



EARTHQUAKE POOL LAUNCHES

Readers will recall from our last IBSNews issue that the 'Earthquake Pool' (actually earthquake, volcanic eruption and tsunami) was intending to launch in late 2002. The long awaited official start-date occurred on January 1st but almost went unnoticed. Not unexpectedly, there continues to be a certain amount of market confusion as to how this is going to work and whether or not at the end of the day the scheme actually adds any value. Most insurers seem to have adopted a wait and see attitude.

There are many aspects to the Pool which raise concern on behalf of insureds and insurers alike. The Pool now mandates that every property/fire policy which includes earthquake cover must cede (reinsure) 2.50% of the earthquake risk, up to a maximum US\$2.50 million, to a Pool consisting of all insurers licensed in Indonesia. The rules applying to the Pool have been subject to continuous change as problems of workability have manifested themselves.

Cont'd page 2

HIGHLIGHTS

- Earthquake Pool Launches
- Multi Specialty, Single Identity
- Director and Officers Liability Insurance Covers More Than Shareholders' Actions
- Special Insurer For Terror Risks Founded
- Understanding Terrorism Risks And How To Apply Them
- Senior Engineer In IBS Group
- DPLK And The Ministerial Decree No. 150 / 2000

The current intention is for all locally issued all risks and fire and perils policies to carry an earthquake exclusion and that separate 'earthquake policies' should be issued. The workload required to do so in terms of administrative policy count, premium accounting and reinsurance will be considerable.

The Pool requires all non-life insurers to subscribe capacity reflecting their proportionate share of any losses to the Pool. They have also been levied with their share of the cost of the reinsurance protection which has been purchased by the Pool. The amount of this reinsurance protection has reduced from the US\$72.00 million expected at the time of our last IBSNews, to only US\$35.00 million now.

This means that aggregate losses above US\$35.00 million would immediately exhaust the Pool, and Pool members are required to share proportionately any losses above that amount. Insurers are thereby assuming a potentially unlimited and unidentifiable exposure above US\$35.00 million. Needless to say this has proven to be a major stumbling block for the market and for the insuring public in general. It is difficult to quantify the real catastrophe exposure, especially on an EML (estimated maximum loss) basis. One thing seems certain however and that is the Pool capacity, including reinsurance, is likely to be insufficient for even a modest catastrophe event.

WHAT ARE THE TERMS?

Terms have changed and continue to change. On behalf of our clients we are concerned about the premium rating levels that have recently been applied, (more or less across the board on a zonal basis) and the deductible structure.

It also appears that the Pool is seeking to mandate Pool rates and conditions across the market as a whole through a recommended Tariff rating schedule, notwithstanding the availability of treaty and facultative capacity in the market with more favorable terms.

As the Pool rates have now been confirmed to be between 0.12% and 0.165% there is a real likelihood that, if applied, the Pool will take earthquake coverage beyond the ability of some policyholders to pay.

Pool deductibles of 10% co-insurance of any loss **PLUS** a deductible of 2.50% of the total values at risk generate high and open-ended deductible exposures, especially on larger risks.

For example, a risk of US\$300.00m in value suffering a loss of US\$100.00 million would incur a retention by the client of US\$10.00million co-insurance plus a US\$7.50 million deductible, i.e., US\$17.50m overall.

This is allied to the high premium levels applicable and may not be competitive in the global market.

A number of other issues remain unclear as to how the Pool will operate. One problem is that the Pool is not able to accept business interruption risks and thereby leaves ceding insurers with an imbalance in their retention once a Pool cession has been made. This will prove difficult to apply unless, as many have suggested, risks including business interruption coverage are exempted from the arrangement. This now seems to be a probability and one which we would welcome since it will alleviate many of the problems.

Mega risks, i.e., those over US\$500.00 million in value, are clearly subject to global market conditions where the Pool's capacity contribution is not significant. A recent meeting of the Earthquake Pool Committee seems to have confirmed that these too are exempted from participation.

IBS has held discussions with a number of insurers. Many of these companies are equally concerned at the potential unreserved liabilities to which they may be subject should the Pool (and its reinsurers) be unable to meet their obligations in the event of a major loss.

In the interim, the potential increase in premium cost and self-insured levels represent an issue of real concern to IBS and to our clients. The most apparent are the introduction of a tariff cost structure including deductibles which will represent a severe hardening of terms over current market conditions and beyond those normally available in the international insurance markets. Initial indications are that many clients may simply drop earthquake, volcanic eruption and tsunami protection from their coverage altogether. This is not the desired result of course and will leave a lot of the Indonesian corporates uninsured against catastrophe risks.

