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ETHAN GOW, Avondale Underwriting
Associates, 1000 Elm Street, Suite 1900, Manchester, New Hampshire, 03101, after having been first duly sworn, testified on his oath as follows:

MR. HOUGHTALING:
This is John Houghtaling on behalf of the Plaintiffs. And this is the deposition of an officer, director, employee, agent, and/or representative of Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's, London, subscribing to policy number
AVS011221002 designated by Certain Underwriters
at Lloyd's, London pursuant to Article 1442 of
the Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Sir, can you tell me -- it my
understanding that you are being produced as a
representative of Certain Underwriters at
Lloyd's?
A. Yes. That is correct. I have been
produced here to discuss with you the questions in the 1442.

And I have been produced on behalf of the syndicates that are part of the program of this placement.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And you have seen the 1442 deposition, I presume?
A. I have seen it. Yes.
Q. Okay. And if we could bring it up on the -- do you have a copy of it in front of you?
A. I'm sorry. I'm working on one screen today. I do have it. But, unfortunately, if I look at it, I lose you.
Q. No problem. No problem. I'm going to have my assistant here try to put it up.

And as we -- tell me your name, please?
A. My name is Ethan Gow.
Q. And can you spell that for me?
A. Ethan, E-T-H-A-N, and the last name is Gow, G-O-W.
Q. Yeah. I'm jealous you have got an easily spelled name. Really simple.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And, sir, who do you presently work for?
A. I work for Avondale Underwriting Associates.
Q. So you don't work directly for Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's?
A. No, sir.
Q. Okay. And what is the relationship of Avondale to the Certain Underwriters?
A. Sure.

So Avondale is an MGU, which is managing general underwriter, on behalf of several markets. Some of those markets include Lloyd's, London syndicates.
Q. And where are you based out of?
A. Manchester, New Hampshire.
Q. All right. So here is the 1442
deposition. I'm just going to the Notice.
Let me go through it and just make sure
we have got the right person, that you are the
person with the most knowledge here that can help us answer some of these questions. Okay?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Number 1, the underwriting process in the issuance of a Lloyd's Property and Business Income (extra expense) policy, and any other policy.
A. I can help you with that.
Q. Okay. The forms available in putting together a Lloyd's manuscript policy.
A. Yeah. So we don't -- Avondale does not issue a Lloyd's manuscript policy.

So, you know, in specific to this question, I wouldn't have any knowledge of a Lloyd's manuscript policy.
Q. What about the forms that the Certain Underwriters used to put together this policy?
A. Yes. The ISO forms, yes, I can help you with that.
Q. Okay. Number 3, the communications or submission with any State Department of
Insurance, including Louisiana, regarding insurance coverage and related rates.
A. Yeah. So Avondale, in regards to this policy, it is an excess and surplus lines policy. So, Avondale does not have any -- we do not file any coverage or rates with the -- with any state, including the State of Louisiana.
Q. Are you familiar with the communications by the author of the form policy?
A. No, I am not.
Q. All right. Number 4, any endorsements or forms utilized by Lloyd's to exclude any physical loss or damage caused by a virus.
A. I can speak to the forms that Avondale has available.
Q. When you say "Avondale has available,"

1 what do you mean?

They all may view this differently, so I can't speak to that specifically. But in regards to this policy, I can certainly explain, you know, how Avondale put together this form.
Q. Great. The frequency -- let's see. The method or guidelines utilized in determining which policies include an endorsement or form excluding physical loss or damage caused by a virus?

## A. Sure.

I can explain that as it relates to Avondale, yes.

## Q. Sure.

The differences in policy rates, which include and do not include certain exclusion, including any exclusion of a physical loss or damages caused by a virus.
A. I can explain that.
Q. Okay. Let me see. Wait. Let me go through.

All right. So if it is okay, I'm going to ask you some questions about Lloyd's, London in general, how it works.

And I'm going to preface this by saying,
I'm going to apologize upfront if I ask what
seem like stupid questions or that I don't know what I'm talking about. So I am going to preface that upfront and apologize in advance.
A. No problem.
Q. Okay. What I want to understand is basically how Lloyd's, London works in how the policy was constructed with the deal that was made with my clients, in general how that is done. And then we will get to how it worked or didn't work in this case. Okay? Fair enough?
A. No problem.
Q. Okay. So explain what Lloyd's, London is. You have done a little bit of it. But, for the Record, if you will do that.
A. Sure.

And I will just speak generally. I'm sure if someone were to -- you know, would have specifics, it may be different.

But, you know, just from a general
perspective, Lloyd's, London is a corporation that manages a group of what they call syndicates.

It sounds sinister, but it is not. It is a group of 100 plus carriers that provide insurance across industries around the world.
but you essentially have to post assets to be able to be a part of Lloyd's so that they know that you are going to pay claims.

And then there is certainly a designation of the lines of business that you are going to write.
Q. You sign by-laws?
A. I would -- I mean, I would assume so. I mean, again, I have never filled out -- I'm not privy to that application process, but I would assume it is not easy.
Q. And you said that there are designated lines of business. Can you describe that?
A. Sure.

So, in our case, Avondale writes commercial property with some of the syndicates of Lloyd's, London.

But, certainly, Lloyd's, London writes all different types of business from general liability, workers' compensation, event insurance, terrorism.

So, I mean, they -- I mean, Lloyd's, London is -- they essentially write -- anything that you can think of that can be insured, they will write it.
Q. Okay. Now, Avondale, the company you work for, is not a direct member of Lloyd's, London, is it?
A. No, sir.
Q. You help members buying the policies, I guess, put together policies?
A. Yeah. So, essentially, what we are contracted to do is distribute, underwrite, and then issue a policy on their behalf.
Q. All right. Now, are there different categories in a syndicate of membership? That is a bad question.

When a syndicate -- what is a syndicate?
Let's start there.
A. It is just -- it is -- honestly, it is
just a synonym for a carrier. So their
insurance companies are called syndicates. A member of Lloyd's is called a syndicate.

So it is just synonymous with being an insurance carrier that is part of Lloyd's, London.
Q. And in this policy there are several syndicate members, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that is typical?
A. Typical to an MGU?
Q. Yes.
A. You know, again, we have several Lloyd's carriers. But we have domestic carriers. We have European carriers. We have different carriers.

So, I mean, certainly, you know, Lloyd's, London is probably the most -- the most easily named carrier that an MGU would have.
Q. And describe the process. I am a
business in New Orleans, and I want business interruption coverage covering my business.

How do I go -- walk me through the process of how it happens that I end up with a policy with a group of syndicates.
A. Sure.

Again, I can only speak to this specific policy and how it was placed. And then also I can certainly only speak to how Avondale would -- you know, how you get coverage through Avondale.

So this particular program is only accessed through a wholesaler. So if you are a business in New Orleans, you would go to your local agent, a retail agent who would then --
you know, by law, they have to try to procure insurance from an admitted market or a standard market, which is a more highly regulated, highly oversight -- it has high oversight within the state.

If you get declined with your standard market -- and, again, declinations don't necessarily mean you are doing anything wrong. Declination can be simply that you, you know, are in a location -- as you know in the past couple of months in Louisiana, it has been difficult and challenging from a hurricane perspective. So, you know, a standard market or admitted market may want to -- may not want to take on that exposure.

There are certain -- you could be a class of business. You know, just if you are a woodworker, there are certain -- you know, there may be a standard carrier that wouldn't want to take on that exposure.

So the insurance agent, you know, would be a licensed professional who would go out there and try to procure coverage from an admitted market.

If they were not able to procure
coverage from an admitted market, they would go to a wholesaler to then access the excess and surplus lines market. And that is how you would access Avondale.

And that is how Avondale would then
assign different syndicates to this particular program.
Q. Okay. So, as a business, I first go to a retail broker, correct?
A. Yeah. Retail agent. Sure.
Q. Retail agent. Sorry.

I go to a retail agent. That is -- you
corrected me. Thank you.
The proper term would be, I would go to a retail agent, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that agent would then go to a U.S. wholesale broker?
A. Correct. After a number of -- after some declinations where they were not able to procure coverage through the standard markets and they wanted to pursue a surplus lines policy.

