Meeting Minutes –I&RS Review Board

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION
Meeting Name:	DTCC I&RS Review Board
Facilitator	Jeanann Smith
Scribe	Jeanann Smith
Date & Time:	January 5, 2021
Location:	Conference Call

Advisory Group Attendees

NAME	GROUP
Karen Mottley	ACORD
Lalitha Nagarajan Monica Avery	AIG
Bryan Fort	Albridge
Carol Albright	Allstate
Wendy Crane Michele Reece	American-Equity
Travis Misslin	Ameriprise Financial
Monica Clancy	Ameritas
Scott Roskilly Jonna Sandegren	Athene
Mark Watermiller Kelly Dinville	Brighthouse Financial
Kevin Lowe	Broadridge
Yolanda Austin	Bulldog
Amy Dingman	Cetera
Christine Phuong	Citizens Securities
Cathy Weidman Eric Kerns Jentry Miller Nick Remy Alex Boettger	Cuna Mutual
Dawn Maffiolini	Delaware Life
Jeanann Smith Cory Stark Jon Volpe	DTCC
Suzanne Dorman Saul Herrera Bryan Holland	EBIX
Ryan Brown Krysti Spohn Chris Adams	Edward Jones

Alicia Watkins Daniel Surber Richard Sutphin	Fidelity & Guaranty
Jennifer Yerly Brenda Brown-Morris Vicki Dees Christine W. Evans	Genworth
Michael Sceifres	Great American
Steve Burk	Insurance Designers of Kansas City
David Desrocher Katherine Dease	Insurance Technologies
Andrew McMorris Jay Rottenberk Adam Ducorsky Dave Lamphere	Ipipeline
Dan Falco Rolando Rodriguez Tina Jorge	John Hancock
Rob Hosier Dan Wilson	Lincoln
Teresa Celsi	Mass Mutual
Carol Steele Angie Thompson	Merrill Lynch
Sarah Baraff	M Financial
Joe Wengler	Morgan Stanley
Nick Jellings	National Western
Matt Myers Eric Dulaney	Nationwide
Matt Sullivan	New York Life
Nidhi Mehra-Kumar	Ohio National
Joe Procacini Liz Moore Danny Smith	Pacific Life
Mike McCombs Chad Turner	Principal
Amy Hamilton Susan Sanders	Protective
Mike Syrett	Prudential
Kristina Miller	Raymond James
Lindsey Kniebel	RBC
Carissa Dove	RW Baird
Michelle Path	Sammons Financial
Yusef Carrillo	Securian
Jeff Barnett	SE2
Shaya Scher	Simkowitz Co

Shelley Wallace	Stifel
Ryan Hoffman	
Kathi Carter	
Chani Lu	Symetra
Brian Gossman	TransAmerica
Emily Cole	
Fran Forslund	
Truda Wodke	
Rosario Paget	
Dan	
Michelle Pasker	United Life
Matt Brant	Venerable Annuity
Zack Dunkin	
David Krawczyk	Voya
Janina Buldrini	
Sharon Macken	
Angelique Faucher	
Molly Walter	
Jonas Hellie	Wells Fargo
Carolyn Palmer	
Ben Daniels	
April Grover	
Laura Mancini	WS Financial

Meeting Minutes

Enhancements Re-Reviewed:

None

New Enhancements to Review:

IPS00660 – IFW – Increase Address Object Occurrences

Currently the Policy Inquiry (115) Response and Policy Administration (113) non-financial message schema supports only one occurrence of the Address object within Party. This limits the carrier from being able to provide all of the addresses for the party on their admin system and limits the ability to add or update multiple addresses through the IFT web service.

Ebix is requesting the 115 Response and the 113 Request/Response messages be modified to allow up to three address occurrences for the Party. This will include three address types (home, business and mailing.)

This enhancement was approved. However, there is an outstanding question for DTCC to review and determine impact to the IFT Access platform. IFT Access supports the data capture for Broker/Dealer of Record (& Custodial) changes, which are translated into a 113 message to the carriers.   DTCC will bring back to the review on the February call to let them know of the research and then we can determine if this will be added to the Access platform as well.

<mark>Enhancement Approved for September 2021 release</mark>

IPS00661 – IFW – Add ArrangementKey Property

Ebix is requesting that the Cancel Request/Response message be modified to include ArrangementKey property. Currently arrangement key is available in the Values Inquiry response and arrangement request and carriers use this value to track the arrangement for their admin systems. However, the arrangement key is not available in the cancel request message schema so it cannot be passed when a cancel is initiated. This can cause some manual touch points for the carriers to process the appropriate arrangement requested for cancel. If the carrier supplies an arrangement key (property is optional) for the values inquiry response the best practice is to include the same arrangement key value for the 107 request and cancel request to identify the arrangement update.