We will continue to monitor the Pool and negotiate to our clients' best interests and will keep you informed of developments. Should you wish to discuss the Pool further please do not hesitate to contact your IBS Account Executive.

Multi Specialty, Single Identity

As a dominant force in Indonesian risk services for more than 25 years, the IBS Group of companies continually seeks to position the resources and focus of our company to the best advantage of our clients.

Within the business community in Indonesia, the name of IBS is well regarded in terms of service quality and professionalism, and within the insurance company market, both locally and



internationally, IBS is regarded as the market leader in risk presentation, negotiation and placement.

With the consolidation of the global insurance market over the past 24 months, and the concurrent hardening of the terms and conditions demanded by that market, size has become increasingly important, and IBS has responded to that need through a re-branding of our corporate identity to **IBS Group**.

Through consolidation of our subsidiary companies and operations under one roof and under one corporate banner, **IBS Group** will further leverage our leading position with the insurance company market. A single and powerful brand will be projected to represent the 5 core specialties of the Group:

Risk Services
Risk Management Services
Reinsurance Services
Healthcare Management
Technology

However, the re-branding activity will not touch upon the statutory and legal entities of the subsidiaries.

The new logo of **IBS Group**, though seemingly identical to the old one, carries a far more vital message. The new logo represents the five specialty services through interconnected rings which

symbolize the three core principles embraced by **IBS Group**: Integrity, Professionalism and Opportunity. These values closely govern the interaction between all employees of the IBS Group and our clients and business partners. These principles have been identified as the three rings of success.

The consolidation of our operations and brand name will integrate our specialty service units into one seamless group. Cross-over activities between these units will strongly enhance the quality service and buying power **IBS Group** is able to deliver to our clients and business partners alike.

Director and Officers Liability Insurance Covers More than Shareholder Action

Gregory K.McCoy, AFF.All - Technical Adviser - Risk Services

When most companies and their executives consider Directors and Officers Liability Insurance (D&O), they often regard it as protection from shareholder lawsuits only.

However the broad cover provided under a D&O policy provides much wider protection than this, including the following key coverage areas:

- a) **Cost and expenses cover for representation** at any official investigation, examination or inquiry into the affairs of the company. Often this cover is granted independently of a "Claim" being made and or proof of a "Wrongful Act".
- b) **Cost for defending a criminal prosecution.** A D&O policy defines "Claim" to include criminal proceedings. Corporate officers are exposed to lawsuits under various statutory provisions, particularly Article 85 of the Indonesian Companies Act. For example, if a company's action resulted in bodily personal injury or property damage to a third party, directors and senior officers of the corporation can be exposed to criminal lawsuit. Such prosecutions are not uncommon in the area of product liability, building collapses, pollution, aviation, shipping disaster and employment practice liability. Adding to this is the fact that in many legal jurisdictions, white collar crimes come under the purview of the general criminal

D&O
policy
defines
"Claim" to
include
criminal
proceedings



provisions and often these provisions carry a presumption of guilt, making it easier for the prosecution to discharge their burden to prove guilt.

- c) **Protection for claims by Insured Directors.** Whilst a standard D&O policy excludes claims by one Director against another, the exclusion is not exhaustive and is worded to actually provide cover in some instances. One example is actions taken by insured Directors in their capacities as members or beneficiaries of any pension, retirement or provident benefit fund, for example. Another key exception where insured party suits are covered is for actions in the form of a shareholder's derivative suit. In some jurisdictions such as in Thailand and Singapore, shareholder derivative action is permitted by the respective company legislation. In UK, the law regulating shareholder derivative action is undergoing changes with the aim of granting shareholders wider access to bring a derivative claim against Directors and Officers.

- d) **Employment Practice Liability (EPL).** Employment practice suits are becoming increasingly visible in Indonesia, especially in this period of corporate restructuring, lay offs and increasing union activity, and IBS Group regard this area of potential liability as a major risk to all employers now. The EPL extension to a D&O policy provides protection for a broad range of risks including claims arising out of any actual or alleged unfair or wrongful dismissal, discharge or termination of employment, wrongful failure to employ or promote, wrongful deprivation of career opportunities, wrongful

IBS
regard
Directors
and Officers
Liability
as an
increasing
area of
risk for
companies
and
their
executives



discipline, failure to furnish accurate job references, negligent employee evaluation, sexual or workplace or racial or disability harassment of any kind and failure to provide adequate employee policies and procedures.