That is how you gain access to Avondale, and that is generally how you would gain access
to a Lloyd's, London syndicate.
Q. Okay. But Avondale is not a U.S. wholesale broker, is it?
A. No, sir.
Q. So you would go to a U.S. wholesale broker. And then what? Then that U.S. wholesale broker, as my understanding is, they go to a London broker?
A. They could go to London directly. There are wholesale brokers in the United States that do have access to Lloyd's, London carriers directly.

Other wholesale brokers may choose to -they, essentially, are a second sales -- they are, essentially, another distribution channel for that account.

So, you know, just as the retail agent shopped that account around his insurance carriers, the wholesale broker would then shop that account around his surplus lines carriers. And one of those surplus lines carriers may be Lloyd's syndicates, and also that would include Avondale.
Q. Okay. And so is there a way where the U.S. wholesale does not go to the London broker?
A. The only way you can access Lloyd's, London syndicates directly is to go through a London broker.
Q. Do you know if that is what happened in this case?
A. I don't know.
Q. All right.
A. Well, sorry. On this policy --
Q. On this policy.
A. -- the Lloyd's, London carriers were
accessed through Avondale.
Q. The Lloyd's, London carriers were accessed through Avondale?
A. Through our --
Q. So there is not a London broker involved?
A. Well, I don't know if the wholesaler
went to a London broker prior to coming to us.
But, no, we -- no, we do not go through a London broker.
Q. So explain the process of after it gets
to you. If you know, in this matter, explain
how it got to Avondale, and then what happened?
A. Yeah. So the wholesale broker would
send it to many different insurance carriers,
and also probably other MGUs, as well, you know, operations set up similar to us.

I mean, we are one of maybe multiple hundreds of different MGUs that are spread across the country.

Every MGU is a little bit different in the carrier capacity and the eligibility requirements for a certain program.

So the wholesale broker may send it to another 10 or 15 places to try to get it placed that look similar to Avondale.
Q. Okay. And --
A. And so -- sorry. Go ahead.
Q. Oh, no. Go ahead. This is helpful.
A. Good.
Q. So, I'm learning.

So the U.S. wholesale broker, you said they would send "it." And I assume "it" is a package of information?
A. Correct. So, yeah.

If you are -- again, if you are that
business in New Orleans, you would have worked with your insurance agent to come up with an application.

It is sort of a standardized application

1 of eligibility that that insurance agent would have sent to his admitted market.

And then he would have then passed that along to the wholesaler, as sort of their sales packet to try to sell the risk to the surplus lines market.
Q. Yes. And then what is contained in that packet of information?
A. Yeah. So, in general, that package
would contain -- you know, in the instance here, we are talking about a commercial property policy.

So what we would be looking for is an insurance application very similar to something that would be presented on an ACORD application.

So it is, essentially, just, you know, named insured, mailing address, some information about the locations being insured, some values, any specific operations that are going on at each location, coverage that is being desired, limits that are being desired.

And then, you know, sometimes we get that information on an Excel spreadsheet that makes -- it, you know, makes everything in life easy to have things in Excel. And then loss
A. Well, I mean, it is on a case-by-case, but, no. I mean, in general, it is -- again, you know, the insured can suggest things.

And, you know, it is different than the admitted market. The wholesale market has the right to, you know, include or exclude things as they see fit.
Q. Yeah. And do you know any specifics in this particular matter how that was done?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Okay. All right. And then so take me through.

The packet of information gets to either a London broker or to an MGU, such as Avondale. Then what happens?
A. So the general underwriting process begins for acceptability.

So, you know, again, we are underwriting a commercial property in this particular case. So, again, we are looking through that packet of information.

We are making a determination as to whether, one, the class of business is a class of business that is eligible for our program; if the limits are eligible for our program; if the
runs, so if there had been previous losses from years prior.

And then anything -- again, it is a sales pitch from the agent to the wholesaler to us. So anything else that would help them sell us to write that risk could be included.
Q. All right. And other than -- let's take a scenario that we have here, business interruption.
A. Sure. Okay.
Q. And I outline and I give you the
information of my business, my income. I give you information of the limits, I assume, that I am seeking.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And my loss history.
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. In that packet of information, do I propose any terms of the policy?
A. Yes. So, you could -- you could suggest which deductibles you would like to see; what valuation you would like to see; and, again, the limits you would like to see.
Q. Other than that, any more specificity in general than that?
desired deductibles are eligible for our program; the loss history, is that eligible for our program; is the location eligible for our program.

If all those things sort of get checked "yes," so then you would do some passive reviews online. You know, again, online has a lot of information nowadays where you can Google things and determine, you know, some ancillary things that may help you in the underwriting process. There could be a back and forth between the wholesale broker regarding questions.

And then, ultimately, it will end up in a proposal for insurance, which will then be passed along to the wholesale broker, who is a licensed professional, passing it on back to the insurance agent, the other licensed professional, who then is going to give it to the insured.

So Avondale would never -- we are two people -- two insurance professionals removed from the insured.
Q. Yes. Okay. When you say "our program," you are talking about Avondale, as the MGU, correct?

```
the insured.
```

A. Correct. bought? our markets. say yes or no. quote.
Q. Not an insurance program, correct?
Q. Okay. And when you say "our program," am I correct that what you mean is, it kind of fits the profile of prescreening of something that you can likely bring to market and get
A. That is correct. Yeah. I mean, as an MGU, we have the authority to bind on behalf of

So, again, I just -- I'm not correcting you, but I'm just saying, you know, we wouldn't go back to Lloyd's or we wouldn't go back to any of our carriers. They give us the authority to
Q. Okay. When you say you bind it, what do you mean that you bind it, and when does the binding process happen?
A. Sure. So Avondale would put together a

That quote, again, would get passed on to the wholesale agent, who is passing it back to the retail agent, who is passing it back to

There is a -- there could be a
negotiation in limits, premium, terms. If it is accepted, the quote, then we are given a bind order from the agent, who then gives the bind order to the wholesale broker, who then gives the bind order to Avondale, at which point we bind the contract with a formal -- I mean, it is going to sound redundant here, but it is called a binder.
Q. I got it.
A. So it is, essentially, just a placeholder until the policy is issued.

So that binder, again, we are going to run it right down the chain, again, back to the insured, so that they can choose to accept the binder, make sure everything -- they have that chance to review it. And then it stays there until the policy is issued.
Q. So when you talked about the initial
bind, you are not talking about the binder saying where Avondale is the MGU who is binding the insurance?
A. I'm sorry. Can you say that one more
time, please?
Q. When you initially said that "we get
things together and we bind it," you did the initial, but then there was another process where there was an actual binder.

The first process you talked about, the bind, that is not where -- Avondale isn't standing in there as the insurer?
A. Well, Avondale -- we do have authority
on behalf of our markets to bind business as
part of a contractual piece that we have with
our insurers, that we bind business on their behalf.
Q. At some point?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. All right. So I want to get -- I
want to sort of drill down, if it is okay, in understanding the process very, you know, specifically of the deal that gets negotiated, okay, between my client and the market.
A. Understood.
Q. So we have in this particular case, we have got a retail agent. All right. And then that retail agent gets to a U.S. wholesale broker, and then the U.S. wholesale broker gets to Avondale?
A. You got it.
Q. Okay. Now, does Avondale have direct contact with the -- do they make direct contact to the managing agents of these syndicates?
A. No, sir.

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Okay. You become the managing agent?
A. Well, the managing agent -- again, I'm just -- managing agents generally -- I'm just going to kind of go with your -- we are an MGU, so a managing general underwriter, as opposed to an MGA, which is a managing general agent.

The difference generally being is that MGUs do not have claims authority. So we don't have claims authority on this program. So, again, I'm just -- I think I am sort of get what you are saying.

But just from a -- like, we wouldn't consider ourselves an agent of Lloyd's.
Q. Okay. How does Avondale -- once the package of information gets to Avondale, how does Avondale go to the market to shop it?
A. We don't. So we are -- again, we are
given the underwriting authority on behalf of our markets, which includes some Lloyd's syndicates, to underwrite, quote, bind without going back to them, as long as it fits within the program authority.
Q. Okay. So they have a certain amount of program authority that they give you, and they let you handle all? They outsource that to you?
A. Yes. As long -- again, as long as it fits that criteria.

