21. PREMIUM	
Introduction	21.1
Consideration	21.2
The Amount of the Premium	21.5
The Broker's Liability for the Payment of the Premium	21.10
Section 53 of the Marine Insurance Act 1906	21.11
The application of section 53 to treaty and facultative reinsurance	21.12
Non-marine insurance and facultative reinsurance at Lloyd's	21.18
The fiction	21.26
Non-marine facultative reinsurance in the companies market	21.29
Conclusion	21.33
Effect of the Broker's Liability for Premium	21.35
The reinsurer's position	21.35
The broker's position	21.39
The reinsured's position	21.47
Mixed Lloyd's and companies market placings	21.48
The avoidance of the broker's liability to pay premium	21.52
Payment of Premium	21.67
General	21.67
Payment of premium in the London market	21.68
Late payment	21.74
The legal position	21.74
The Fenton case	21.75
Section 52 of Marine Insurance Act 1906	21.82
The market response	21.84
Types of premium clauses	21.95
Flat premium	21.96
Variable premium	21.97
Premium reserve deposit	21.98
Premium review clauses	21.99
Premium payment warranties	21.102
General	21.102
The Report of the PPIWG	21.110
Non-payment of premium	21.118
Premium Income	21.122
Estimated premium income	21.122
Estimating premium income	21.123
Causes of action	21.130
Premium income limits	21.139
Effect of a breach of premium income limit clause	21.140
Conclusion	21.142
22. BROKERAGE AND COMMISSIONS	
Introduction	22.1
Brokerage	22.3
General	22.3

Liability for payment of brokerage	22.6
The legal position	22.7
The LMBC model Terms of Business Agreement	22.19
Avoiding the traditional problems	22.21
Joint broking and sub-broking	22.23
Accounting for brokerage	22.26
Transparency and disclosure of brokerage	22.28
Time at which broker's entitlement to commission accrues	22.36
Non-payment of commission	22.40
Brokerage payable after reinsured has appointed a new reinsurance broker	22.48
Brokerage: future developments	22.53
Commissions Paid to Cedants	22.57
Flat commission calculated on original gross premium	22.58
Overriding commission calculated on net premium	22.59
Profit commission	22.60

PART 5—LLOYD'S

23. LLOYD'S	23.1
Overview	23.2
The Society of Lloyd's	23.5
Members of Lloyd's	23.10
Syndicates	23.13
Members' agents	23.15
Managing agents	23.21
"Types" of syndicate	23.24
Lloyd's brokers	23.28
"Security of tenure"	23.29
Accounting and reinsurance to close	23.31
Governance of Lloyd's	23.31
The Council of Lloyd's	23.35
The Franchise Board	23.37
The framework of rules at Lloyd's	23.43
Underwriting at Lloyd's	23.43
How business is placed at Lloyd's	23.44
Open market subscription placements	23.46
Prudential oversight of underwriting at Lloyd's	23.55
Security behind contracts of insurance underwritten at Lloyd's	23.55
Capital requirements	23.57
Resources within the Lloyd's market and the protection of policyholders	23.61
Premiums trust funds	23.69
Members' level assets: funds at Lloyd's (FAL)	23.71
Overseas business regulatory deposits	23.73
Central assets	23.77
Disciplinary arrangements at Lloyd's	23.77
Lloyd's Act framework	23.79
Jurisdiction	23.81
Misconduct	

Inquiries	23.83
Enforcement proceedings	23.84
Sanctions	23.87
Appeal tribunal	23.88
FSA and Lloyd's arrangements	23.89
Lloyd's litigation	23.90
Litigation by members against underwriting agents	23.91
Litigation by underwriting agents against members	23.92
Duty of care owed by Lloyd's to members	23.93
Lloyd's statutory immunity	23.94
Judicial review	23.95
Misfeasance in public office	23.96
Compliance with European Community law	23.97
Members resident outside England	23.98
Action by members against the Government	23.101

PART 6—REINSURANCE ALTERNATIVES

24. ALTERNATIVE RISK TRANSFER	24.1
Introduction	24.6
Principle Types of Alternative Risk Transfer Products and Mechanisms	24.6
Financial reinsurance	24.6
Characteristics of financial reinsurance	24.11
Prospective and retrospective covers	24.14
Development of financial reinsurance	24.15
Time and distance policies	24.16
"Rollovers"	24.18
Spread loss contracts	24.19
Run-off solutions	24.21
Multi-line, multi-year and multi-trigger	24.22
New asset solutions	24.23
Insurance risk securitisation	24.28
Insured derivatives	24.30
Contingent capital	24.31
Alternative Reinsurers	24.31
Self-insurance, captives and protected cell companies	24.31
Self-insurance	24.32
Captives	24.34
Protected cell companies	24.36
Sidecars	24.39
Legal and Regulatory Considerations Arising out of Alternative Risk Transfer	24.39
Financial reinsurance: legal considerations	24.39
Is the financial contract a contract of reinsurance?	24.49
Financial reinsurance: regulation	24.59
Financial reinsurance: accounting	24.68
Lloyd's	24.70
Financial reinsurance: tax	24.72
Financial reinsurance: security	

New asset solutions: credit enhancements	24.75
Derivatives	24.77
Are derivatives contracts of insurance?	24.78
Insured derivatives	24.87
Securitisation: Regulatory Concerns	24.89
Products Which Are Intended to Bridge Seamlessly the Reinsurance and	
Financial Markets	24.99
Differences between financial products and reinsurance contracts	24.100
The duty of utmost good faith	24.100
The remedy for breach of the duty	24.105
Warranties and conditions: an explanation	24.109
The consequences of a breach of warranty	24.113
Reform	24.114
Exclusion of Reinsurer's Legal Protections	24.115
Competing obligations of bankers and insurers	24.115
Documenting the Transaction	24.117
Tailor-made transactions	24.117
Tradition for reinsurers to operate on a slip policy	24.120
Drafting wordings for "seamless" products	24.123
Captives	24.125
Duty of disclosure and related issues	24.127
Claims co-operation and control clauses	24.130
Protected cell companies	24.131
Liquidation only in the place of incorporation of the PCC	24.133
Insolvency proceedings only in England	24.135
Insolvency proceedings in both offshore and English jurisdictions	24.136

PART 7—CLAIMS

25. CLAIMS NOTIFICATION, CO-OPERATION AND CONTROL PROVISIONS

Notification of Claims	25.1
What does Notification Entail?	25.2
Timing of Notification	25.7
Notification of circumstances	25.11
Notification of "Loss"	25.15
By Whom Must Notification Be Given?	25.26
To Whom Must Notification Be Given?	25.30
Failure to Comply with a Notification Clause	25.32
Claims Co-operation and Control	25.42
"Follow the Settlements" versus "Claims Co-operation"	25.51
Claims control clauses	25.55
Subsequent developments	25.57
Limits on the Reinsured's Obligation to Co-operate	25.65

26. GOOD FAITH AND CLAIMS

Introduction	26.1
Existence of a Continuing Duty	26.3

Duty Not to Make Fraudulent Claims	26.10
Failure to disclose information in the claims process	26.17
27. CLAIMS ALLOCATION	
General Nature of Allocation Disputes	27.1
Disputing Allocation	27.3
Allocation of Losses to Correct Reinsurance Period	27.19
28. AGGREGATION	
Introduction	28.1
The General Principles	28.6
The Reinsuring Clause	28.7
Event-based clauses	28.7
Cause-based clauses	28.37
A series of "events"	28.50
The Aggregate Extension Clause	28.56
The development of the aggregate extension clause	28.56
The operation of the AEC	28.62
The interpretation of the AEC	28.66
Claims Series Clauses	28.73
One Person and Sole Judge Clauses	28.77
The Hours Clause	28.84
29. LOSS SETTLEMENT PROVISIONS	
Introduction	29.1
Position where no loss settlement provision	29.1
The "tension of reinsurance"	29.3
Follow the Settlements: Full Reinsurance Clause	29.4
ICA v. <i>Scor</i> : the facts	29.7
ICA v. <i>Scor</i> : Court of Appeal decision	29.11
The requirement to act honestly and take all proper and businesslike steps	29.13
Claims must fall within the terms of the reinsurance contract as a matter of law	29.18
Burden of proof	29.27
Must the reinsured provide strict proof of its underlying liability?	29.31
Use of "follow settlements" in treaty insurance	29.36
Qualified Follow the Settlements Provisions	29.39
"Loss settlements binding"	29.39
"Ex Gratia" and Compromise Settlements	29.45
The Wellington Agreement	29.53
Establishing Reinsurer's Liability where the Inwards Contract is Subject to Foreign Law	29.56
Allocation of Loss to Correct Reinsurance Period	29.64
Follow the Fortunes	29.69
Historical development of the "follow the fortunes" clause	29.70
The present position	29.71
The US Position	29.79
The scope of the US "doctrine"	29.82