- e) **Cover for suits brought by corporate regulators.** Suits by regulators form a major source of claims against directors and officers in Asia. The D&O policy grants cover for regulator's action since "Claim" is defined to include administrative and regulatory proceedings. Though the resultant fines and penalties are excluded from the scope of loss that is payable under the policy, Directors are protected for costs in defending a regulator's action, and would be for any civil action taken by regulators. Malaysia recently announced amendments to the Securities Commission Act, which now allows the Securities Commission to institute civil action for misleading statements in the prospectus, and in Singapore plans are underway to grant the Monetary Authority of Singapore the power to institute civil action for all securities violations.
- f) **Claims By Lenders.** Whilst there is no specific exclusion to the standard D&O policy, until recently insurers have imposed an absolute exclusion relating to actions arising out of company bankruptcy and insolvency, or actions taken by creditors. In recent months IBS Group has seen a softening of this position by the insurance market and in a number of instances this coverage has been provided without limitation.
- g) **Entity or Company cover.** The D&O policy is intended to cover costs and expenses arising out of actions directly against Directors, or the costs a company may incur by indemnifying the Director against that action, it does not provide cover for claims against the Company itself. However, insurers do grant extensions to cover the Company for limited situations, namely the EPL cover mentioned overleaf and in the area of securities litigation. The extension makes the entity a direct Insured, i.e. granting the same status as a Director and Officer but only for claims arising out of securities, such as IPOs or additional share issues. While the benefit under this is insurance cover for the Company as well as the Directors, there is also a practical benefit in that the defense can be conducted jointly as opposed to having two sets of lawyers, one for the Director and the other for the Company who are likely to have separate defense agendas.

IBS regard Directors and Officers Liability as an increasing area of risk for Companies and their executives, particularly considering the increasing incidence of complainants using litigation as a dispute resolution tool. Any inquiries should be directed to IBS Group's specialist Financial Services Group.

(With material provided by Chubb Insurance Group)



These
policies
have
always
contained
War
exclusions



Understanding Terrorism Risks And How To Apply Them

Brian J. Dallamore, ACII - Technical Advisor
- Reinsurance Services

Ever since the World Trade Center loss occurred on what is now infamous September 11th the insurance world has never been quite the same. One of the first things to almost disappear overnight was the insurers relaxed attitude to what is universally known as **S&T** or to use its full description **Sabotage and Terrorism** coverage. But to what extent was this coverage previously available and just what has happened since? What cover do we have now and how is it defined? These are all very reasonable questions and by no means straight forward. In this article we will attempt to answer some of them.

Firstly, nearly all conventional property policies (and for the sake of simplicity this is the risk area that we will concentrate on here) is based on the **Munich Re Standard Form**, especially those issued in the Indonesian insurance market. These policies have always contained War exclusions, which specifically exclude any loss or damage arising directly or indirectly from the defined perils of war, civil war, civil commotion assuming the proportion of a popular rising, insurrection and/or military or usurped power.

Whilst the clauses vary between some policies and others they are basically the same in intent. The words **sabotage and terrorism** were not specifically mentioned and as such you could reasonably assume that acts of terrorism, however it may be defined, which causes damage to insured property is covered.

What is a terrorist act?

Based on the fact that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter this is by no means a simple question to answer. However for the un-initiated a terrorist act was generally considered to be an act directed towards the overthrow of the government or a government related institution i.e. a political act.



Jakarta Riot, May 1998

Using this definition one would agree that the riots which took place in Jakarta and elsewhere in Indonesia during 1998 fell under this definition since those actions which caused damage were directed towards the downfall of the Suharto Government. Of that there seems little doubt. Consequently, with some notable exceptions, the fire and general damage claims which occurred during the May riots were mostly paid in full by insurers with market wide losses aggregating to something like US\$ 400 Million. A heavy blow indeed to what is a relatively small insurance industry in Indonesia.

The reason was of course that the infamous **T&S** words did not appear in the policy exclusions and hence the claims were payable. Whether insurers intended to cover nation wide politically motivated events is arguable. The general public saw the May 1998 events as "riots" and riot together with it's associated peril of civil commotion cover is actually defined in most policies as a covered risk.