Anything outside of that criteria does require going back to them, but that is -- that is not what we do.
Q. Okay. And my understanding is sometimes you have a lead member that initially buys off on it, and then they go to the market and they fill the remaining percentages?
A. Yeah. So, again, our program is pretty
well diversified. We will have probably 20
different carriers on a single policy, of which
I think, if we are speaking to this specific policy, which is all I can do, is say that there are 11 Lloyd's syndicates on this policy out of 17 total carriers on the policy.
Q. And in this particular process, is it
A. No. No.
Q. No. Okay. Explain that.
A. No. That is a master -- so it is a master slip that is done on an annual -- that will run on an annual basis. And that is a slip between Avondale and its carriers.
Q. And that is what was done in this case?
A. Sorry. Can you just -- you are breaking up --
Q. Is that what was done in this case?

That is how this policy was written?
A. No. This policy was written on an Avondale program through a previously agreed to line slip with our carriers.
Q. All right. So explain to me the back and forth between Avondale and the wholesale broker with regards to the negotiation or the terms of the insurance. Explain how that worked.
A. Sure. Yeah. I mean, there is far more negotiation on the surplus lines side of the business, primarily because it is mostly unregulated; whereas, an admitted market would have -- you know, an admitted market carrier would have to -- what you said earlier, would
that you analyze the risk, you put things -- do you put a slip together? I've heard something about a slip.
A. Yeah. So I think --
Q. Is there a slip?
A. -- what you are actually talking about is how we -- how Avondale gets its capacity to put this together.

So that process would involve a slip where, you know, again it is a -- we have a contract with each of our different carriers.

And those contracts are called slips.
Again, there is some verbiage, you know, that is, you know, more insurance than it is sort of contractual.

But it is, essentially, just the
contract between Avondale and the insurance
carrier, again, to do what I spoke of before,
which is, essentially, underwrite on their
behalf within a certain set of eligibility guidelines.
Q. Is that --
A. The --
Q. Is that -- sorry. Is that slip done per risk?
file forms. They would be filing rates. They would be filing deductibles.

So, essentially, the pricing between a Liberty Mutual and a Travelers isn't hugely different.

Whereas, on the surplus lines side of the business, there is huge variation between coverage forms. There is huge variations between premiums, deductibles.

So the negotiation can be a little bit more because different MGUs and then different surplus lines carriers will have completely different views of risks and how it fits their portfolio.

So the negotiation, generally, as you could probably guess, focuses mostly around price. But in areas like Louisiana, where this policy was issued, where there is a catastrophe exposure by way of a named storm, hurricane, certainly there is a deductible issue there where there is usually some negotiation around what types of deductibles get used to cover that peril.
Q. Okay. And so take me through the process, the initial process, and then how the
specifics of the policy are formed of the deal.
A. Sure.
Q. Take me through that. If you can walk me through sort of from the beginning. There is a packet of information, I assume. I want this kind of limits. I want business interruption coverage in this particular area. And then it gets more specific?
A. Yeah.
Q. Take me through the process of how that works.
A. Sure. So just to be clear, too, you
know, we don't issue stand-alone business interruption coverage.

So I know sort of what you are getting at, but it is part of a commercial property policy that may or may not include business interruption.

So we wouldn't be issuing -- Avondale does not issue business interruption only policies.
Q. Understood.
A. But for the purposes of this, so we would come up -- we would evaluate the risk. We would determine how it fits into our portfolio.

Again, speaking to Louisiana, you know, we are mostly concerned about the catastrophe exposure that the hurricane peril presents. So we would -- we would see how that peril fits into our portfolio.

We have some underwriting guidelines internally that we use around acceptable deductibles based on where the location is, possibly what the construction of the building is, the age of the building. So, essentially, things that maybe make it better or worse in regards to that specific peril.

And then the pricing will go up or down depending on that. The same with the deductible; it will go up or down depending on those characteristics.
Q. Okay.
A. Those characteristics -- sorry. Go ahead.
Q. No, no, no. Go ahead. Go ahead. This is helpful. I don't mean to interrupt you.
A. Yeah. So those characteristics will then, you know, get put into a proposal back to the wholesaler and say, you know, Listen, here is where -- here is where we think Avondale is
likely to be on this presented risk.
This is -- we will lay out the pricing.
We are going to lay out your deductibles. We
are going to lay out the limits and the valuations that we would feel comfortable with.

And then they have the opportunity, you know, to accept that quote or, you know, likely with all contracts, you can counter. And then that would come back, back up through the chain, to us, and we decide whether we would want to do that or not.
Q. Okay. And when you say "we" and "accept it" and the rest of it, you are doing it on behalf of a group of trusted investors that you have a contract with?

MR. MILLER:
Objection. Objection to the form of the question.

MR. HOUGHTALING:
What is wrong with that, Allen?
MR. MILLER:
You can answer.
You called it -- you said he is doing it on behalf of a group of investors. I think he has already testified he is doing it on
behalf -- he has the authority himself. He doesn't have to go back to the investors. EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Okay. So you have a -- you have a contract with a group of investors, correct?
A. Again, terminology, I'm not trying to wipe it here, but --
Q. No, no, no. Please. I want specifics.

I'm a contract lawyer, so I likes -- specifics is my thing. I like it.
A. You got it. So they are not really -they are not investors. They would provide risk
capital to us to -- again, to utilize on their behalf under the contracted program rules.

So, again, I just don't want the term that they are investors. They are not investors in Avondale, by any means.
Q. Understand. They are not investors.

I guess when I use the term "investors," when I'm using the term, I mean someone is investing in a certain risk hoping for a return?
A. Understood. I think we are talking about --
Q. They are not investing in Avondale, per se?
A. Sure. You got it.
Q. They are investing in the risk that I'm going to take and I'm hopefully getting some profit.

I'm going to take a risk if an event happens or not; and I am going to get a return on my investment, a gain or a loss?
A. Yeah. We were ceding them risk, pieces of risk, yes.
Q. Yes. And they decide to take a certain percentage of that risk?
A. They decide to take a certain percentage of the Avondale program, and so the Avondale program disseminates that capital differently on a per risk basis. But, again, that is -- that is an Avondale item.
Q. Yeah. It can happen with one particular risk or a grouping of risks?
A. Yes, sir. Correct.
Q. Kind of like a fund, per se?
A. Similar. Yeah, could be.
Q. Similar to a fund?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So walk me through -- let's
get more specific, if we can. And this has been
helpful.
Let's get more specific into what happens specifically here for a particular restaurant in New Orleans that wants to cover its property and the business interruption associated with it.
A. Okay. Sure. Yeah. So, again, once the proposal is made, within that proposal they will have a set of terms and conditions that they can either accept or counter or decline.

I think that it is important to note, too, that it is unlikely that we are the only person quoting on a risk. I think if we are, then maybe we made a mistake.

But, generally, we are not the only person or the only carrier MGU quoting on a risk. So there will, generally, be a choice. That is why you use the wholesale market, to try to get choices.
Q. Okay.
A. So, again, once the negotiations start, there is something about our quote that the wholesaler is representing back to the agent, who is representing back to the insured.

You know, maybe they have kicked other
quotes out. Some don't look like they are worth negotiating, and then maybe they picked a couple to start negotiating with.

In this particular case, we were, obviously, one of those. And you know, they ended up accepting the terms of the quote, and we ended up issuing a binder for this policy, which, again, acts as a placeholder until we formally issue the policy.
Q. Okay. And when you say "the terms of the quote," what exactly are the terms? Take me through the steps. What are the terms of the quote?
A. Sure. So the key terms that an insured would be -- again, would be focused on here would be deductibles.

And that would be a deductible for -- we call it the AOP, which is all other perils, which is generally, you know, sort of your -- if no other deductible is mentioned, the AOP applies.

So that would be if you had, you know, a water damage loss or, you know, something -- I don't know. I can't think of anything else off the top of my head. But so that would apply
there.
In the case of in New Orleans when we choose to include wind or hail, which we did in this case, you would also see a separate named storm deductible, wind deductible, hail deductible, you know, again, depending on loss history.

Let's say they've had a couple -- using the restaurant example, let's say they've had a couple water damage losses. We may choose to put on a water damage deductible. Again, to help mitigate some of that loss history and make the account fit our program and help with the rates, as well.