Implying follow the fortunes into US reinsurance contracts without an express provision	29.117
Follow the allocation decisions	29.126
30. INSPECTION PROVISIONS	30.1
Why Inspect?	30.4
The Basis of the Reinsurer's Right of Inspection	30.4
Express inspection clause	30.5
Implied inspection clause	30.12
Exercise of the Right of Inspection: Legal Issues	30.12
Reinsurer	30.12
Affirmation of the contract	30.18
Effect of delay in exercising right	30.21
Reinsured	30.21
Refusal of right to inspect	30.27
Enforcing inspection where the contract contains an arbitration clause	30.31
Exercising Right of Inspection: Practical Issues	30.31
Conduct of the inspection	30.35
Choice of inspectors	30.38
Confidentiality	30.41
The inspector's report	30.43
The US approach: audits	30.44
Pre-contract audit	30.45
The underwriting audit	30.46
Claims audit	30.47
The English approach to inspections compared with US audits	
31. MARKET PRACTICES AS TO PRESENTATION AND SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS	31.1
General Introduction to the Claims Process	31.6
The Leading Underwriter's Role in the Settlement of Claims	31.7
The nature of the leading underwriter's role: is the leading underwriter the agent of the following market for the purposes of handling claims?	31.20
The London Market Principles and the Market Reform Group	31.30
Treaty business	31.33
"Follow London" Clauses	31.38
The Role of the Broker in Claims Management	31.42
FSA Requirements as to the Claims Management Process	31.44
Accounts and Bordereaux	31.45
Accounts	31.54
Delays in providing accounts or making payments	31.57
Bordereaux	31.65
Electronic Accounting and Claims Handling	31.66
Early electronic claims handling systems and the creation of WISE	31.70
ELASS and CLAMS	31.71
CLASS and the Electronic Claim Form ("ECF") System	31.76
Operation of the systems and possible problem areas	31.80
The Lloyd's Unified Claims Schemes	

The development of the Lloyd's Claims Scheme	31.80
The 1999 Claims Scheme	31.84
The 2006 Claims Scheme	31.88
32. SET-OFF, OFFSET AND FUNDING	32.1
Set-off	32.1
What is set-off?	32.2
Legal set-off	32.6
Equitable set-off	32.12
Set-off and limitation	32.13
Limitation and legal set-off	32.14
Limitation and equitable set-off	32.17
Set-off between principals	32.19
Offset	32.19
What is offset?	32.21
Offset in the London market	32.24
Express authority to offset	32.26
Implied authority to offset	32.31
The dangers of offset	32.36
Practical suggestions for avoiding problems of offset	32.37
Practical suggestions for the broker	32.44
Practical suggestions for the principals to a reinsurance contract	32.46
Funding	32.46
What is funding?	32.47
Types of funding	32.48
Reasons for funding	32.49
Dangers of funding premium	32.51
Dangers of funding claims	32.56
Additional problems with funding	32.59
Recovery of funded claims by reinsureds	32.63
Protecting the broker's position	
33. LETTERS OF CREDIT AND OTHER SECURITY PROVIDED BY REINSURERS	33.1
Introduction	3.5
The Uniform Customs and Practice for Documentary Credits (UCP)	33.5
Development and application of the UCP	33.10
Provisions of the UCP	33.19
The Use of LOCs in connection with Reinsurance Transactions	33.19
Introduction	33.21
The United States	33.32
Procedures concerning LOCs	33.32
General	33.34
The reinsurer and the bank	33.41
Draw-downs	33.42
Amendments to LOCs	33.43
Lloyd's American Trust Fund and Letters of Credit	33.47
Practical Legal Problems concerning Reinsurance Letters of Credit	

Introduction	33.47
English law	33.49
Fraud	33.53
Restraint of payment	33.59
Choice of law and jurisdiction	33.73
Trusts as an Alternative to Letters of Credit	33.78

PART 8—EXPIRY AND TERMINATION OF THE REINSURANCE CONTRACT

34. EXPIRY, EXHAUSTION AND TERMINATION OF THE REINSURANCE CONTRACT

Introduction	34.1
Expiry of the Reinsurance Contract Period	34.4
The duration of the contract	34.4
The practice at Lloyd's in respect of multi-year contracts	34.5
Expiry of the contract period	34.16
"From" a specified date	34.17
"At" a specified date	34.18
"Until" a specified date	34.19
The hour of termination	34.20
Where discrepancies exist	34.24
Extension of the contract period	34.27
Exhaustion of Monetary Limits	34.29
Introduction	34.29
Facultative proportional reinsurance	34.30
Excess of loss insurance	34.31
Aggregation	34.32
Reinstatement provisions	34.34
Contractual Right of Cancellation	34.37
In general	34.37
Cancellation where no cancellation provision exists	34.38
Right of cancellation where the reinsurer becomes insolvent	34.39
Form of notice of cancellation	34.41
Annual contracts	34.43
Contracts that run for more than a year	34.44
Difficulties with provisional notice of cancellation	34.48
Cancellation and the reinsured's ongoing disclosure obligations	34.51
Notice of cancellation at anniversary date ("NCAD")	34.54
Meaning of NCAD	34.54
Use of NCAD	34.55
NCAD as a term on a slip	34.56
NCAD when used by an underwriter subscribing to a risk	34.60
Problems associated with the use of NCAD	34.61
The legal effect of NCAD	34.73
The advantages and disadvantages of NCAD	34.76
NCAD and Lloyd's	34.80
Termination for Breach of the Duty of Utmost Good Faith	34.86
Return of premium following avoidance	34.87

The general rule	34.87
Where there has been fraud	34.88
Interest on returned premium	34.89
Breach of Warranty, Condition Precedent or Fundamental Term	34.94
Breach of warranty	34.96
Breach of warranty: consequences for return of premium	34.104
Condition precedent	34.111
Breach of fundamental term and repudiatory breach	34.113

35. COMMUTATIONS AND NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENTS

Introduction: Terminology and Definitions	35.1
Defining a commutation	35.1
Commutation vs. termination by effluxion of time or cancellation	35.2
Commutation vs. settlement or compromise	35.4
Elements of a Commutation	35.9
Agreeing the sum payable	35.9
Effecting a commutation	35.14
Pre-commutation tasks	35.14
The commutation agreement itself	35.16
Details of contracts involved	35.18
Release	35.19
Payment details and interest payment	35.20
Confidentiality	35.23
Jurisdiction and proper law clause	35.25
Advantages and disadvantages of commutations	35.26
Commutations and run-off	35.31
Recovery of settlements or commuted balances from retrocessionaires	35.33
Commutations and follow the settlements clause	35.36

PART 9—TRANSFER, RUN-OFF AND INSOLVENCY

36. RUN-OFF

Introduction	36.1
Reasons for run-off	36.2
Run-off Strategies	36.6
Objective of a run-off and need for a strategy	36.7
Outsourcing the run-off to an independent agent	36.11
Matters for consideration	36.12
Claims handling function to be fulfilled by appointed run-off manager	36.15
The quantum of claims	36.17
Authority to repudiate liability	36.18
Consistency in claims handling: problems of waiver and affirmation	36.19
Collections from retrocessionaires	36.20
Fixing the run-off manager's remuneration	36.21
Potential VAT implications of appointing an independent agent	36.24
Run-off Options	36.30
Run-off to expiry	36.31
Commutation	36.36

Scheme of arrangement	36.41
Transfer of portfolio	36.44
Reinsurance	36.50
Sale	36.57
Reinsurance Underwriting Pool Run-offs	36.58
37. TRANSFER OF THE REINSURANCE RISK	
Introduction	37.1
Common Circumstances Giving Rise to Transfers	37.4
Statutory Regime Governing Transfers	37.5
Insurance Business Transfer Schemes	37.11
Application to Transfer	37.18
The Regime Following Transfer	37.29
Reinsurance to Close at Lloyd's	37.37
Mandatory terms in RITC contracts	37.39
38. INSOLVENCY PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES IN REINSURANCE	
Introduction to Corporate Insolvency	38.1
Individual insolvency	38.3
Corporate insolvency	38.5
Receivership and administrative receivership	38.6
Administration	38.9
Provisional liquidation	38.17
Company voluntary arrangements with creditors	38.19
Liquidation	38.23
Liquidator's powers	38.29
Effect of liquidation on policyholders	38.34
Proof of debt in liquidation	38.35
Valuing policies in liquidation	38.38
Reduction of insurers' liabilities	38.40
The Financial Services Compensation Scheme	38.41
Role of the FSA	38.44
Accounting issues	38.46
Availability of insurance business transfer schemes	38.47
Insurance claims given priority over claims of other unsecured creditors	38.48
Application of the Reorganisation Regulations to Lloyd's	38.51
Schemes of Arrangement under Part 26 of the Companies Act 2006	38.53
Introduction	38.53
Voluntary creditors schemes	38.64
Objectives of a scheme	38.66
The Reinsurance Company in Liquidation	38.72
Introduction	38.72
Assets and liabilities	38.74
Accounting	38.76
Solutions	38.78
The liquidator and the cedant	38.80
Letter of credit	38.81
Set-off	38.85