A riot is a riot and the applicability of cover is quite clear. This however is no longer the case. Insurers have significantly widened the scope of exclusions applying to these events

A riot may not be covered and you will need to ask the complex questions of why is the riot occurring? What is its purpose and objective? Who is organizing and carrying it out? Only by answering these questions is it possible to know whether or not the damage and a business interruption, which may arise from it, will be indemnified under the policy or not.

From our
point of
view
of course
these
clauses
open-up
all sorts of
other
problems
to think
about.



During the last 18 months the international insurance market has attempted to clarify intent by introducing newly issued policy clauses and which are now quite specific. These are referred to in the Insurance industry as NMA 2918 and NMA 2920 together with their respective reinsurance clauses NMA 2919 and NMA 2921. They are extremely serious in their implication and application to policies and should be fully understood by insurers and the insuring public alike. We are not yet aware of their meaning being tested in law although we feel that this is only a matter of time



Jakarta Riot, May 1998

For Indonesian insurers it should be noted that even if they do not appear in an issued policy they almost certainly exist within the insurers annual treaty and risk specific (facultative) reinsurance arrangements. **INSUREDS BEWARE.**

What do these clauses say?

WAR AND TERRORISM EXCLUSION ENDORSEMENT

Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary within this insurance or any endorsement thereto it is agreed that this insurance excludes loss, damage, cost or expense of whatsoever nature directly or indirectly caused by, resulting from or in connection with any of the following regardless of any other cause or events contributing concurrently or in other sequence to the loss;

1. *War, invasion, acts of foreign enemies, hostilities or warlike operations (whether war be declared or not), civil war, rebellion, revolution, insurrection, civil commotion assuming the*

proportions of or amounting to an uprising or usurped power; or

2. *Any act terrorism*

For the purpose of this endorsement an act of terrorism means an act, including but not limited to the use of force or violence and/or threat thereof, of any or group(s) of persons, whether acting alone or on behalf of or in connection with any organization(s) or government(s), committed for political, religious, ideological or similar purposes including the intention to influence any government and/or to put the public, or any section of the public, in fear.

This endorsement also excludes loss, damage, cost or expenses of whatsoever nature directly or indirectly caused by, resulting from or in connection with any action taken in controlling, preventing, suppressing or in any way relating to (1) and/or (2) above.

If the Underwriters allege that by reason of this exclusion, any loss, damage, cost or expenses is not covered by this insurance the burden of proving the contrary shall be upon the Assured. In the event any portion of this endorsement is found to be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder shall remain in full force and effect

From our point of view of course these clauses open-up all sorts of other problems to think about. It could be reasonably argued for example that any act of any kind could be deemed to be political, religious or ideological in intent. In whose opinion and to what extent? These questions remain un-answered until today. In addition, the reverse Onus of Proof requirement (In our opinion a quite unreasonable burden to place upon the insured) means that an insured will have to prove that the event that resulted in the loss of a factory or a business interruption that ensues, was not political or ideological in nature. We are not at all sure how this could be done especially if the people concerned who caused such damage are no longer available for interview.

For our part, we have found it difficult to obtain a clear understanding from insurers and reinsurers as to how this would apply on behalf of our clients. As far as we are aware those shops and restaurants destroyed in the recent Bali bombing have not been able to claim under their policies. The warning is clearly there.

In our next issue we will be describing in detail the esoteric terrorism and sabotage covers which are available in the international markets to clients and to their lending institutions. **Coverage is available to some extent but at what cost?**

DPLK And The Ministerial Decree No. 150 / 2000

Sonny S.C. Cheah, MBA, FCII - Technical Advisor - Healthcare Management



Workers on strike in Jakarta

Decree number 150 / 2000 of the ministry of man-power has generated much controversy. It is blamed for investors' reluctance to invest in Indonesia and has been the center of much controversy since its introduction 2 years ago.

Analysts and observers have so far been focusing on the part of the decree that governs dismissal of employees. However, the decree covers a broader area of employment regulation, and one of the areas we will be discussing in this article is the suitability of the savings plan required by the decree versus a pension savings plan (more commonly known as DPLK) and its implications for our clients.

Despite the harsh and unfavorable economic climate, as part of a standard compensation package, employers are often heavily pressured to provide pension benefits to their employees. The most often adopted solution is to contact providers of pension programs, compare the most favorable policy conditions as well as services available and take on the program. It is however in nearly all cases a long term and irrevocable decision.