And then, certainly, they have -- again, the largest one is, of course, price. So pricing varies hugely by carrier and by MGU. It just depends on certain -- certain things fit different programs differently.

And certain underwriters, you know -and when I say "underwriters," in this case I mean the Avondale underwriter -- would, you know, obviously have some authority to price the risk as they see fit, as well based on how they feel about the risk.

So there is some -- it is not all mandate pricing or it is not all technical pricing. There are some gut feel that goes into it.

And then, certainly, there is a market out there, right? So, you know, it is -- you try to get the highest price you can for the risk.
Q. Sure. And, consequently, on the opposite side, the person that is offered the premium is trying to get the most coverage for the least amount?
A. Yes, sir. Certainly, they are looking for the most fair pricing possible.
Q. Yeah. And so the deductible helps decrease the risk?
A. It helps decrease the risk for the carriers, yes.
Q. And the decreased risk generally, all the things being equal, decreases the cost, potential cost?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. And increased risk, all the things being equal, increases cost?
A. Correct. Yeah. Increased risk could
where it is this deductible, this endorsement, this menu of items?
A. So that is at the quote stage. I would -- I would mention, though, that, you know, the retail agent, you know, going through a standard market -- the standard market, it is not a coincidence that they are called the standard market. Most of those things that are in the admitted and standard market are standard.

And once you get into the -- once you get into surplus lines arena, it is why generally a retail agent is happy to pass off that work to a wholesaler.

The wholesalers are just far more familiar with the surplus lines market. That general market, the wholesaler will know the carriers and know which sets of forms will be used in their base policy.

So speaking from Avondale, I would -- I would hope that a good wholesale broker knows which carriers are using which forms.

So as far as when the insured has knowledge of which forms, from Avondale's perspective, they will have knowledge at the quote stage. But a good wholesaler and a good
increase cost or push it outside the eligibility of the program.
Q. Okay. And so the deductibles help with that. What about in -- tell me about the role of endorsements and when do the role of endorsements -- when are they discussed? Are they discussed in the beginning of the initial packet of information that goes out?
A. Yes. So the quote document will have a list of forms. And, again, I am going to use "forms" here. I think you are saying endorsements to mean forms, but --
Q. Yeah.
A. -- generally coverage forms. So the coverage forms will be listed on the quote.
Q. Okay. So I want to take you back.

Let's back up a little bit. Let's back up to
the stage -- because I want to start in the
chronology -- back up to the stage where it is
the insurance retail broker can't bind it in any
other place in the market; decides to go a
surplus lines carrier; needs a U.S. wholesale
broker. They have a general idea of the packet
of information.
When does it get specific enough to
insurance agent will be disseminating that information back down probably prior to the quote.

And maybe that is why they choose, you know, Avondale versus another market, which could be coverage forms.
Q. Okay. So --

MR. MILLER:
John. John, is it a good time for a
break?
MR. HOUGHTALING:
Yeah. Yeah.
MR. MILLER:
We have been going for an hour.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
Yeah. Sure.
MR. MILLER:
Let me say this, too. I mean, look,
I'm giving a whole lot of leeway on this general education about how the market and stuff works, but --

MR. HOUGHTALING:
I'm asking specifically -- I want to know specifically -- Allen, I want to know specifically what happened here.

## 

But in order to know that --
MR. MILLER:
Well --
MR. HOUGHTALING:
-- the way --
MR. MILLER:
-- I'm ready -- I'm ready --
MR. HOUGHTALING:
-- I need to --
MR. MILLER:
-- for you to ask those questions.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
-- have him define those terms,
okay?
MR. MILLER:
I'm ready for you to ask those
questions. Thanks.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
Yeah. We are getting there. We are
getting there fast.
(Recess held.)
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. All right. So the AOP refers to "all other perils," right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And the AOP, the all other perils, I assume it is an all-risk type policy you discussed?
A. That is correct.
Q. Unless it has a specific deductible associated with that risk? It has to be outlined for that specific risk?
A. So, yeah. If there is no other deductible listed on the policy, then the AOP is the deductible.
Q. All right. Explain to me how -- you were talking about forms and that the forms usually come when the quote comes.

Okay. Describe to me what do you mean by forms.
A. So the quote would include a standardized set of forms that would apply to the quote, which would eventually become part of the policy.

So we list those forms on the quote so that the wholesaler and the insurance agent have a chance, obviously, to review the forms that would apply, and then certainly ask questions about the forms.
Q. Now, I understand there is a list of
forms. But can you draw down to me -- because when I say the word "form," I'm a lawyer. It could mean a lot of different things.

So what exactly do you mean when you say a list of forms?
A. Sure. So I -- so Avondale issues an

ISO-based policy. So the forms that would be included on that quote would be an outline of the ISO coverage forms that would apply to the risk.
Q. And when you say ISO coverage forms -- I know there is a thing like there is an ISO form policy and then there is also ISO endorsements and ISO exclusions and ISO things.

Can you draw down on what you mean when you say ISO forms are listed?
A. So as it pertains to the specific risk, there will be a set of applicable ISO forms. Again, we don't issue, you know, sort of a -- I don't know what you mean by an ISO policy, per se, but our policy is made up of specific ISO forms.
Q. Okay. And when you say it is made up of specific ISO forms, can you describe what you mean by that?
A. Oh, so there is a -- you know, like, there is a form for what is covered, how it is covered.

So, you know, we issue an ISO form that would talk about what is covered. So that might be the building and business personal property form. That is ISO.

There would be the how it is covered, which would be the cause of loss form, which is ISO.

And then there is other, you know, that is the -- that is sort of $90 \%$ of the policy coverage falls in between those two forms.

Then there is certain -- there are some state forms that get applied.
Q. And when there is a quote that is attached to that, is that the entire policy? Is it with the quote, or is it a short form?
A. No. We just -- we just list the forms and their applicable numbers.
Q. When you say -- what do you mean applicable? So, like, in this particular case, you have listed forms. What applicable numbers are we talking about?
A. All right. So like the business
that started sometime around 1970. And, really,
personal property form has a name. It is called the CP0010, for instance. So, you know, that corresponds to an ISO number so that you can find the form.
Q. Got it. So it lists a short form of the coverage, and then it has got like a serial number or such?
A. That is -- yes, that is a good way to describe it. Yes.
Q. And then that serial number ascribes to an exact long form portion of the policy?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So in this particular situation, what would have been issued would be a list of the different forms and the serial numbers on them?
A. That is right.
Q. And there would be a CP number?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. Explain ISO. What ISO is.
A. Yeah. So, I mean, the acronym itself stands for Insurance Service Office, I think. I
don't know. Actually, I think it is Insurance
Service Office or Insurance Services Office.
But, essentially, it is an organization
Q. I'm sorry?
A. I don't know the answer to that.
Q. Were you aware that ISO does that, that they --

MR. MILLER:
Objection. I think he -MR. HOUGHTALING:

You can answer.
THE WITNESS:
I don't know.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Okay. Do you know that non-surplus
lines -- well, you know that ISO creates forms for non-surplus lines insurance companies?
A. Well, I think they create a -- they create forms that can be used by either surplus lines or non-surplus lines companies, I would assume.
Q. Okay. And you are aware that state insurance regulators regulate policy forms?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
THE WITNESS:
I don't know how that would apply in
what it is, is it is an insurance aggregation organization.

So what they are going to be doing is, they are going to be taking data, statistics, loss information, building information, could be rating information, and they are capturing all of that data and they are capturing it from insurance companies all across the country that file into ISO.

And what they are essentially doing in that case is building a database of statistics for insurance companies to use.

And also they do write policy language, which an insurance carrier can subscribe to ISO to have access to the policy language, standardize policy language.

Again, you know, from an Avondale perspective, the benefit of using ISO would be that it is standardized and used. It is sort of the standard insurance policy wording for the surplus lines industry.
Q. Yeah. And ISO goes to like the
insurance commissioners about the forms to get approval?
A. I don't know the answer to that.
the surplus lines markets.
I mean, if we wanted to, we could
manuscript policy wording, but we don't. So,
you know, again, we don't -- as a surplus lines market, we do not file coverage with any state. EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Yes, but are you aware that the ISO forms are used by companies that have to go through that regulation?
A. Again, I can only speak to Avondale.