Premium reserves	38.92
Loss reserves	38.95
The liquidator and retrocessionaires	38.97
Excess of loss recoveries	38.100
Cut-through clauses	38.123
Dangers of cut-through provisions	38.132
The liquidator and the broker	38.134
Introduction	38.134
Funding	38.136
Offset	38.139
Accounts	38.143
Checking potentially insolvent security	38.154
The Broker in Liquidation	38.155
Introduction	38.155
Premiums	38.157
Claims	38.160
39. CROSS-BORDER INSOLVENCY	
Introduction	39.1
Jurisdiction of English Courts	39.3
Section 221 powers	39.7
Section 426 powers	39.12
PART 10—REMEDIES AND RESOLVING DISPUTES	
40. REMEDIES FOR BREACH OF DUTIES AND CONTRACTUAL TERMS	
Introduction	40.1
General Contractual Remedies	40.4
Discharge of a contract	40.5
Repudiation	40.6
Impossibility created by one party	40.7
Failure of performance	40.8
Specific performance	40.9
Damages	40.11
Contractual Remedies: Reinsurance Contracts	40.15
Discharge of a reinsurance contract	40.15
Specific performance of a reinsurance contract	40.20
Damages for breach of a reinsurance contract	40.21
Remedies for Breach of Utmost Good Faith	40.26
Avoidance for misrepresentation and non-disclosure	40.27
Misrepresentation	40.34
Post-contractual duty of utmost good faith	40.41
Damages for non-disclosure	40.42
Damages for misrepresentation	40.48
Damages for Breach of Duty in Tort	40.57
Breach of duty by an underwriting agent	40.58
Breach of duty by a reinsurance broker	40.60
Contributory negligence and reinsurance brokers	40.64

Return of Premium Following Avoidance	40.70
Breach of Warranty and Condition	40.72
Introduction	40.74
Warranties in reinsurance	40.87
Breach of warranty: consequences for return of premium	40.88
Terms delimiting the risk	40.90
Procedural conditions precedent	40.94
Innominate terms	40.97
Restitution	
41. LOSS OF REMEDIES	
Introduction	41.1
Waiver and Estoppel in Relation to General Contract Law	41.2
Waiver by Election or by Estoppel	41.3
Waiver of the Right to Avoid for Breach of the Duty of Good Faith	41.5
Necessity for full knowledge of breach	41.6
<i>Pan Atlantic v. Pine Top</i>	41.8
Waiver by invocation of contractual right	41.13
Waiver of a Breach of Warranty	41.17
Waiver of a Condition Precedent	41.25
Summary	41.28
42. LIMITATION	
What is a Limitation Period?	42.1
General Rules Regarding Limitation periods	42.3
The standard rule	42.4
Exceptions to the standard rule	42.5
Practical application of limitation rules	42.8
Contractually agreed periods	42.12
Law Commission Proposals	42.15
What Is a Cause of Action?	42.18
Establishing the Date when the Cause of Action Arises	42.20
Contract	42.20
The US position	42.28
Tort	42.31
Latent damage	42.40
Section 14B	42.47
Changing the Date of Commencement: the Effect of Fraud, Concealment or Mistake	42.48
Extending a Limitation Period by Acknowledgment of Debt or Part Payment	42.58
Limitation Periods under Foreign Law	42.60
Limitation Act 1980, Section 35	42.63
How to Prevent Time Running?	42.65
Issue and service of claim form	42.66
Arbitration notices	42.67
Liquidation	42.71
Moratorium or "standstill" agreements	42.72

43. METHODS OF RESOLVING REINSURANCE DISPUTES	
Introduction	43.1
Informal Dispute Resolution	43.5
Arbitration v. Litigation	43.10
The importance of precedent	43.11
Procedural difficulties in arbitration	43.13
Arbitration: the quick result?	43.14
The advantages of expert knowledge	43.18
Confidentiality	43.22
The relative costs of litigation and arbitration	43.24
Joining third parties to the proceedings	43.28
The flexibility of arbitration	43.33
Enforceability of arbitration awards and court judgments	43.36
The ability to appeal	43.40
Conclusion	43.45
Advantages and Disadvantages of Alternative Dispute Resolution	43.47
Advantages of ADR	43.48
Maintains commercial relations	43.48
Quick process	43.51
Cost efficiency	43.52
Confidentiality	43.53
Disadvantages of ADR	43.54
No finality	43.54
Increased costs	43.57
Delay	43.59
Lack of enforceability	43.60
Summary	43.62
44. ARBITRATION PROCEDURE	
Introduction	44.1
Scope of the Arbitration Act 1996	44.8
The arbitration agreement	44.8
Does the arbitration agreement cover the dispute?	44.14
The seat of the arbitration	44.20
Starting the Arbitration	44.24
Limitation	44.24
The arbitration notice	44.28
Service	44.28
Response	44.33
Appointment of the tribunal	44.35
Number of arbitrators	44.39
Qualifications of arbitrators	44.44
Dealing with vacancies	44.52
Considering consolidation	44.53
What law will apply to the proceedings?	44.57
Staying court proceedings in favour of arbitration	44.66
Stays under section 9 of the Arbitration Act 1996	44.66

Stays on other grounds	44.73
Opposing an application for a stay	44.74
Appeal from a decision granting or refusing a stay	44.78
Scott v. Avery clauses	44.79
The Arbitrators	44.81
Remuneration	44.86
Duties	44.88
Removal of an arbitrator	44.94
Resignation of an arbitrator	44.95
Revocation of authority	44.96
Progressing the Arbitration: the Procedural Framework	44.101
Pleadings	44.104
Disclosure of documents	44.106
Witness evidence	44.109
Expert evidence	44.111
Progressing the Arbitration: Interlocutory Hearings	44.111
Case management	44.111
Preliminary meeting	44.111
Dealing with case management disputes between the parties	44.114
Further interlocutory hearings and the pre-hearing review	44.116
Applying for interim relief to the tribunal	44.117
Security for costs	44.118
Striking out proceedings for delay	44.121
Preservation of property and detention of subject matter	44.125
The court's powers in support of the arbitration at the interlocutory stage	44.126
Enforcement of peremptory orders	44.130
Securing attendance of witnesses and production of documents	44.131
Injunctions and similar orders	44.136
Determination of preliminary points of law	44.138
Termination of the Arbitration Agreement Prior to the Final Hearing	44.140
The Final Hearing and the Award	44.144
Conduct of the final hearing	44.144
Outline procedure	44.144
Who may attend?	44.145
Alternative approaches to procedure	44.148
The award	44.150
Formalities	44.153
Remedies	44.156
Effect of a valid award	44.161
Costs	44.170
Enforcement of the award	44.179
Confidentiality of the award	44.183
Challenging the Award	44.189
Lack of substantive jurisdiction	44.194
Serious irregularity	44.196
Appeals	44.203
Effect of foreign governing law on the ability to challenge an award	44.211
Further appeals to the Court of Appeal	44.213

45. LITIGATION IN THE COMMERCIAL COURT	
Jurisdiction of the Commercial Court to Hear Reinsurance Disputes	45.1
Introduction to the Commercial Court	45.3
Legal Representation in the Commercial Court	45.11
Proceedings under the CPR and the Guide	45.12
Pre-action conduct	45.13
Commencement of proceedings	45.15
The claim form	45.15
Service of the claim form within the jurisdiction	45.19
Certificate of service	45.21
Acknowledgment of service	45.22
Service of proceedings out of the jurisdiction	45.24
Disputing the English court's jurisdiction	45.25
Statements of case	45.27
Particulars of claim	45.27
Defence	45.30
Reply	45.33
Summary judgment	45.35
Case management	45.38
Generally	45.38
Case memorandum, list of issues and case management bundle	45.40
Case management conference ("CMC")	45.43
Progress monitoring date	45.45
Preparation for trial	45.46
Pilot scheme	45.47
Practical Application of the CPR	45.48
The early resolution of disputes	45.50
Offers to settle by the claimant	45.51
Offers to settle by the defendant	45.56
Statements of truth	45.60
Witnesses	45.65
Experts	45.67
Introduction	45.67
Duties of an expert	45.73
Expert's report and instructions	45.74
Expert evidence	45.78
Documentary disclosure	45.82
Costs	45.90
Basic Sequence of Events under the CPR for an Action in the Commercial Court	45.93
46. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION	
Introduction	46.1
Types of ADR	46.4
Mediation	46.5
Executive tribunal (or "mini-trial")	46.8
Expert determination	46.10

Early neutral evaluation ("ENE")	46.14
Providers/Mediators	46.16
Provisions for ADR	45.22
Commercial Court provisions/protocols: Commercial Court Guide and CPR	46.22
Contractual provisions for ADR	46.29
Extent of Use of ADR in Reinsurance Context	46.34
Practical Issues in relation to Mediation	46.37
Why mediate?	46.37
Importance of timing	46.41
Selection/appointment/role of mediator(s)	46.47
Preparation for and formalities of successful mediation	46.53
Legal and client representation in mediation	46.67
Identifying, communicating and achieving goals	46.68
Securing settlement/success	46.73
Conclusion	46.80
47. JURISDICTION AND JURISDICTION DISPUTES	
Introduction: Why is Jurisdiction Important?	47.1
The Legislative Framework	47.7
The Brussels I Regulation	47.7
Conventions	47.11
The residual role of the common law	47.16
Jurisdiction under the Brussels I Regulation	47.17
The Brussels I hierarchy	47.17
The scope of the Regulation: civil and commercial matters	47.19
Application to reinsurance	47.21
Arbitration	47.25
Overriding jurisdictional rules	47.31
Jurisdiction agreements	47.36
Exclusive and non-exclusive jurisdiction agreements	47.41
The need for writing	47.43
The courts of a member state	47.45
The defendant's domicile	47.47
Special jurisdiction	47.51
Contract	47.54
Branches/agencies	47.67
Multiple defendants	47.68
Jurisdiction under the Common Law	47.70
Service of proceedings where permission is not required	47.72
Service of proceedings where permission is required	47.74
A good arguable case within CPR rule 6.37	47.78
A serious issue to be tried	47.87
Is England the appropriate forum?	47.88
Challenging the court's decision to grant permission	47.97
Applications to the English court for a stay of proceedings	47.100
Jurisdiction clauses in favour of a foreign court	47.102
Proceedings in a foreign court	47.108
Multi-party proceedings	47.112