In our view, there could actually be three types of solutions which should be carefully considered by employers: (1) DPLK, (2) Saving Plan under the ministerial decree no. 150/2000, (3) A combination of both. Whatever solution gets adopted in the end it should be able to cater to the employees' requirements as well as address

the needs of the employer. Any program should be able to answer the five basic questions:

- i. Fulfill the obligation and comply with the following articles as stipulated under the ministerial decree no. 150/2000, to their employees for:
 - Article 22: Severance pay
 - Article 23: Service pay
 - Article 24: Compensation for medical allowance etc
 - Article 26: Employee voluntary resignation rule
 - Article 27: Employer mass termination due to bankruptcy etc
 - Article 31: Employment termination due to pension age
 - Article 32: Termination due to death of the employee
- ii. How to equip the Company to meet their future labor legal liability to their employees.
- iii. What are the Tax treatment advantages available
- iv. How much is the fund allocation to ensure better cash flow structure, both short term and long term.
- v. How the Fund can still remain under Management control

Savings Plan

Protection is the essence of all life insurance products. During the early days of life insurance, the main objective was for insurers to provide cash in the event of death of the insureds. However, along with the evolution of human needs, savings are now a common and often times the main element of life insurance products. If we view the savings feature of life products in to the Decree number 150 / 2000 of the ministry of manpower, there are a wide variety of products available in the market to choose from which can fulfill the requirements of the decree, i.e. the fund provision in the event of voluntary resignation or involuntary employment termination.

To the employers, there are two possible course of action to comply with the ministerial decree, both with its own advantages and disadvantages, highly dependent on the balance sheet of the employers. The fund can be managed and administered by the employers themselves or it can be outsourced to a third party in which case there will be added benefit of investment expertise as well as the discipline to consistently run the fund. If a third party is appointed to run the fund, there are two options available as described below. An effective solution to one may be unsuitable to the other, thus we recommend comprehensive evaluation prior to selecting an option.

Option 1

This involves the setting up of a pool fund whereby the ownership of the fund remains with the employers. There is no tax incentive available to those opting for this method. The advantage is clear that the fund is readily at the disposal of the employer. This type of plan is fully revocable and many life insurers offer this type of products, thus a quick deployment of the plan is possible.

Option 2

Opposed to option 1, this option will leave ownership of the fund to employees. Employers do not have access to the fund or other benefits. The main advantage is the tax treatment enabled through this plan. Again, many such plans are readily available in the market, with subtle benefit differences from one to another. Nevertheless, a careful evaluation of needs should be completed beforehand.

Tax Incentive

The challenge for employers is how to satisfy the decree requirement while at the same time effecting maximum benefits to all parties concerned: employers and employee. Below are simple illustrations to better reflect what we mean when saying a company's balance sheet and financial situation are the main factors to consider when deciding on an option:

As illustrated above, to PT XYZ, there is a clear tax advantages by selecting option 2, even though the company loses controlling rights on the fund. To PT JKL, however, neither option offers any tax advantage, therefore it is recommended to at least retain ownership to the fund. Important to note that administering the fund without assigning to a third party will require resources such as investment specialist, fund administrator as well as consistency and discipline. Please contact IBS Group, Healthcare Management Unit for more comprehensive expert analysis.



Exhausted and seeks for protection under the controversial decree

| ITEM | PROVISION FUND | OPTION 1 (w/o Tax Incentive) | OPTION 2 (w/ Tax Incentive) |
|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Gross Income | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 |
| Insurance Expenses | (50,000,000) | (50,000,000) | (50,000,000) |
| Other Expenses | (0) | (0) | (5,000,000) |
| Taxable Income | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 45,000,000 |
| Income Tax (30%) | (15,000,000) | (15,000,000) | (13,500,000) |
| Income After Tax | 35,000,000 | 35,000,000 | 31,500,000 |
| Provision | (5,000,000) | (0) | (0) |
| Insurance Expenses | (0) | (5,000,000) | (0) |
| Net Income | 30,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 31,500,000 |

In IDR '000

Simplified Profit & Loss Statement of PT. XYZ at close of accounting year. All figures and percentages are invented to enable simple calculation.

Senior Engineer in IBS Group

In today's increasingly complex insurance industry, the need for access to risk engineering information is being duly recognized as indispensable. Not only are experienced risk engineers able to identify and evaluate risks from a purely scientific engineering perspective, when combined with extensive hands on experience in various operational and loss scenarios, they become highly effective in providing expert assessment of the true risk profile of a business.