And we don't -- again, we don't file any forms.
So I don't know how --
Q. Let me ask this: You are aware of that, though, correct?

MR. MILLER:
Objection. Asked and answered.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. You are aware that ISO does that, correct?
A. All I can say -- I mean, I have never worked for a standard lines company that used ISO forms, so -- I apologize. I don't know the answer. I don't know -- I don't know that.
Q. Well, Lloyd's uses standard ISO forms, correct?
A. I don't know that Lloyd's does. I know
we -- we, Avondale, uses ISO forms.
Q. You use ISO forms?
A. That is correct.
Q. All right. And the reason is they are standardized?
A. In the United States, yes.
Q. In the U.S. Okay.

Is it another reason that those forms are vetted by insurance commissioners? Does that factor into it at all for you, for Avondale?
A. Well, I think -- I think the fact that they would be, again, used as a standard makes it -- makes us less prone to, you know, have judgement against the form itself.
Q. Correct. And what do you mean by that; judgment against the form itself?
A. Again, if -- you know, as an MGU, we would not have the expertise to draft our own forms. So having the ability to use a standardized product that many other carriers use, allows us the ability to pass that burden off on professionals.
Q. Yeah. So because you don't have the
expertise of what specific language, you
subscribe to the company that does that, that has that expertise?
A. That is correct.
Q. And they draft the language?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you purchase and copyright those forms?
A. I don't know that we copyright.
Q. I'm sorry. You purchase copyrighted forms, I should say?
A. I don't -- I don't know if they are
copyrighted, but we purchase access to the forms.
Q. Access. Okay. And in this particular matter, the quote would be based upon what forms are listed?
A. That is correct.
Q. And some of those forms will not just be coverage, but some of those forms would be -well, let me ask you this: Is the deductible that effects the risk, are those also forms with numbers?
A. Well, I think the deductible would appear on a form.
Q. And would that also have an ISO number?
A. Yes, but it is a different ISO number.

And, I'm sorry. I don't have it in front of me right now. But, essentially, it is called the declarations page.
Q. Okay. And then describe to me the endorsements, how the endorsement works. Endorsements, as my understanding is, they can add or take away coverage on a general policy?
A. Yes. An endorsement is a -- I mean, it
could be -- they could add or take away coverage.

They could also specify a designated --
like, a service-of-suit clause would be an
endorsement. You know, as you know, "How do you sue us?" that is an endorsement on the forms.

So there could be clarification
endorsements. There could -- you know, in our
case, we have an endorsement that tells the insured who the carriers are behind the policy.

So, they are not always
coverage-related. But, yes, they certainly could take away or add coverage.
Q. And how would I know if they take away or they add coverage? Would it say it?
A. Well, the name of the forms generally say what the form does. I think that is -- you know, ISO is pretty good about making sure that these -- that the language is pretty clear.

But, certainly, the form number, you would have access to review of that form prior to acceptance of the quote.
Q. Okay. And the endorsements in this particular case, does it affect what type of rate is -- well, let me ask you this: If you have endorsements that add coverage, that adds risk, correct?
A. Not in all cases.

But, you know, certainly there could be things that if, you know, you didn't want -- you know, like if you didn't want business interruption coverage, you know, we could exclude that.

And that would reduce our liabilities
out. So that would reduce the amount of limit that we were putting out, so that would subsequently reduce the premium.

So, you know, certainly anything that restricted limits would allow us to do that.
Q. Okay. So, but there are endorsements
that add coverage, correct?
A. Correct. Yes.
Q. And if you have an endorsement that adds coverage, that adds risk, correct?
A. I mean, I don't -- I mean, it might not.

MR. MILLER:
Asked and answered.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Well, I mean -- let me ask you this: If
you are adding risk, you are -- well, if you are adding coverage, you are adding risk, are you not?
A. Again, it depends on -- it depends on the endorsement. But, generally, yeah, if you had an endorsement that was adding coverage that was acceptable, you could choose to -- I mean, yeah, I guess in some cases that could increase your risk.
Q. Yeah. And it --
A. I don't -- I don't think it is $100 \%$ of
the time. So that is why -- that is the only
reason I'm having trouble answering your question.
Q. And, in general, you add risks, you add
Q. Well, what about the customer?
A. Well, they have the chance to either accept or decline it.
Q. Yes. But they also -- they negotiate
risk. They look at not just the quote, but they
look at the forms being given to them.
MR. MILLER:
Objection. You are asking him to
tell you what the customer does?
MR. HOUGHTALING:
He is describing that.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. And I think we have laid some foundation
that, of course, its negotiation, correct? It
is not just the price. It is also the coverage,
right?
MR. MILLER:
He can answer.
THE WITNESS:
They have an opportunity through
their wholesale broker and their agent to review
coverage, yes.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Yes. And it is a negotiation on -- is
it your understanding that insureds only care
risks that you are going to pay for. You add risk and the potential cost goes up?

MR. MILLER:
Asked and answered.
THE WITNESS:
Yes. I think in theory, certainly
the more risk there is on a particular account, that could talk to rate and premium.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Okay. And the converse is, if you have
an endorsement that eliminates coverage, that
eliminates certain risk?
A. Again, possibly.

MR. MILLER:
Same objection.
THE WITNESS:
If it -- if it does -- if it is, you
know, sort of implicit to -- if it is
significant to the policy, yes.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Who determines if it is significant to the policy?
A. The individual. In this case, the

Avondale underwriter could determine whether the endorsement was material to the pricing or not.
about price?
A. No, I would hope not.

MR. MILLER:
Objection.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
I'm sorry.
MR. MILLER:
You can answer.

## EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:

Q. I'm just asking to your general
knowledge, your business. This is it.
They don't just care about price. They
care also about what type of coverage it is, correct?
A. That is -- you know, the needs of the
client would go back to the insurance
professionals that they are dealing with, I
mean, if their agent is going to guide them in a direction that is best for them.
Q. But that is also a consideration for
their purchasing, right? They are purchasing coverage. You understand it matters what type of coverage it is in determining --
A. Yes.
Q. -- what price is fair?
the wholesale broker.
Q. Got it. Okay.

Does Avondale try to keep up with the -for its clients, does Avondale keep up with the forms of coverage that are available through ISO?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS:
Sorry. Can you just -- can you
rephrase it so I can help you?
MR. HOUGHTALING:
Sure. Sure. Sure. Sure.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Does Avondale in pricing and putting together forms for pricing for ISO forms, does it keep up with or try to keep up current with the ISO forms that are available?
A. Yes. I mean, as best we can. You know, they don't change often. And when there are significant changes, we certainly would look to update forms.
Q. Okay. And when was there, in your mind, the last significant change in forms?
given to Avondale? I'm sorry. What forms were given -- strike that. It is late.

Do you have any personal knowledge as to the particular forms that were given to Oceana in the quote that was given?
A. My knowledge of that would be based on a file review. But then, also, that there are base forms that are on all our policies.
Q. But sitting here -- so, you weren't involved in the original underwriting decisions and price and negotiations?
A. No, sir.
Q. Do you know who was?
A. Off the top of my head, we -- we were on this risk for three years from my review of the file. So, I did see that the underwriter changed. So this particular policy number that we are talking about, I don't know who the underwriter was.
Q. Were you privy at all to the agent and what the particular retail agent in this case was looking for?
A. No. We don't have any contact with the retail agent. We don't have any contact with the insured. Our contact is designated only to
Q. Change in coverage endorsements, when
policy is based on essentially two forms. Those two forms have stayed static with Avondale for several years.
Q. Okay. So you have the policy forms and then you have a bunch of endorsements forms, as well?
A. There is -- I would just more call it -MR. MILLER:

Objection.
THE WITNESS:
-- ancillary forms.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Okay. Ancillary. Ancillary meaning what?
A. They may or may not be coverage forms.

Like I said, they could be, you know, listing who the particular -- who the carriers are on the policy.