The Problem of Concurrent Proceedings	47.113
Concurrent proceedings under the Regulation	47.118
Proceedings in respect of the same cause of action	47.119
Related actions	47.124
Proceedings brought in breach of jurisdiction clauses in favour of another member state	47.125
The need for proceedings in another member state	47.127
Discretionary stays of proceedings and the Regulation	47.130
Stays in favour of a more appropriate foreign court	47.133
Stays where there is a jurisdiction clause in favour of a foreign court	47.136
Anti-suit injunctions	47.139
What amounts to "wrongful conduct"?	47.141
The protection of a legitimate interest	47.145
Are anti-suit injunctions compatible with the Regulation?	47.150
48. EFFECTIVE LITIGATION MANAGEMENT	
Pre-action Conduct	48.2
Management of Documents	48.6
What documents are privileged?	48.12
The Ideal Expert	48.30
Security for Costs	48.34
49. ENFORCEMENT OF COURT JUDGMENTS AND ARBITRATION AWARDS	
English Court Judgments	49.2
Third-party debt orders	49.7
Winding-up proceedings	49.9
Writ of <i>fieri facias</i>	49.12
Application to determine debtor's means	49.14
English Arbitration Awards	49.17
Action on an award	49.18
Section 66 application	49.19
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in England	49.21
Systems of enforcement of judgments	49.25
Principles applicable to enforcement of judgments under common law, Administration of Justice Act 1920 and Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act 1933	49.30
The jurisdiction requirement: determining the validity of foreign jurisdiction	49.31
The jurisdiction requirement: question of the foreign court's jurisdiction	49.37
Risk of not defending foreign action: the American context	49.38
Defences	49.43
Enforcement of judgments of member states of the European Union and EFTA: the Brussels I Regulation, the Brussels Convention, the Lugano Convention and the European Enforcement Order Regulation	49.49
Differences between the Regulation and the common law	49.51
European Enforcement Orders	49.60
The Lugano Convention	49.63
Enforcement of Foreign Arbitration Awards in England	49.65

Methods of enforcement	49.66
Is the award governed by any international convention?	49.67
Principles applicable to enforcement of awards	49.69
50. REINSURANCE DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN THE UNITED STATES	50.1
Reinsurance Law in the US	50.7
Legal Framework for Reinsurance Arbitration in the US	50.12
Arbitration Proceedings	50.12
Commencement of the arbitration	50.14
Panel selection	50.17
The organisational meeting	50.23
Discovery	50.26
Experts	50.27
Pre-hearing briefs and the evidentiary hearing	50.36
Arbitration Award	50.36
The panel's award	50.40
Appeal of an award	50.45
Salient Differences between UK and US Arbitration Systems	
51. REINSURANCE REGULATION, LAW AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN THE PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA	51.1
Introduction	51.5
The Regulatory Framework	51.10
Key principles	51.16
Specific rules	51.24
Basic Principles and Rules of (Re)insurance Law	51.24
Disclosure	51.28
Misrepresentation	51.33
Warranties	51.37
Fraudulent claims	51.38
Claims based on a non-existent insured event	51.39
Claims based on an intentionally caused insurance event	51.40
Partially fabricated/exaggerated claims	51.41
Construction of insurance contracts	51.44
Choice of law	51.50
Choice of jurisdiction	51.51
Dispute Resolution	51.54
Litigation through the PRC courts	51.57
Jurisdictional considerations	51.62
No system of precedents	51.66
Legal representation	51.70
Discovery and evidence	51.75
Privileged documents	51.76
Notarisation/legalisation	51.77
Interim remedies	51.79
Appeals	51.83
Retrial	51.84
Damages	

Costs	51.85
Interest	51.86
Service of foreign proceedings in the PRC	51.90
Time limitation	51.94
Timeline in the courts	51.97
Arbitration	51.99
General	51.99
The arbitration agreement	51.103
<i>Ad hoc</i> arbitrations not recognised	51.107
Arbitral institutions	51.109
Kompetenz-kompetenz	51.112
Selection of arbitral tribunal	51.113
Interim protective measures	51.117
Evidentiary matters	51.119
Making an award	51.124
Setting aside of an award	51.126
Enforcement of foreign arbitration awards	51.134
Mediation	51.138
52. THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE MARKETS IN SINGAPORE AND HONG KONG	
Singapore	52.1
Introduction	52.1
The legal system	52.2
Insurance law	52.6
Authorisation	52.7
Regulation	52.10
Regulatory framework governing intermediaries	52.14
Marine Insurance Act 1906	52.19
Dispute resolution: the current trend	52.20
Enforcement of arbitration awards	52.26
Hong Kong	52.28
Introduction	52.28
The legal system	52.30
Insurance law	52.33
Authorisation	52.35
Regulation	52.38
Regulation of intermediaries	52.43
Marine Insurance Act 1906	52.47
Resolution of insurance disputes	52.48
Enforcement of arbitration awards	52.52

PART 11—PROPOSALS FOR LEGAL REFORM

53. THE ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH LAW COMMISSIONS' PROPOSALS FOR REFORM	
Introduction	53.1
The perceived need for reform	53.1

Past history of attempts to reform	53.2
The structure of the Law Commissions' review	53.3
Driving force behind and aims of the project	53.4
Treatment of reinsurance	53.7
First Joint Consultation Paper	53.8
Pre-contract information (non-disclosure/misrepresentation)	53.10
Warranties and basis of contract clauses	53.15
Pre-contract information and intermediaries	53.21
Cost/benefit analysis	53.29
Issues Paper 4: Insurable Interest	53.30
Indemnity insurance	53.31
Non-indemnity insurance	53.37
The Commissions' proposals	53.40
The potential impact of these proposals	53.44
Critical Issues Arising Out of the Proposals	53.47
The Commissions' Timetable	53.52

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Typical "Fully Developed" Aggregate Extension Clause Included in LMX Outwards Reinsurance Contracts from the Mid-1960s Onwards	991
Appendix B: Public and/or Products Liability and/or Professional Indemnity Claims Series Clause TPX 1986	993

Index

Page

997

TABLE OF CASES

All references are to paragraph number.