This enhancement was approved. The Cancel message does not include Arrangement object or any child properties. DTCC will review the Arrangement (107) message to support all additional child properties, as optional, as needed.

DTCC will include the following optional properties along with the ArrangementKey property.

If Holding.Arrangement object is present (otherwise optional), then Holding.Arragement.ID and Holding.Arrangement.ArrangementKey is required.   We will also add Holding.Arrangement.ReferenceNo but will be optional.

This will be added to both Arrangement (107) response and Withdrawal (105) response messages to be consistence with the Cancel message.

<mark>Enhancement Approved for September 2021 release</mark>

Discussion Items:

This is a reminder that DTCC will not be holding a Spring (March) 2021 enhancement release.   There were no submitted enhancement requests that were not handled as part of the regularly scheduled code list releases.   The next code list release is scheduled for January 14th (PSE) and January 21st (Production).

The two new code additions will impact the Positions and Valuations (POV) file.

DTCC Revised Saturday Processing Schedule

Just a reminder, the new Saturday processing schedule will be going into effect on Saturday, January 16th.   DTCC will be sending out a reminder email to the User Group & Review Board, along with a link to the Important Notice a8952 with the details of this change along with the updated I&RS processing schedule.
https://www.dtcc.com/legal/important-notices?subsidiary=NSCC&category=Insurance+and+Retirement+Services&year=2021&pgs=1

CAT/REP Confirmation

When DTCC made the necessary modifications to remove the usage of Producer PII data from our services back in September 2020, it was determined that there may a need to modify an edit when the carrier sends back a CAT/REP confirmation.

DTCC is noticing several CAT/REP transactions being rejected after the recent modifications to the Agent record due to the September 2020 enhancement release. Due to business reasons, DTCC is supporting the passing of the producer's SSN on the CAT/REP transactions within the Agent record, along with the NPN and/or CRD.   On the confirmation coming back from the Carriers, inbound to DTCC, the edit does not allow the Carrier to send back the producer's SSN.   This is regardless if the CAT is being ACK (acknowledged), hard (HRJ) or soft (SRJ) rejected. The agent information is not passed to ACATS, so it is not needed even if the Carrier is rejecting the transaction.

Today, in the insurance data file received from ACATS, there is no CRD or NPN – since ACATS does not support these fields (at this time.) When the CAT transaction is created by I&RS to the carrier, there is a producer SSN and there will not be a CRD or NPN in the Agent Record.   However, I&RS edits expects the CAT confirmation to have one of these. If the Carrier is rejecting they may not know.

Several carriers on the call indicated they are removing (or blanking out) the agent identifier submitted on the reject and sending back the NPN and/or CRD that was submitted as part of the transaction request. This is for both CAT and REP confirmations. Since there is no CRD or NPN this is causing the CAT rejects.

It was determined that an edit needs modified to allow producer's SSN back from the carrier when the transaction type (7033) = CAT and the transaction status (7035) = Hard Reject (HRJ) or Soft Reject (SRJ). If Acknowledged (ACK), it will require a NPN and/or CRD to be present and no SSN will be allowed.   DTCC will submit an enhancement request, for audit purposes, to be reviewed during the February 2021 call.

LNA Training Vendor File

Currently, DTCC has six training vendors who send training updates, via a simple CSV data file. DTCC takes this information and creates Training Updates (TU) transactions to the 'receiving' contra firm. This will be for both carriers and brokers.

A training vendor is looking to not support the passing of the agent's SSN number. However, as part of the work completed by the clients in 2019, it was requested that the SSN continue to be supported on the 'vendor' file for business reasons. The vendor wants to send blanks and send the NPN instead. Today due to DTCC's edit, we are forcing the training vendor to pass all zeros (000000000) in the agent SSN field. It has been requested for the carriers to go back to their licensing teams to confirm the support of sending blanks, if the vendor does <u>not</u> have a valid SSN to send.

The following question/feedback request will be sent to the clients. We will discuss proposed solution on the next call.

Question: Do you require the producer's SSN on the inbound training update transaction? If you don't, are all zeros or nines acceptable or would you rather receive blanks (or spaces)?

Next Call:

Tuesday, February 2nd, 2021 at 2:00 – 3:30pm ET