It could be the service-of-suit clause. It could be privacy notices. It could be state notices. They are not always coverage forms.
Q. Okay. Let me reduce my question just to the coverage endorsements.
A. Okay.
was the last time that ISO, in your mind or to your knowledge, made a major change to the coverage endorsements in its --

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the question.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. What do you call them? General form policies?
A. Yeah. Again, I don't know the exact answer to that. I can tell you that we haven't updated our versions of the forms in several years.
Q. And when you say update the forms, you mean the general policy forms?
A. We haven't changed them. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. I don't know -- I don't know if there is newer versions available. I don't know the answer to that.
Q. Okay. And as to the last time, can you give me a year as when is the last time you updated the forms?
A. Well, I -- I can tell you that if you
have the policy in front of you, which I could
bring up, but if you have it, there is an edition date on the bottom of the policy. That would have been the last time that we had updated the form.
Q. Yeah. Let me -- let me give it to you. And I will mark it as Exhibit 1, the policy itself.

And I can pull it up on here. Yeah. Do we need to page through it? I see different dates and stuff on it.
A. Yeah. And that is sort of what I was -you know, again, I'm not trying to be evasive here, but it is just --
Q. Oh, no. No, no. Please.
A. -- typically for me, they are all the edition dates. Each form will have its own edition date.

So, you know, again, as to when we last updated the form, the edition date is -- again, the ISO edition date is at the bottom of the forms. Bottom right, usually. And so that will give you when, the time that form was updated.
Q. Okay. And you want us to flip through that to --
A. Oh, sorry. So if the one I'm looking at
right here -- you have to scroll down to the bottom again. So you can see that is 05-2015.
Q. Okay.
A. That would have been the edition date of that form.
Q. In this particular matter, do you know what forms, both the general policy and the endorsement forms, were given with the quote?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
I don't know that any endorsement
forms were given with the quote, but you can answer.

THE WITNESS:
Again, I apologize. I'm working with one screen. But the insured would have been given a quote.

MR. HOUGHTALING:
Uh-huh.
THE WITNESS:
And on that quote, there would have been a list of applicable forms and then their corresponding numbers.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
question.
Q. And any endorsement forms would be listed on there, correct?
A. Correct.

MR. MILLER:
Same objection.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. And then the forms will determine the rate?
A. The forms, they are a factor in rate determination.
Q. Yeah. Sure.

And did you analyze the risk of business
interruption when Avondale gave its quote on
those particular forms? What risks were considered?
A. You know, again, I was not involved in
the underwriting of the policy. So I can,
again, speak through a file review and certainly
anecdotally as to how business interruption
would be underwritten. Is that fair?
Q. Was the risk of business interruption from a pandemic considered?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
exclusion form?
A. Not at the time, no.
Q. You do now?
A. Again, ISO has -- I mean, ISO has
hundreds and hundreds of forms. So that is not
a form that we used as part of our policy.
Q. Okay. The question is: Do you use it now?
A. We do.
Q. When did you start using it?
A. April of 2020.
Q. Do you know the number, the CP number of
the endorsement that you are using now?
A. I can bring it up for you, but --
Q. Sure. Yeah.
A. Yeah. Just give me -- give me one
second. And when I say one second, I mean,
like, two minutes.
Q. Okay. I'm not going to hold you to it.

Let me give you what is marked as Plaintiffs
Exhibit 4. Let me see which one you got here.
Oh, Exhibit 2. I'm sorry. Exhibit 2. And I
will pull it up on the screen for you.
A. I have it, if you need it.
Q. If you go to --

THE WITNESS:
The policy certainly isn't written
to cover a pandemic, no.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Was the risk that the policy could be interpreted as covering a pandemic? Was that a consideration?
A. No.
Q. Okay. When you issued the policy, did
you consider that the risk of viral
contamination warranted attention?
A. No.
Q. Did you know that the drafter of the policy, the author of the policy, ISO, told that to the Insurance Commissioner of Louisiana in 2006?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
THE WITNESS:
I don't -- I don't know the answer
to that.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Were you aware at the time that this
policy was issued that there was an ISO virus
A. I have the number, if you are ready.
Q. Okay. Go ahead. What is the number?
A. The number is CP0140.
Q. Okay. And let me pull up -- go to this page, please.

So does this appear to be the
endorsement Commercial Property CP01400706?
A. Again, without going side-by-side, I'm
just going to say that that has the right name,
and it has got the right form number on it.
So I would -- I would say that that is
likely the form.
Q. Okay. You are aware now that that form
existed at the time that this policy was issued?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you know whether or not that
endorsement form changed the policy?
A. What are you --

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
THE WITNESS:
Sorry.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. You mentioned before that certain
anything to the policy.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Avondale does not feel that that form
changes anything.
Q. Do you know what ISO has said about
that?
A. No.
Q. Do you know what ISO tells its customers
about that form as to whether it changes the
policy?
A. I do not know.
Q. Let's pull it back up.

MR. MILLER:
And, John, all of my objections are
reserved, right, save as to form?
MR. HOUGHTALING:
Yes.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Can you read the first sentence after

Commercial Property Form CP01400706? What does
the first sentence say?
A. "This endorsement changes the policy.

Please read it carefully."
Q. Thank you.
A. I would like to point out, though, that
the ISO forms are meant to -- they stand-alone,
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so you could have a policy that included virus coverage, and then you would utilize this form to exclude it.
Q. Are --
A. These forms are meant to stand-alone.

So the fact is that they changed the policy, they wouldn't change our policy.
Q. Does it say that?
A. Well --
Q. The policies that you are issuing right now with this endorsement, does it say that, that this endorsement changes the policy?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Will you read Paragraph B, the first clause in Paragraph B?
A. "We will not pay for loss or damage caused by or resulting from any virus, bacterium, or other microorganisms that induces or is capable of inducing physical distress, illness, or disease."
Q. Okay. What loss or damage is caused by a virus that is excluded here?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question. You are asking him to interpret a
policy. He is not a lawyer. And the policy at issue in this case doesn't need an exclusion because it doesn't cover viruses.

MR. HOUGHTALING:
You cannot give a speaking
objection. You can object to the form. I got
it. I am asking you -- I'm sorry -- I'm asking
the witness --
MR. MILLER:
But you are asking him to interpret
an exclusion that is irrelevant.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
I am absolutely because he just
testified that his company does not believe that
it does. So I can ask it. Thank you.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Now, "We will not pay for loss or damage caused by or resulting from any virus."

What loss or damage caused by or
resulting from any virus? What damage does
virus do that is excluded here?
MR. MILLER:
The document speaks for itself,
John.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Do you know?
A. Yeah. So we don't generally interpret any of the wordings. We let the ISO forms stand for what they are.

Again, it is our interpretation that
there was no coverage for the virus to begin with, so this form again just becomes a redundancy.
Q. You think it is redundant?
A. We do think it is redundant, certainly as it relates to the current climate.

Putting this form on provides the redundancy that seems to be needed.
Q. Why does it seem to be needed?
A. We are getting sued.
Q. And is the risk of getting sued on policies and policy language, is that part of the risk that you undertake?
A. Well, I think -- I think certainly part of our ability to put out a policy. Again, what I explained earlier was part of why we utilize a standard policy form is so that we can reduce any of the ambiguity in any of the policies.
Q. Yeah. And it --
A. So if something happens that was outside
of predictability, like a pandemic and there
needs to be some redundancy to clarify anything that goes on, then having a redundant form isn't a bad thing.
Q. Is it a good thing to clarify language?
A. I think --

MR. MILLER:
Objection.
THE WITNESS:
Certainly, I think, you know, when
we are working business-to-business, you know, there is certainly an expectation that when we work with insurance professionals that people understand how a policy reads.

I think it is -- it is certainly a challenge for an insured to understand a policy, which is why they hire an agent, which is why that agent hires a wholesaler.

So I think, you know, part of working business-to-business, especially through two insurance professionals is to -- we generally don't feel -- there is sort of an understanding in the industry as to what these forms say.

So, you know, when this goes outside
of a business-to-business dealing and it gets
brought into the forefront, you know, this is --
I don't think it is a -- I think we are -- when circumstances change because of outside things, you know, again, a redundancy, you know, we try to be as clear as we can. And if redundancy is necessary, we are willing to do it.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. And do you think this clarification is necessary, not necessarily to professionals, but to the insureds themselves?
A. Again, I can't speak to what an insured would say.