George Gibb - Risk Management Services

George Gibb has recently joined the IBS Risk Management team and is responsible for the co-ordination of risk engineering surveys for our clients. The risk management unit produces risk report presentations which identify and quantify loss exposures and profiles, and provide recommendations for risk mitigation, removal and/or management. These reports also assist the Group insurance and reinsurance broking companies in their strategic marketing and program placements to local and international markets.

The Risk Management unit also provides customers with full claims management services ranging from claims submission, negotiation and investigation through to settlement, with current information on claims status available through IBS's unique on-line claims management system, ClaimsLink.

George has a degree in Mechanical Engineering and more than 14 years of experience in the insurance industry, 10 of which have seen him heavily involved in Engineering Risk Management in the London insurance market. "If we are talking about Indonesia alone, we are better resourced to service our clients' business than any other service provider in the market" was his comment when asked about the difference between IBS Group and other companies he has worked for. He stated that "the demand to deliver quality risk information and recommendations is higher than most places. It goes hand in hand with the levels of service that IBS Group is providing to it's clients. This is quite unique in my experience." George leads a team of experts comprising 4 qualified engineers all based in IBS Jakarta.

Industry Updates

The global insurance industry attracted USD 2,408 billion in premium income in 2001, representing a modest 1% growth over 2000, according to Swiss Re's new *sigma* study – *World insurance in 2001*. The survey points to the continuing turbulence in financial markets and a high claims burden as the primary factors shaping the limited development of the global insurance markets in 2001. Swiss Re Press.

The 15 former Equitable Life directors who are being sued for more than £ 3bn by the new board of the troubled mutual are only insured for a collective sum of £ 5m. The directors' and officers' policy written by Royal and Sun Alliance has an aggregate limit of £ 5m even if all the pursued directors are found liable. London Financial Times.

The US general insurance sector suffered its first ever full-year loss in 2001 – \$ 7.9bn - according to the Insurance Services Office and the National Association of Independent Insurers of the US. In 2000, the sector made a \$ 20.6bn profit. Post Magazine.

A number of major European insurance Groups agreed to support a new company, based in Luxembourg, to cover property against acts of terrorism. Subject to regulatory approval, Zurich Financial Services, XL Capital, Swiss Re, SCOR, Hannover Re and Allianz will combine resources to set up Special Risk Insurance and Reinsurance Luxembourg (SRIR) backed by capital of Euro 500 million. SRIR will limit coverage to Euro 275 million per event within a 600 metre radius to prevent aggregation. Business Interruption losses will not be insured. The insurers will each have an approximate 18.2% stake in the company, other than SCOR with 9.1% but SRIR will be an independent company with a management board making underwriting decisions. The Euroguard Commentary.

General Electric (GE), one of the world's largest companies, has lowered its profit expectations for next year after taking a larger-than-expected hit from insurance claims. The group, which makes a range of products from jet engines to cookers, said it was taking a \$1.4bn (£890m) charge for its reinsurance company Employers Reinsurance Corporation (ERC). This followed a review of the business last week which had revealed higher-than-feared claims following 11 September. Chief financial officer Keith Sherin said losses at ERC had "blown away" previous estimates and revealed an extra \$100m loss resulting from the World Trade Center attacks. Nonetheless, the news was better than some analysts had been expecting, sending GE's shares up almost 7%. *BBC News, November 2002*.

IBS Group is the Country's largest risk services provider with more than 25 years of experience in Indonesia. With a focus on our customers' needs, IBS Group services include market positioning of clients' risks in Indonesia and throughout the world, selection of underwriters and vetting of security standards, negotiation with underwriters of correctly worded policies, negotiation on pricing levels and dedicated claims assistance. All these services are provided through IBS Group's 5 core businesses : risk services, reinsurance services, risk management services, healthcare management and technology. For more information please visit our website at www.ibsrisk.com or call us at +62 21 515 31 31.

IBSNEWS is a quarterly publication distributed exclusively to all clients of the IBS Group of companies. **Information is correct at the time of print.**
© 2002 PT IBS Insurance Broking Service, Jakarta Stock Exchange Building, Tower II, 27th Floor, Jl. Jend. Sudirman Kav. 52-53, Jakarta 12190, Indonesia. Some articles written by expert specialists of the IBS Group. Certain articles are extracted from various sources and all rights reserved. Certain photographs, graphics and clipart images © 2002 by Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved. For enquiries please contact Corporate Communication Dept. +62 21 515 31 31.