AA Mutual Insurance Co. Ltd <i>v</i> Bradstock Blunt & Crawley [1996] LRLR 161 (QB Com Ct)	21.57, 32.29, 32.30
Absalom (on his own behalf and on behalf of all members of Lloyd's Syndicate 957) <i>v</i> TCRU Ltd (formerly Monument Insurance Brokers Ltd) [2006] 2 Lloyd's Rep 129 (CA)	22.18
ACE Insurance SA-NV (formerly Cigna Insurance Co. of Europe SA NV) <i>v</i> Zurich Insurance Co. [2000] 2 Lloyd's Rep 423 (QB Com Ct); <i>affirmed</i> [2001] Lloyd's Rep IR 504; [2001] 1 Lloyd's Rep 618 (CA)	1.142, 1.143, 47.106, 47.107
Adams <i>v</i> Cape Industries plc [1990] Ch 433 (CA)	49.32, 49.33, 49.38-49.43
Admiral C, The [1981] 1 Lloyd's Rep 9 (CA)	32.25, 32.27
Aegeon, The [2002] Lloyd's Rep IR 191 (QB Com Ct); <i>affirmed</i> [2002] 2 Lloyd's Rep 42 (CA)	26.15
Aegis Blaze, The [1986] 1 Lloyd's Rep 203 (CA)	48.21
Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. <i>v</i> Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's London, No. 11867/95, slip op. (N.Y. Sup. Ct. June 9, 1997)	29.97
Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. <i>v</i> Home Insurance Co., 882 F. Supp. 1328 (S.D.N.Y. 1995)	29.79, 29.94, 29.117
Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. <i>v</i> Philadelphia Reinsurance Corp., 1995 U.S. Dist. NEXIS 7742 *9-10 (E.D. Pa. June 6, 1995)	29.94
Aetna Reinsurance Co. (UK) Ltd <i>v</i> Central Reinsurance Corp. Ltd [1996] LRLR 165	1.164, 30.19
Affiliated FM Insurance Co. <i>v</i> Constitution Reinsurance Corp., No. 89-2411, Mass. Super. Ct. September 15, 1998; 416 Mass. 839, 626 N.E. 2d 878 (1994)	15.29-15.33, 29.87
Affiliated FM Insurance Co. <i>v</i> Employers Reinsurance Corp., 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27961 (D.R.I. Sept. 3, 2004); 369 F. Supp. 2d 217 (D.R.I. 2005)	29.134, 29.135
Afia Worldwide Insurance Co. <i>v</i> Deutsche Rückversicherungs AG (1983) 133 NLJ 621 (QB Com Ct)	47.83
Agapitos <i>v</i> Agnew (The Aegeon) [2002] Lloyd's Rep IR 191 (QB Com Ct); <i>affirmed</i> [2002] 2 Lloyd's Rep 42 (CA)	26.15
Aggeliki Charis Compania Maritima SA <i>v</i> Pagnan SpA (The Angelic Grace) [1994] 1 Lloyd's Rep 168 (QB Com Ct); <i>affirmed</i> [1995] 1 Lloyd's Rep 87 (CA)	47.146, 49.52
Agnew <i>v</i> Lansforsakringsbolagens AB [2000] Lloyd's Rep IR 317 (HL)	47.24, 47.57, 47.63, 47.64
AIG Europe (Ireland) Ltd <i>v</i> Faraday Capital Ltd [2007] EWCA Civ 1208; [2007] Lloyd's Rep IR 267 (CA)	25.15, 25.19-25.25, 27.15, 27.16
AIG Europe (UK) Ltd <i>v</i> Ethniki [2000] Lloyd's Rep IR 343 (CA)	16.64, 47.44, 47.65
AIG Europe SA <i>v</i> QBE International Insurance Ltd [2001] 2 Lloyd's Rep 268 (QB Com Ct)	47.44
Airbus Industrie GIE <i>v</i> Patel [1998] 1 Lloyd's Rep 631 (HL)	47.145
Akai Pty Ltd <i>v</i> People's Insurance Co. Ltd [1998] 1 Lloyd's Rep 90 (QB Com Ct)	1.150, 20.11-20.13, 49.35
Aktion Maritime Corp. of Liberia <i>v</i> S. Kamas & Brothers (The Aktion) [1987] 1 Lloyd's Rep 283 (QB Com Ct)	40.73
Al-Naimi (t/a Buildmaster Construction Services) <i>v</i> Islamic Press Agency Inc. [2000] 1 Lloyd's Rep 522 (CA)	44.75, 44.76
Al Wahab, The [1983] 2 Lloyd's Rep 365 (HL)	20.1, 20.17, 20.32, 47.90
Alfred C. Toepfer International GmbH <i>v</i> Societe Cargill France [1998] 1 Lloyd's Rep 379 (CA)	44.80, 47.123
Alfred McAlpine plc <i>v</i> BAI (Run-Off) Ltd [1998] 2 Lloyd's Rep 694 (QB Com Ct); <i>affirmed</i> [2000] 1 Lloyd's Rep 437; [2000] Lloyd's Rep IR 352 (CA)	17.15, 17.20, 25.35-25.37, 25.40, 40.95, 40.96
Ali Shipping Corp. <i>v</i> Shipyard Trogir [1998] 1 Lloyd's Rep 643 (CA)	44.184, 44.185
Allen <i>v</i> Robles [1969] 2 Lloyd's Rep 61 (CA)	41.22
Allendale Mutual Insurance Co. <i>v</i> Excess Insurance Co., 970 F. Supp. 265; <i>modified following reargument</i> , 992 F. Supp. 271 (S.D.N.Y. 1997)	29.111-29.116
Allianz Insurance Co. Egypt <i>v</i> Aigaion Insurance Co. SA [2008] 2 CLC 1013 (CA)	11.43
Allianz SpA, formerly Riunione Adriatica di Sicurtà SpA, Generali Assicurazioni Generali SpA <i>v</i> West Tankers Inc., Case C-185/70, 10 February 2009	47.30, 47.155, 47.156
Allianz Via Assurance & Others <i>v</i> Marchant & Others, Comm Ct, 12 December 1996, unreported	4.26
Allied Marine Transport <i>v</i> Vale do Rio Doce Navegacao SA (The Leonidas D) [1985] 2 Lloyd's Rep 18 (CA)	44.143
Allstate Ins. Co. <i>v</i> American Home Assurance Co., 837 N.Y.S.2d 138 (App. Div. 2007)	29.83, 29.141-29.147
American Accord, The (UCM case) [1982] 2 Lloyd's Rep 1 (HL)	33.50, 33.54

1.75 Section 17 of the Marine Insurance Act 1906 states that a contract of insurance is a contract of utmost good faith. Section 18(1) provides that: "... the assured must disclose to the insurer, before the contract is concluded, every material circumstance which is known to the assured ...". Section 18(2) provides that: "Every circumstance is material which would influence the judgment of a prudent insurer in fixing the premium, or determining whether he will take the risk."

1.76 Section 18(3) provides, however, that in the absence of enquiry, certain circumstances need not be disclosed; namely those: which diminish the risk; which are known or presumed to be known by the reinsurer; as to which information is waived by the reinsurer; and which are superfluous by reason of express or implied warranty.

1.77 In *Pan Atlantic Insurance Co. Ltd v. Pinetop Insurance Co.*¹ the House of Lords set out to define "material" in the context of non-disclosure in a reinsurance contract. The effect of the decision is that a reinsurer can avoid for non-disclosure and/or misrepresentation of material facts if it can prove:

- (a) that the mind of a prudent underwriter would have been influenced although it need not be shown that it would be decisively influenced—a prudent underwriter would have taken the matter into account but would not necessarily have acted any differently (for the purposes of establishing the attitude of a prudent underwriter reference is usually made to the evidence of an independent expert underwriter); and
- (b) that the non-disclosure induced the actual underwriter. In the event that the actual underwriter is not available to (or cannot) give evidence, there is a presumption of inducement, i.e. it is presumed that in the event of a material non-disclosure, the reinsurer relied on it. It is up to the reinsured to prove that the reinsurer did not. This is a difficult presumption to rebut.

1. [1994] 2 Lloyd's Rep 427.

1.78 The Court of Appeal applied the *Pan Atlantic*¹ test for "materiality" in *Brotherton v. Aseguradora Colseguros SA (No. 2)*.² In this case, it was held to be irrelevant whether or not newspaper reports alleging corruption by officers of a bank in whose favour professional indemnity policies had been written by the reinsured subsequently turned out to be without substance. In ascertaining whether or not disclosure should have been made to the reinsurers, the relevant question was whether these matters would have been regarded as material by a prudent reinsurer and would have been likely to have induced him to act differently, at the time of placement. The appellant was wrong in contending that an allegation, which could affect an insurer's decision to write a policy, was material only if it was true.

1. [1994] 2 Lloyd's Rep 427.

2. [2003] 2 All ER (Comm) 298.

1.79 *Brotherton* was later distinguished by the Court of Appeal in the case of *Drake Insurance plc v. Provident Insurance plc*.¹ In *Drake* an attempt was made by an insurance company to avoid a motor policy. The insured had renewed his motor policy without declaring on his proposal form a speeding offence. He also incorrectly declared a separate incident involving his wife who was a named driver. At first instance, Moore-Bick J held that a court should not be allowed to overturn an avoidance where, with hindsight, the facts relied upon are shown to be unfounded or immaterial. However, the majority

of the Court of Appeal, allowing the appeal, instead held that on the facts of the case, the insurance company was not induced by the non-disclosure of the speeding conviction and, on those grounds could not avoid cover. Clarke LJ commented that on the facts of this case as they were known at the renewal date, the speeding conviction was not material to the reasonably prudent insurer. However, *Brotherton* was followed by the Commercial Court in *North Star v. Sphere Drake*² and the High Court in *Norwich Union Insurance Ltd v. Meisel*.³

1. [2004] 2 All ER (Comm) 65.

2. [2005] 2 Lloyd's Rep 76.

3. [2007] 1 All ER (Comm) 1138.

1.80 In *Assicurazioni Generali SpA v. Arab Insurance Group (BSC)*¹ the Court of Appeal also commented further on the requirement of "inducement". It was confirmed as a key principle that the matter which was misrepresented or not disclosed must be the effective cause of the underwriter entering the contract, but it need not be the sole cause. Clarke LJ noted that if the reinsurer would have entered into the contract on the same terms anyway, the representation could not, however material, be the effective cause of the making of the contract.

1. [2002] EWCA Civ 1642.

1.81 What is the duration of the obligation? Section 18 clearly states that the obligation of disclosing every material fact exists before the contract is concluded. The reason for this is quite simply that the reinsured will know considerably more about the subject matter of the reinsurance, and indeed the subject matter of the original insurance, than the reinsurer and the purpose is to ensure that the reinsurer is given as fair and accurate presentation of the risk as possible in order to evaluate whether it wishes to underwrite it. Therefore if the reinsured becomes aware of facts which are material after the conclusion of the contract, it is under no obligation to disclose those to the reinsurer.

1.82 Case law has investigated what continuing duties of good faith (if any) an insured has once the contract has been concluded. In *Manifest Shipping Co. Ltd v. Uni-Polaris (The Star Sea)*¹ the Court of Appeal determined that the failure of the claimant to disclose certain material reports after conclusion of the contract did not provide any remedy or right to the reinsurer to avoid the contract, although the assured was under a continuing duty not to make fraudulent claims. This duty continued until litigation was commenced, at which point the rights of the parties became regulated by the courts and the contractual duty ended. A differently constituted Court of Appeal returned to this issue in *K/S Merc-Skandia XXXXII v. Certain Lloyd's Underwriters*.² Longmore LJ concluded that:

- (i) The continuing duty of good faith had no application to fraudulent claims. Rather the rationale for defeating such claims was that the assured could not profit from his own wrong.
- (ii) Duties of good faith arose when the assured sought to increase or extend the risk or in "held covered" cases. The right to avoid only arose in respect of the variation or "held covered" and not the original insurance. These duties were in fact pre-contractual matters governed by pre-contractual principles and not, strictly speaking, part of any continuing duty of good faith.
- (iii) Where the insurer had a right to information under the terms of the policy, then the assured had to act with good faith in relation to the provision of that information.