I mean, certainly, I know more than most, and less than some. But I think, you know, certainly, you know, between a wholesaler and an insurance agent, again, both licensed individuals that we have not had to -- we don't generally have to explain these things.

So, again, as a company that works
business-to-business, it is hard for me to answer how an insured would react to policy forms. Again --
Q. You --
A. -- they hired an agent who hired a
wholesaler, so --
Q. And when you are talking
business-to-business, Oceana is a business, right?
A. Insurance business to insurance business.
Q. Oh, insurance business. Because insurance people, they should have the knowledge. They either have the knowledge or they should have the knowledge as to what these forms -- a deeper understanding as to what these forms mean than an insured might, correct?
A. Well, I think -- I think a lot in the
same way that -- I mean, I don't -- certainly, I
mean, you know, I wouldn't venture into, you know, a deposition like this without an attorney.

And, you know, Oceana hired an attorney to do some of this work. I mean, there is a level of, you know, contract language that requires -- if you are not versed in it, that may require professional assistance.

I think hiring an insurance agent to help you with your insurance policy is a good thing. I think them transferring that again to
a wholesale agent to explain the surplus lines industry is a good thing.
Q. So it is a good thing and you think that is a good thing to be able to have someone. You think it needs to be translated by an insurance professional as to what these terms may mean? MR. MILLER:

Objection. Asked and answered.
What is your next question?
MR. HOUGHTALING:
You can answer.
THE WITNESS:
Well, translation is difficult. I think the -- again, the ISO language has stood.

You know, I definitely think that if you are -- if you are not familiar with -- I mean, listen, I've been in the insurance industry now a handful of times.

I don't always understand my health insurance. I don't always understand my car insurance. And I think utilization of an agent to get me comfortable with what things -- what they mean and what they say -- I mean, we just -- we went through a couple instances of we used different terms for things, you and I.

So, you know, insurance terms, insurance language, you know, it is not always, you know, the way that people talk. As much as it tries to be, it is just not.

So I think having -- having
professionals assist you on things that you are
not $100 \%$ confident with, I don't -- again, I
think it is -- I think it is -- there is nothing
bad about it.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. And in dealing with these forms, I mean, you, yourself, said that Avondale isn't a professional in the drafting of policy language, which is why you turn to a company like ISO, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. So it would be -- it is important to you -- you need to understand what ISO was saying about the forms?
A. I'm sorry. You broke up.

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
Because you are not a professional
in drafting these particular language and you rely upon ISO to help draft the language for you, then it is should be incumbent upon you, should it not, to keep up with what ISO is saying about its particular policy forms?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
THE WITNESS:
Well, I think -- I think, again, ISO
policy forms are utilized by many different companies doing many different things.

I think, you know, ISO creates forms
and an insurance MGU like us has the opportunity
to use the forms that apply to our program that
are the best fit for our program.
So, I mean, I don't know if that
answers your question.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. When selling this policy to Oceana, did

Avondale consider the risk that disease-causing agents may render a product impure?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
THE WITNESS:
No.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. In selling the policy to Oceana --
sorry. When selling the policy to Oceana, did
you consider the risk that disease-causing
agents can cause a product to be impure by
changing its quality?
MR. MILLER:
Same objection.
THE WITNESS:
I mean, I hate to answer these the
same way every time. But, you know, again, when
we look at these, we are looking at -- we have
to anticipate how we think the coverage language
would be applied in a certain case.
And, you know, in those two
instances that you mentioned, we would not have
expected the policy to apply in those cases.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. You didn't believe that the viral
contamination warranted your attention?
MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form.
THE WITNESS:
something that the policy covered. So, you
know, making it a part of any underwriting
underwriting perspective, we would not have considered that to be an insured risk.

So, you know, much in the same way that we don't give the workers' compensation line any attention because our policy doesn't cover it, certainly, we wouldn't give -wouldn't have given this any underwriting attention because we didn't believe it was covered.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. And you didn't consider the risk that the disease-causing agents can cause a product to be impure by changing its substance?

MR. MILLER:
Same objection.
THE WITNESS:
Yeah. Again, I mean, I know -- I
hate to keep giving you the same answer again, but --
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Did you consider that risk or not?
A. So, we just wouldn't have considered it

Same objection.
THE WITNESS:
Yeah. Yeah, the same answer for that, too. Again, you know, we wouldn't have considered it to be a covered cause of loss.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Okay. Because you didn't consider it to be property damage, correct?
A. We wouldn't have thought that it would
have -- would have been covered under our policy.
Q. Did you consider the risk that when
disease-causing viral contamination occurs that
potential claims may involve the cost of decontamination?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
THE WITNESS:
Here, you are going to get a
different answer now. It is going to be a
two-parter.
MR. HOUGHTALING: Okay.
THE WITNESS:
decision wasn't -- no, it was not considered.
Q. Do you know whether -- were you aware that that is what ISO told the Louisiana state regulators when --

MR. MILLER:
Objection. Asked and answered.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
-- when it looked to clarify its
policy --
MR. MILLER:
Asked and answered.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
-- with this endorsement?
THE WITNESS:
Yeah, I'm not aware of that or the instance or the particular policy language that we are speaking to. So, I don't know the answer to that, no.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Okay. When selling the policy to

Oceana, did you consider the risk the
disease-causing agents may enable the spread of disease by their presence on interior building surfaces?

MR. MILLER:

You know, first, from an
underwriting perspective, again, we wouldn't have considered that to be something that this policy would have responded to.

The second part of that is Avondale, as an MGU, does not have any access or any claims authority. So in regards to what happens to claims, that is outside of the Avondale's purview.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Yes. But analyzing the risk is your purview, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you consider the risk that
viral contamination of this property can involve
a potential claim for the cost of
decontamination?
A. No.

MR. MILLER:
Object to the form. Asked and answered.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. The answer is no?
A. No.
Q. Why did you think viral contamination
was not covered? Who told you that?
A. So, again, we let the policy wording speak for itself. You know, again, we -- we rely on the direct physical damage portion of the policy to dictate where we think coverage could be applicable.
Q. Did you consider that the direct physical loss of damage can be when viral contamination impacts surfaces and then there would be a cost to decontamination?
A. No.
Q. How about the risk of potential claims of business interruption?
A. No. Again, we wouldn't have considered any part of any virus or pandemic to be covered under our policy. So it wouldn't have been a consideration in the underwriting process.
Q. Would it have been helpful to you if you knew that -- strike that.

Would it be helpful to you -- and we can't go back in time. At the time of this underwriting, would it have been helpful to you if you were aware that in 2000 -- well, strike that. Let me show you an exhibit.

Let me ask you whether this would have
been helpful to you. Let's look at the -- maybe it is the same exhibit. Oh, Exhibit No. 2.
Let's go back. Would it have been helpful to you --

MR. MILLER:
John, can you identify this exhibit?
MR. HOUGHTALING:
Yeah. Sure. This is Exhibit No. 2.
MR. MILLER:
Yeah, but what is it?
MR. HOUGHTALING:
You don't know? Exhibit No. 2 is a
-- Exhibit No. 2 was a document produced by ISO
and explaining its endorsement and why it needed
clarification. And --
MR. MILLER:
And I just wanted --
MR. HOUGHTALING:
-- you saw this --
MR. MILLER:
And I just wanted to make sure you
identified it so I could say that we object to this exhibit.

This witness doesn't know anything
about this exhibit.

But now you can ask your question.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
I'm not -- I'm asking him -- he has already testified that he has not seen it. He didn't know about it.

MR. MILLER:
Right.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
I got that.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. So what I'm asking you is: Would it have been helpful to you in analyzing the risk for your clients if you were aware that ISO told the State of Louisiana, quote, Disease-Causing agents may render a product impure (change its quality or substance), or enable the spread of disease by the presence on interior building surfaces or the surfaces of personal property. When the disease-causing viral or bacterial contamination occurs, potential claims involve the cost of replacement of property (for example, the milk), cost of decontamination (for example, interior building surfaces), and business interruption (time element) losses?

Would that have been helpful to you in
deciding whether or not at the time of underwriting this policy to include this form exclusion, CP --

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
-- CP01400706? THE WITNESS:

I mean, again, without -- it is hard to answer that question only because I don't know what policy they are saying has a hole in it.