1. [2001] Lloyd's Rep IR 247 (HL).
2. [2001] 2 Lloyd's Rep 563.

1.83 In English law, the only sanction available to a reinsurer for a non-disclosure of a material fact is to avoid the contract *ab initio*, i.e. from the beginning. It is an all or nothing remedy; there is no half-way house, such as damages or an increased premium as in many continental jurisdictions. Any premium already paid is returned to the reinsured, who in turn has to return any claims payments received from the reinsurer.

CLAIMS

1.84 In general terms reinsurance premiums tend to be lower than those charged by insurers for the same risk, because the reinsurers hope that they can cut out certain overheads and administrative costs, and indeed the costs of a claim unless they are specifically included. Reinsurers do not wish to become involved, in many cases, in the settlement of a claim by a reinsured, and prefer to rely upon the integrity and professionalism of the reinsured when it settles a claim and then requests an indemnity from the reinsurer. To avoid the necessity for the reinsured to re-prove the claim to its reinsurer, a clause was developed many years ago whereby the reinsurer simply pays and essentially trusts its reinsured to underwrite its portfolio of business and adjust claims professionally, called a "follow the settlements" clause. A typical "follow the settlements" clause as it might appear in a facultative reinsurance contract is as follows: "Being a reinsurance of and warranted same gross rate, terms and conditions as and to Follow the Settlements of [the reinsured]."

1.85 Although at first sight this clause may appear straightforward, its meaning and effect have caused considerable disagreement between reinsureds and reinsurers. Reinsurers sometimes consider they should still have the right under the clause to review the reinsured's settlement of the underlying claim. However, in *Insurance Co. of Africa v. SCOR UK Reinsurance Co. Ltd*¹ the Court of Appeal held that the effect of the clause was that the reinsurer was bound to follow the settlements of its reinsured subject to two conditions which are known as the "two provisos":

- (a) As a matter of *fact*, that in settling the claim the reinsured had acted honestly and had taken all proper and businesslike steps in making the settlement.
- (b) As a matter of *law*, that the claim paid by the reinsured to the original insured falls within the risks covered by the policy of reinsurance.

1. [1985] 1 Lloyd's Rep 312.

1.86 If these two provisos are satisfied, the reinsurer is bound to follow the reinsured's settlement (but only up to the reinsurance policy limit) where there has been either a compromise of liability or quantum or both. In particular, the reinsurer cannot seek to go behind the reinsured's settlement of the original insured's claim and it must rely on the reinsured's professionalism.

The first proviso: The reinsured has acted honestly and has taken all proper and businesslike steps

1.87 In most cases, on the production by the reinsured of its records and claims in proper form, a settlement made by the reinsured of an original claim will be presumed to be both honest and businesslike. If either of these elements is challenged by the

reinsurer, the onus of proof is on the reinsurer to show that the original settlement was not in fact honest or businesslike.

1.88 In *Charman v. Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance plc*¹ the court was asked to consider whether the obligation to act in a businesslike fashion was satisfied simply by appointing a reputable loss adjuster. It was decided that the appointment would have to be in a businesslike fashion, i.e. would have to be of a competent firm and the reinsured must act in a businesslike fashion when settling the claim in the light of the report.

1. [1992] 2 Lloyd's Rep 607.

1.89 The case of *Assicurazioni Generali SpA v. CGU International Insurance plc*² also dealt with the question of the scope of the obligation to behave in a "business-like manner". A reinsurance contract was made by declaration to an open cover. A term in the contract required payment "to follow without question the settlements of the Reassured.". The reinsured argued that the words "without question" meant that the only limitation on the reinsurer's obligation to follow the reinsured's settlements was that the reinsured should not have acted in bad faith. However, the court did not consider that these words relieved the reinsured of its implied obligation to take all proper and businesslike steps in relation to any compromise of liability or amount with respect to the original claim. It held that the significance of the words 'without question' was to emphasise that if the reinsured admitted or compromised an issue of liability on a basis which fell within the risks covered by the contract of insurance as a matter of law, the reinsurers could not go behind the settlement, but were bound by it, even if they were able to prove, following a trial of the issue, that there was in fact no liability. The decision in the Commercial Court was subsequently confirmed by the Court of Appeal.²

1. [2003] EWHC 1073 (Comm).
2. [2004] 2 All ER (Comm) 114.

The second proviso: Claims must fall within the terms of the reinsurance contract as a matter of law

1.90 Although it will be assumed that the reinsured has acted in an honest and businesslike manner as a matter of fact, the reinsurer is nevertheless entitled to insist that claims paid by the reinsured fall within the terms of the reinsurance contract as a matter of law. It is this aspect that continues to cause reinsureds and reinsurers to differ. Before turning to the most important cases in this area, it is necessary to consider the distinction between issues of fact and issues of law.

1.91 Assume that an insurance policy expires at midnight on a particular Saturday night. A burglary occurs sometime on Saturday night but it is not clear whether the burglary took place before midnight on Saturday or in the early hours of Sunday morning. If the reinsured can point to any circumstance which properly indicates that the burglary took place before midnight, then it is entitled to say that the loss is covered by the policy as a matter of fact. If, however, there is a condition precedent in the policy requiring the premises to be protected by a burglar alarm, and the facts are that the insured had installed a burglar alarm at his home but that at the crucial time the alarm was not functioning properly, a dispute may arise between the reinsured and reinsurer over the meaning of the word "protected", and the reinsurer may argue that the burglary is not covered as a matter of law because at the relevant time the premises were not properly "protected" and the condition precedent was therefore not fulfilled.

1.92 In *Hiscox v. Outhwaite* (No. 3)¹ the reinsurance agreement considered by the court was in excess of loss form, and contained the usual "ultimate net loss" clause whereby the reinsurer agreed to pay the reinsured unlimited sums in excess of the reinsured's ultimate net loss (retention) of \$7,500,000. The ultimate net loss was (as is generally the case) defined in terms of sums actually paid by the reinsured, including legal costs. The reinsuring clause provided that the reinsurance agreement was "subject to the identical periods, terms, clauses, conditions and warranties as contained in the original policies . . . and in all things falling within the scope of this agreement the Reinsurers shall share to the extent of their interest the fortunes of the reinsured." This provision was supplemented by a further clause which required the reinsured to exercise due diligence in dealing with its liabilities, subject to which all reasonable compromises and settlements (including *ex gratia* settlements) were to be "unconditionally binding" on the reinsurer. It was common ground that the combined effect of these clauses was to produce a "follow the settlements" obligation on the reinsurer. This case concerned the liability of the reinsurer for payments made by the reinsured under the "Wellington Agreement", which settled coverage disputes in the United States between asbestos producers and their insurers by allocating a percentage of the total liability to each producer, irrespective of whether that producer had been named as a defendant by a claimant and irrespective of whether that producer could have been legally liable to that claimant. Its purpose was to reduce the overall cost of asbestos settlements.

1. [1991] 2 Lloyd's Rep 524.

1.93 The arbitrator found that the reinsurer was not liable for Wellington Agreement payments made by the reinsured which were not based on any legal liability, although the reinsurer was liable for reasonably agreed settlements in respect of claims *actually* made against the reinsured. In support of this ruling, the reinsured claimed that the reinsurer was liable for all claims which had been settled in a reasonable fashion; the reinsurer, however, argued that it could only be liable for sums paid out under legal liability.

1.94 Mr Justice Evans considered the *SCOR* ruling,¹ and derived from it three principles applicable to "follow the settlements" clauses.

- (a) The reinsurer is only liable for those losses which fall within the reinsurance agreement itself.
- (b) If the terms of the reinsurance are identical with those of the original insurance policy, the reinsurer is able to plead by way of defence that claims met by the reinsured *without legal liability* are not binding on the reinsurer and thus do not fall within the reinsurance agreement, and this remains so despite the presence of a "follow the settlements" clause and despite the fact the reinsured has acted in a reasonable and businesslike fashion.
- (c) However, by way of exception to (b), the reinsurer is bound to follow the reinsured's reasonable settlement of a disputed claim, and cannot subsequently seek to establish that the reinsured would not have been found liable for that claim had the matter proceeded to litigation i.e. if the reinsured *could* have been liable, that is enough.

1. [1985] 1 Lloyd's Rep 312.

1.95 Applying these principles, Mr Justice Evans held that the arbitrator had been correct in holding that the reinsurer was not liable for payments made by the reinsured

to persons towards whom the reinsured plainly faced no legal liability. However, the reinsurer was liable for payments made by the reinsured where the reinsured was either liable in law to make payment or at least arguably liable to do so.

1.96 *Hill and Charman v. Mercantile & General Reinsurance Co.*¹ arose from the appropriation by Iraqi forces of aircraft belonging to Kuwait Airways during the Gulf War. The original insurers made a single \$300 million payment to Kuwait Airways on the basis that the loss of all the aircraft constituted one event under the terms of the contract. The claimant reinsurers settled claims in respect of the inwards reinsurances written by them on the basis that such claims represented one loss which had occurred on the date of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. The claimants then made corresponding claims on their outwards reinsurance contracts underwritten by M&G. M&G resisted the claim on a number of bases including the fact that it regarded the loss of each aircraft as a single event. They also argued that on the facts the losses occurred subsequently in 1991 at a time when at least some of the relevant outwards reinsurance contracts had expired. There was no issue as to the proper and businesslike conduct of the reinsured. The defence was put on the basis that the payments were not covered either under the terms and conditions of the original insurance or under the terms and conditions of the reinsurance contracts.