Again, it could -- ISO is a
business, as well. They make money by selling
their policy forms. So alerting somebody that their policy may have a gap in it, I just don't know if they are saying that the policy that we issued had a gap in it. I don't know.

I mean, I can -- again, this is the first I am seeing of this document. So I don't know the answer to that. But I -- what I am not seeing here is that the policy that we issued had a gap in it.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
business is sold through a licensed insurance professional and a wholesaler, who then goes to a licensed insurance professional and a retailer, who then is -- you know, they are part of a team that advises the insured as to what the best product is for them to purchase.

So that three-tiered system is in place much in the same way that you generally don't buy a house without a real estate agent.

There are just certain transactions that are best utilized with a professional to make sure that your interests are protected.
Q. And because the professional may have more understanding or more knowledge about interpretations of the wording that is at issue?
A. Certainly different -- certainly
different terminology within a policy is helpful to have someone who can explain that terminology and give you -- you know, maybe a different example of how that terminology could apply to them.
Q. And this may be one of those cases, correct?
A. I'm sorry. I didn't hear the question.
Q. This may be one of those cases?

```
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
```

Q. Do you know that it is not addressing
Q. Certainly, if you had seen this and it was referring to the policies that you were selling, you would have followed it and included this, if you wanted to exclude the risk of viral contamination?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
THE WITNESS:
so I can speak to you about it more, a little bit better.

But, you know, again it is hard for me to say this. It is -- I'm just looking at it. I don't -- again, without knowing how it would have changed the policy that we issued, I am a little uncomfortable sort of answering how it would -- what it would do hypothetically.

I don't know the answer. So it is
-- again, I don't know the answer to that because it is not really addressing the policy
form or the policy that we issued.
Q. Do you know that it in
the policy that you issued?
A. No, I don't know. And that is all -all I'm saying is, this is the first time I'm seeing this.
Q. Okay. You don't know that. You have never seen this before?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. But after the COVID-19 pandemic began, you now became aware that these existed at the time you sold the policy?
A. Well, we became aware that once these started to -- once the interpretation of these forms were going to consumers and were going to noninsurance professionals, that utilizing redundancy would help our form.
Q. When you say that they were going to noninsurance professionals, why would it be -why would it be helpful to have it go to noninsurance professionals?
A. Again, from the surplus lines
perspective, what we are generally talking to are non-filed forms. What we are generally talking to is commercial -- in our instance, its commercial property insurance.

You know, again, we utilize -- our
A. What? What may be one of those cases?
Q. Where it is helpful to have a clarification.
A. What -- sorry. What -- what may be?
Q. Strike. Strike it.

Did you consider the risk of civil authority shut -- let me strike that.

Do you know whether or not this policy that you sold provided civil authority coverage?
A. This policy included the business
interruption form, which has a civil authority clause inside it, yes.
Q. Okay. And that coverage -- what is your
understanding of that coverage? Strike that.
Did you consider the risk of a civil
authority shutting down businesses because of
viral contamination from a pandemic?
MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
THE WITNESS:
No. In this case, again, we would
go back and -- we would not have expected our
policy to respond to that event.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Did you consider it? Did you consider pandemics a risk when issuing these policies? MR. MILLER:

Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS:

No. Again, you know, we don't
consider things that we wouldn't expect the policy to respond to.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. What is your understanding of selling an all-risk policy?

MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question. That is kind of vague, John. What do you mean?

MR. HOUGHTALING:
No, I don't think so.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. What is your understanding of -- is this considered an all-risk policy that was sold?
A. I mean, there is -- I don't know that there is a definition of what all-risk is.

So it is -- I don't want to -- I don't want to be the first guy to go on Record to define what an all-risk policy is.

But, you know, again, we are providing them with a standard policy form via ISO that provides them with a very standardized set of perils and coverages.

And, again, they can -- that is their determination as to if they want more or less.
Q. Do you know how many occurrences of a civil authority shutdown occurred in the city of New Orleans?
A. You mean, how many civil authority orders there were? Or, how many -- can you just ask the question again.
Q. Sure. Sure. Do you know how many -- do you know how many occurrences of civil authority shutdown orders were issued in New Orleans?
A. As it relates to COVID?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't know the exact number, no.
Q. You know if it is more than one?
A. I -- I don't. Sorry. I don't know that
it was more than one, but I know it was at least one.
Q. Do you know if -- do you know if there was shutdown orders both from the mayor and the governor of Louisiana?
A. I would -- you know, given that the shutdown orders are generally state of emergencies, I would -- again, I am not privy to Louisiana law, but I would assume that when shutdown orders are given, they are a state of emergency and would run through a mayor or a governor.
Q. Do you know -- were you in this business in 2003?
A. I was a young man then; but, yes.
Q. Okay. You were in the business?
A. Yes.
Q. And were you writing risk for commercial
lines of insurance then?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And as part of that, do you read any industry trade journals or anything?

MR. MILLER:
All right, John. Let me interject
right here. Look, it is 6:13. Can you identify
which of your areas of inquiry for this 1442
this line of questioning applies to?
MR. HOUGHTALING:
It doesn't. It has to do with
underwriting and his understanding. And I'm
probing his understanding of whether or not he considered it a risk or not.

MR. MILLER:
All right.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
So you can instruct him to answer or not.

MR. MILLER:
Well, I'm about to. Your rope is getting real short on this. We have been going for a very long time.

MR. HOUGHTALING:
Thank you. I understand. So you
do, but I'm not getting paid by the hour, Allen.
I want to get out of here, too. I'm getting close, if that helps.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. So were you in the business in 2003
during the SARS pandemic?
A. I was -- I was in the business in 2003.
Q. Okay. Were you involved with
underwriting for Lloyd's?
A. No.
Q. Who were you involved in underwriting for?
the term? How does that work? The policy
premium, do you know how much the policy
premiums were paid in this matter per year?
MR. MILLER:
That is a compound question, John.
MR. HOUGHTALING: Sorry.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Do you know how much Oceana paid for this policy per year?
A. Sorry. If you don't mind I'm just --
Q. Sure.
A. -- looking it up for you.
Q. Sure.
A. 16,000 . That is what it looks like in my system. Oh, wait. Yeah, does that seem to track?
Q. It was more than that, but --
A. I might be looking -- like I said, they
-- that is the wrong policy. Sorry.
MR. MILLER:
Ethan, if you don't know, you don't
know. We don't need you to go --
THE WITNESS:
I don't know.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Like 86,000 ?
A. Given the limit, I wouldn't be surprised
if it -- you know, since now that I'm
remembering it, it did include wind. So that would make sense.
Q. Okay. And what happens at the end of the policy premium? How does it work? At the end of the policy premium, what happens? So the policy premiums are paid. What happens to it?
A. What happens to the money?
Q. Yeah. Who gets it?
A. Like the accounting function? I don't
know if that is okay. I mean, I am not trying
to avoid the question, but I can only speak for
the particular carriers that are on -- the
Lloyd's carriers that are on this. So I can't
really speak to the entire process.
But so the payment gets remitted through
the wholesaler to Avondale. Avondale keeps the
commission that -- the contracted commission.
And then we send the rest back to the carriers as their percentage.
Q. How much is Avondale's commission?
A. It varies by risk, and it varies by
contract. So it might --

into a protective order you could send us an
interrogatory, and we will put it in. But right
now we don't have one.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
I don't think it is proprietary.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. But, in general, what do companies,
managed companies like yours, make in
commission, MGAs?
MR. MILLER:
Objection to the form of the
question.
THE WITNESS:
Yeah. And, John, the only reason
I'm kind of hesitating on this is it does vary
wildly by contract, so --
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOUGHTALING:
Q. Give me a range. Give me --
A. It could be anywhere from five percent to 20 percent.
Q. Okay. Per your contact, could Avondale
have any liability to the syndicate for not
including certain endorsements?
MR. MILLER:
Objection. You are asking him to
make a legal conclusion.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
If you know.
THE WITNESS:
I don't know the answer to that.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
All right. I have no further
questions.
MR. MILLER:
We don't have any questions.
MR. HOUGHTALING:
All right. Thank you.
MR. MILLER:
Thanks, Ethan.
THE WITNESS: That is it?
MR. MILLER:
Yes. You can sign off.
(Deposition concluded at 6:26 p.m.)
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