1. [1996] 1 WLR 1239 (HL).

1.97 The dispute centred upon interpretation of the "follow the settlements" clause incorporated in all the reinsurance contracts, which is a clause commonly found in reinsurance excess of loss contracts, and reads as follows:

"All loss settlements by the reassured including compromise settlements and the establishment of funds for the settlement of losses shall be binding upon the reinsurers, providing such settlements are within the terms and conditions of the original policies and/or contracts . . . and within the terms and conditions of this reinsurance."

1.98 Lord Mustill, giving the leading judgment of the House of Lords, stated that the conflict inherent in reinsurance, namely the need to avoid an investigation of the same issues twice as against the need to ensure that the integrity of the reinsurer's bargain is not eroded by an agreement over which it has no control, is easily managed where the insurance and reinsurance are on the same terms and the parties are essentially co-adventurers. The problems become more acute when the terms of policies are different, so that a claim under the direct policy may not require the determination of an issue crucial to liability under the reinsurance, or the reinsurance is of another reinsurer, at one or more removes from the direct cover.

1.99 Lord Mustill stated that there are only two rules, both of which are obvious. The first is that the reinsurer cannot be held liable unless the loss falls both within the cover of the policy reinsured and within the cover created by the reinsurance. The second is that the parties are free to agree on ways of proving whether these requirements are satisfied.

1.100 He went on to distinguish this case from *ICA v. SCOR*¹ on the grounds that the "follow the settlements" clause in dispute in this case specifically required claims under the outwards reinsurance to be within the terms and conditions of the original policies and the outwards reinsurance. Thus the decision appears to be binding authority only so far as this particular clause is concerned.

1. [1985] 1 Lloyd's Rep 312.

1.101 However, the court made it quite clear that the numerous variations of these clauses and their differing application under different types of reinsurance contracts made it confusing and fruitless to lay down general principles. Each contract should be considered separately. The language used by Lord Mustill was guarded and it is difficult to distil all relevant principles relating to "follow the settlement" clauses. Lord Mustill refused to analyse in detail the correctness or general applicability of *ICA v. SCOR*. He simply said that it did not apply in this situation. Lord Goff, who had analysed and clarified the two provisos in *ICA v. SCOR*, did not comment at all.

1.102 It is probably correct to say that the second of the provisos in *ICA v. SCOR* remain important where insurance and reinsurance agreements are worded differently in any significant respect, but one interpretation of Lord Mustill's comments that has been put forward is that where the wordings of the direct policy and the indirect policy are the same, unqualified "follow the settlement" clauses may well remove the reinsurers' protection under the second limb of *SCOR*. The basis for this theory is that a reinsurer should not be entitled to rely on questions of law as to the meaning of its own contract when exactly the same questions have been considered and resolved by the reinsured under the direct policy, which had produced a bona fide, honest, proper and businesslike settlement with the direct insured. Whilst this clearly has some merit and indeed may be commercially desirable, it fails to take into account the second of the Evans principles in *Hiscox v. Outhwaite (No. 3)*¹ which clearly states that if the reinsured is not legally liable to pay a claim, such a claim would not be binding and would not fall within the reinsurance agreement.

1. [1991] 2 Lloyd's Rep 524.

1.103 It seems that on any interpretation the distinction drawn in *ICA v. SCOR* between questions of fact and questions of law remains intact and that any reinsurer is entitled to argue that as a matter of law the claim does not fall within the policy of reinsurance. The requirement that the settlement falls within the terms of the reinsurance contract is well demonstrated by the case of *Wasa v. Lexington*.¹ A US court held that Lexington was liable to indemnify its insured, Alcoa, in respect of all property damage which had occurred between 1942 and 1986 even though the period of insurance was between 1 July 1977 and 1 July 1980. Lexington paid Alcoa \$103m in settlement. Lexington had back-to-back facultative reinsurance with Wasa. The reinsurance, governed by English law, contained a follow clause and was for the same period. The House of Lords held that Wasa was not bound by the settlement because the period clause in the reinsurance is of fundamental importance; Wasa had agreed to reinsure Lexington in relation to Alcoa's property between 1 July 1977 and 1 July 1980 only, and the reinsurance could not be construed as a matter of English law as if it provided cover in respect of damage whenever it occurred.

1. [2009] 2 Lloyd's Rep 508 (HL).

1.104 The case of *Commercial Union v. NRG Victory*¹ is also worthy of note. In this case, Exxon made two claims against its insurers in Texas for the costs of clean-up after the *Exxon Valdez* disaster. Insurers repudiated the two claims and finally agreed a substantial settlement of one claim in the expectation that they would lose and on the second claim the matter went to trial and insurers lost. Insurers had purchased excess of loss protections which contained the "follow the settlements" clause in the same form as *Hill v. M&G*²; that is to say that it was made clear that any settlements to be followed had to fall

both within the original policy and the contract of reinsurance. Insurers then sued reinsurers in London for an indemnity in respect of the settlement which they had agreed in Texas. They relied upon evidence from their Texas attorney who admitted in an affidavit that the settlement might have been outside the cover of the original policy but made it clear that the judge and jury in Texas were either unlikely to appreciate the legal arguments or would simply be biased against the insurers, who would probably lose and end up paying a higher figure than the settled claim.

1. [1998] 2 All ER 434.

2. [1996] 1 WLR 1239.

1.105 The reinsurers defended the claim on the basis that the insurers must prove that they were liable for the loss under the original policy of insurance, so that even if the Texas court had given judgment against insurers, that judgment would not in itself prove that there had been a loss under the original policy. They also argued that the evidence of the Texas attorney could not amount to proof of insurers' liability under the original policy, however prudent the insurers' decision to settle might have been. The matter went to the Court of Appeal who accepted reinsurers' argument that the evidence of the insurers' attorney did not establish liability under the original insurance, and insurers would not be permitted to recover in reliance upon it. However, the Court of Appeal made it clear that a judgment of a court or arbitration panel in favour of the insured was conclusive proof of insurers' liability under the original policy, provided four conditions were met:

- (a) the foreign court had jurisdiction;
- (b) the original judgment was not obtained in breach of a clause giving exclusive jurisdiction to some other court;
- (c) the reinsured took all proper defences;
- (d) the judgment was not manifestly perverse.

1.106 Thus a judgment on the original insurance policy appears now to be conclusive evidence of the liability of the insurer, which it can rely upon in claiming against its reinsurers.

TRIGGERS AND AGGREGATIONS

1.107 What triggers the process leading to payment of a claim by a reinsurer? The simple answer to this is "a relevant loss within the terms and period of the reinsurance".

1.108 A problem that can arise is that the duration of a contract of reinsurance does not always fit exactly the duration of an underlying contract of insurance. There are three main formulae for ascertaining which policies of insurances are covered by a contract of reinsurance and which should be contained in the contract.

1.109 The first is on a "policies issued" or "risks attaching" basis whereby original policies issued by the reinsured during the period of the reinsurance fall within the reinsurance cover, which then covers any loss under that original policy. A reinsurer could therefore find itself liable for losses which become apparent years after the reinsurance policy period expires.

1.110 Secondly, the "losses occurring" basis can be used. Provided the date of the relevant loss falls within the reinsurance treaty period, it will be covered. Needless to say,

this type of reinsurance can give rise to problems where the exact date of loss cannot be ascertained with any degree of accuracy.

1.111 Finally, there is the "claims made" basis of reinsurance which covers all those claims made within the reinsurance period. Unlike the two previous bases, this last form covers losses where the exact date of the loss may not be known at all.

1.112 In the past, the insurance market has sometimes assumed that when an insurer takes out reinsurance then, unless the contract specifically states otherwise, the intention of the parties is to reinsure back-to-back with the original insurance.

1.113 When the Lloyd's Names' losses began to gather momentum, however, reinsurers' and insurers' attention became focused on the differences in wording of their respective policies. This led to disputes over cover, with some reinsurers claiming that in fact there were gaps between the cover of insurer and reinsurer, thus affecting their liability.

Originating cause/event/occurrence

1.114 In the case of *Deeny v. Gooda Walker*¹ the underwriters of four syndicates, which were managed by two Gooda Walker companies, underwrote excess of loss contracts which resulted in enormous losses to the Names involved. This was primarily because the underwriters failed to understand the peculiarities of the LMX spiral or to appreciate its likely ramifications. As a result, the syndicates sued the two Gooda Walker companies responsible for managing their underwriting and recovered damages for negligence.

1. [1994] CLC 1224.

1.115 The next case, which followed on from *Gooda Walker*, was that of *Cox v. Bankside*.¹ This case was brought by the errors and omissions insurers ("E&O insurers") responsible for covering the damages awarded in *Gooda Walker*. The E&O insurers wanted a declaration from the court as to whether the many losses sustained by the Names could be said to stem from one or more (and if so how many) *originating causes*.

1. [1995] CLC 180.

1.116 In the E&O insurers' policy, a cap on liability was included for a series of losses arising from one originating cause. In the event more than one originating cause existed, that cap would necessarily be multiplied by the number of originating causes (subject to a limited number of reinstatements of the policy indemnity), amounting to a substantial difference in the amount due to the insured under the policy.

1.117 The Names' losses in *Gooda Walker* stemmed from contracts underwritten by three underwriters. In *Cox v. Bankside*, the managing agents argued that each of the underwriters was a separate originating cause, resulting in the liability cap never being reached and the damages awarded against them in *Gooda Walker* being fully recoverable. The E&O insurers, however, argued in favour of one originating cause, which would cap the recovery.

1.118 The court ruled in favour of the agents, finding that there were three originating causes; one for each of the three underwriters. In so doing it purported to follow the previous decision of *Caudle v. Sharp*¹ in which the court was concerned with the underwriting of 32 separate contracts by one underwriter, who had negligently failed to appreciate the risk of asbestosis. The court in that case had held that the 32 contracts

arose out of "one event" within the terms of the reinsurance covering the underwriter's E&O insurers.

1. [1995] LRLR 80.

1.119 The decision in *Caudle v. Sharp* was reversed on appeal, but the point about it in relation to *Cox v. Bankside* was that Phillips J had taken as read the fact that "event" in *Caudle* was the same as "originating cause" in *Cox v. Bankside*. It was not until this particular issue arose in *Axa Re v. Field*,¹ the final chapter in the Gooda Walker story, that it was definitively dealt with.

1. [1996] 1 WLR 1026 (HL).

1.120 In *Axa Re* the E&O insurers, having paid out on the basis of the decision in *Cox v. Bankside*, turned to their reinsurers for an indemnity. The E&O insurers' cover was phrased so as to embrace a claim or a series of claims arising from *one originating cause* whereas Axa's reinsurance policy covered a loss or losses arising out of *one event*.

1.121 Axa wished the court to establish whether the two phrases meant the same thing and, if not, how many events had arisen for the purposes of the reinsurance. Axa's view was that notwithstanding the fact that there may have been three originating causes, an event was something different and, in their view, there may have been as many events as there were individual LMX contracts underwritten by the Gooda Walker underwriters.

1.122 The House of Lords ruled that an event was not something which could be characterised as a continuing state of affairs (for example ongoing negligence), whereas an originating cause could be so characterised. An event was something which happened at a particular time, at a particular place and in a particular way. In other words, an event was a more constricted concept than a cause, which was a term designed to allow for the widest possible basis for aggregation of claims.

1.123 The stance taken by Lord Mustill in *Axa* regarding the meaning of the phrase "originating cause" was followed by the Court of Appeal in *Municipal Mutual Insurance Ltd v. Sea Insurance Co. Ltd*.¹ This case involved facultative excess of loss reinsurance contracts which covered the reinsured's interest in certain legal liability policies. The conditions of the reinsurances were expressed to be the same as the original policies and it was stated that a single limit of indemnity applied to "all compensation payable to any claimant or any number of claimants . . . in respect of or arising out of all occurrences of a series consequent on or attributable to one source or original cause". Under the legal liability policies, the reassured (the Port of Sunderland) was required to compensate owners of excavators stored at the port which had been vandalised due to successive acts of independent individuals over an 18-month period. The court held that the reinsured was entitled to make an aggregate presentation of the loss, on the basis that there was a clear unifying factor in the history of the losses, namely the want of care of the port authority. Following the "ordinary use of language", these were a series of occurrences attributable to a single source or original cause.

1. [1998] Lloyd's Rep IR 421 (CA).

1.124 Similar issues of aggregation have arisen in cases relating to E&O coverage in respect of pension mis-selling. In *Lloyds TSB General Insurance Holdings Ltd v. Lloyds Bank Group Insurance Co. Ltd*¹ a clause in an E&O policy provided that a "single act or omission, or a related series of acts or omissions" would be treated as a single third-party claim, and

thus subject to a single deductible. At first instance, the Commercial Court considered that the real and effective cause of the third-party claim was the failure of management to adequately train its sales staff. The individual instances of mis-selling were the result of a single act or omission, and could therefore be aggregated in respect of the deductible. The Court of Appeal, considering *Caudle v. Sharp*,² took a different approach, saying that the words "act or omission" referred to failures by the individual sales consultants to provide best advice to policyholders. Nonetheless, these were a related series of acts or omissions under the express words of the policy, and a single deductible did apply. However, the Court of Appeal decision was subsequently reversed by the House of Lords.³ The House of Lords held that the relevant "act or omission" had to be one which gave rise to civil liability. The mere absence of a training or monitoring system was irrelevant in this regard as civil liability would not arise unless such a system was breached. Therefore, although the claims may have arisen from the same underlying cause, the relevant acts or omissions in this case were a series of separate instances of mis-selling. On proper construction of the contract, the Court of Appeal was wrong to say that this was a "related series" of acts or omissions: this was because each claim was attributable to a particular breach of the rules and did not result from all or some of the breaches taken together.

1. [2002] 1 All ER (Comm) 42.

2. [1995] LRLR 80.

3. [2003] 4 All ER 43.

1.125 In a similar context in *Countrywide Assured Group plc v. Marshall*¹ it was held (applying *Axa Re v. Field*²) that individual cases of mis-selling were attributable to one source or cause, namely Countrywide's failure to ensure a proper system of training. Nonetheless, the claims could not be aggregated in this case as the policy expressly provided for claims to be subject to a claim by claim excess. Given the commercial background to the contract, and the fact that it was widely known that pensions had previously been mis-sold, there was no reason why the court should not give effect to the express words of the contract.

1. [2003] 1 All ER (Comm) 237.

2. [1996] 1 WLR 1026 (HL).

1.126 It is often assumed that "event" and "occurrence" have the same meaning. As a matter of English law, *Scott v. Copenhagen Reinsurance Co. (UK) Ltd*¹ indicates that these words will generally be viewed as synonymous, unless the context dictates otherwise. In practice, the wording of given contracts may sometimes suggest a distinction between the two terms, for example, where the definition of "loss" refers to "all losses and/or occurrences and/or series of losses and/or occurrences arising out of one event".

1. [2003] 2 All ER (Comm) 190; [2003] Lloyd's Rep IR 696.

Mismatch between underlying policy and reinsurance cover

1.127 There may have been a presumption in the market that the underlying commercial purpose of the parties to any reinsurance contract was that there would be back-to-back cover i.e. that the reinsurance was intended to mirror and provide cover for the underlying policy. However, in *Axa Re v. Field*¹ the House of Lords held that, in the context of a treaty excess of loss reinsurance of a liability account, it is wrong to assume

that where the underlying insurance contract and the reinsurance contract both contain provisions which allow losses to be aggregated, the parties are likely to have intended the effect of those provisions to be much the same. An excess of loss treaty covering a direct insurer's whole account (i.e. a reinsurance covering the whole portfolio) is not in any real sense back-to-back with the underlying individual insurance policies (although the position might be different with proportional or facultative reinsurance).

1. [1996] 1 WLR 1026.

1.128 The position is even more problematic where the underlying policy (and, therefore, its aggregation provisions) is governed by a different law from the reinsurance contract. For instance, the policies in question in the *Silverstein*¹ litigation were governed by New York law. If some of the reinsurance policies that are likely to be affected are governed by English law, then even if the underlying policies and the reinsurance policies contain the same or similar aggregation language, the definition of an occurrence/event under New York law may be different from the definition under English law. For instance, if inwards claims of any nature are settled under New York law on the basis that they constitute multiple occurrences/events, but English law holds (or is likely to hold) that a one-occurrence approach is appropriate (or vice versa), a question will arise as to whether the reinsured is precluded from aggregating those losses as arising out of one occurrence/event and presenting them to reinsurers as a single loss. In other words, is the reinsured entitled (irrespective of whether or not there is a "follow the settlements" clause) to look at the question of aggregation afresh?

1. *Swiss Re v. World Trade Center Properties LLC*, Civ Action No. 01 CV 9291 (Judge Chin).

1.129 The reinsurer faces a similar question too. It might equally argue that, irrespective of the number of losses paid under the underlying contracts, it is liable only in respect of a single aggregate loss at reinsurance level.

1.130 The judgment of Mr Justice Moore-Bick in *ACIC v. INSCO*¹ is informative. In that case, claims against 14 directors and officers were settled by payment of a global sum which was then allocated (for the purpose of the D&O policy) in equal amounts between the 14 individuals. The insurer presented its claim to its reinsurer as one claim. The reinsurance policy provided, among other things, that:

"The liability of the Reinsurer hereunder shall, in all instances, follow the liability of the Reinsured for business the subject matter hereof . . . [Article V.3]

The liability of the Reinsurer shall follow that of the Reinsured in every case and shall be subject in all respects to the general and special stipulations, clauses, waivers and modifications of the Reinsured's policy [Article XIX]."

1. [1996] LRLR 407.

1.131 Moore-Bick J held that the effect of these articles was to preclude the insurer from presenting claims to its reinsurer on a different basis from that on which it settled under the underlying policy. Moore-Bick J went on to say:

"One of the primary purposes of these articles is to bind the reinsurer to the acceptance by the reinsured of liabilities under the underlying policies. A liability does not exist in a vacuum, however; it is owed to a particular person or persons and arises out of particular facts. If the reinsured has accepted or settled a claim on a particular basis, art. XIX makes that binding as between him and the reinsurer; it is not open to the reinsured to pursue a claim against the reinsurer on the basis that the liability was incurred on a different basis. Having settled 14 claims,