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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report explores the fossil fuel underwriting policies of the top 20 managing agents at Lloyd’s of London, which together represent around 84% of the annual insurance premium of Lloyd’s of London’s market. It is informed by outreach to Lloyd’s and its managing agents during February and March 2023, combined with desk research and policy analysis.

It examines the alignment between Lloyd’s managing agents’ policies, Lloyd’s climate commitments and the actions that need to be taken to align with the global goal of limiting climate change to 1.5°C. It highlights the best practices, the climate laggards and the role of Lloyd’s in certain controversial fossil fuel projects.

Our research shows many Lloyd’s members have not adopted any fossil fuel restrictions and appear to simply ignore Lloyd’s recommendations.

It also finds that Lloyd’s of London is one of the last members of the Net-Zero Insurance Alliance (NZIA) to be still open to insuring coal expansion and that has yet to adopt meaningful measures to tackle oil and gas expansion. This is in contrast to the best practices of other NZIA peers that have committed not to cover new coal mines or new oil and gas projects.

In 2020, Lloyd’s released its first ESG report stating it would ask its managing agents to stop providing cover for new coal plants, mines, oil sands and Arctic energy exploration activities by January 2022. However, Lloyd’s does not enforce its recommendations and leaves it to the discretion of its managing agents to apply these policies, or not.

Lloyd’s fossil fuel guidelines fall short of what is needed to act consistently with its NZIA membership and its net-zero pledge. Even benchmarked against the current insufficient demands of Lloyd’s, close to half of its top 20 managing agents have not yet implemented Lloyd’s initial ESG recommendations for coal and unconventional oil and gas. Lloyd’s itself still avoids mentioning the issue of oil and gas expansion, despite its membership of the NZIA and the fact its peers, and even a few of its more progressive managing agents, have already adopted policies excluding insurances for new oil and gas development.

Six out of the 20 largest Lloyd’s managing agents have not adopted any fossil fuel restrictions (RiverStone Managing Agency, Chaucer Syndicates, RenaissanceRe Syndicate Management, Ascot Underwriting, Aegis Managing Agency, Atrium Underwriters). They ignore the guidance that Lloyd’s issued to its market members in 2020 and tarnish the reputation of Lloyd’s and all other Lloyd’s insurers, including those such as Munich Re Syndicate and Argenta Syndicate Management which have adopted more substantive climate policies.

On coal, only 12 of the 20 managing agents have exclusions of certain new coal mines and power plants, whilst eight have either no coal policy or a coal policy that is not compliant with Lloyd’s guidance on coal: Aegis Managing Agency, Argo Managing Agency, Ascot Underwriting, Atrium Underwriters, Chaucer Syndicates, Liberty Managing Agency, RenaissanceRe Syndicate Management, RiverStone Managing Agency. Liberty Mutual does have a basic coal policy, but it does not exclude new coal mines or power plants.

Regarding unconventional oil and gas, only eleven of the top 20 have publicly committed to certain diverse underwriting restrictions for tar sands and Arctic oil and gas exploration activities: Argenta Syndicate Management, AXA XL Underwriting Agencies, AXIS Management Agency, Beazley Furlonge, Brit Syndicates, Canopius Managing Agents, Hiscox Syndicates, Munich Re Syndicate, QBE Underwriting, Talbot Underwriting, Tokio Marine Kiln Syndicates.

Just three managing agents have committed to go beyond Lloyd’s weak guidance; Argenta Syndicate Management and Munich Re Syndicate have committed not to cover new oil and gas fields, and AXA XL Underwriting Agencies have committed to stop support for new oil fields.

As long as Lloyd’s of London does not implement an enforcement mechanism, RiverStone Managing Agency, Chaucer Syndicates and other Lloyd’s members will continue insuring projects and companies that put the climate and our society at risk.

We call on Lloyd’s of London to:
• Immediately require its managing agents to align their practices with its policy on fossil fuels within a year after adoption by Lloyd’s, and set enforcement mechanisms and sanctions if they do not comply after the one-year deadline.
• Condition the approval of any new managing agent’s business at Lloyd’s to the respect of its fossil fuel guidance.
• Monitor and transparently report every year the compliance and progress of its managing agents with regards to the Lloyd’s fossil fuel guidance on coal, oil and gas.

Lloyd’s of London’s current fossil fuel policy remains inconsistent with its net-zero pledge and we call on Lloyd’s to urgently, and no later than July 2023, update and strengthen its policies for its managing agents:
• Immediately stop offering any insurance services that support the expansion of coal, oil and gas production, and phase out within two years all insurance services for fossil fuel companies that are not aligned with a credible 1.5°C pathway.

Finally, Lloyd’s of London’s inadequate recommendations and lack of enforcement even on these fossil fuel restrictions shows that its managing agents cannot rely on Lloyd’s recommendations alone to protect the climate and our society. We encourage all Lloyd’s managing agents to adopt comprehensive fossil fuel exclusion policies in line with the best practices of their peers and the recommendations of the Insure Our Future network, including a commitment not to insure or invest in any new oil and gas projects and instead to direct support to renewable energy projects.
As the climate catastrophe accelerates, costs are reaching new heights. For the second year in a row, economic losses due to climate disasters have exceeded the $270 billion mark. Yet, fossil fuel companies, responsible for more than 86% of CO2 emissions in the past decade, continue to plan the expansion of oil, gas and coal and carbon lock-in, which will exponentially accelerate climate chaos and related climate, human and financial risks, losses and damages.

As the window to take urgent climate action is rapidly closing, some of the world’s largest insurance companies are stepping up. There was a major wake-up call in 2022 with two of the biggest industry players, Allianz and Munich Re, ruling out the coverage of new oil and gas fields as well as new midstream oil infrastructure and power plants. Munich Re’s commitment was taken a few days after its managing agent, Munich Re Syndicate, revealed it will exit the oil and gas business to focus on renewables.

Faced with the growing costs and risks of climate change, these insurers have had the foresight to restrict coverage for high-emitting industries such as the fossil fuel industry, the expansion of which is only adding fuel to the fire. By refusing to facilitate new oil and gas assets, Allianz and Munich Re, as founding members of the Net-Zero Insurance Alliance (NZIA), showed clear leadership and met the most urgent requirement of the UN Race To Zero Campaign (of which the NZIA is a partner). The UN High-Level Expert Group on the Net-Zero Emissions Commitments of Non-State Entities (HLEG) has also confirmed that supporting the expansion of fossil fuel supply cannot be consistent with any net-zero pledge and only constitutes greenwashing.

At the same time, some insurers refuse to follow these requirements and take the risk of delaying the energy transition by maintaining support for fossil fuel expansion. Even worse, some take it as an opportunity to develop business that has been left behind by others.

What about Lloyd’s of London? Lloyd’s of London is a member of the NZIA and also chair of the Sustainable Markets Initiative’s Insurance Task Force (SMI’s ITF), as well as a member of ClimateWise. But are these memberships followed by a real change in Lloyd’s of London’s market practices? Are the ESG guidelines of Lloyd’s followed by its marketplace and, more specifically, its managing agents? Are the guidelines commensurate with the climate urgency? And are the managing agents really committed to complying with the Lloyd’s of London net-zero pledge?

In this report, Reclaim Finance answers these questions by highlighting the large diversity of coal and oil and gas policies among the top 20 Lloyd’s of London managing agents.
1. LLOYD’S OF LONDON’S Timid Action Is Inconsistent With Its Net-Zero Pledge

In 2020, five years after COP21 and more than three years after the first insurers’ coal policies, Lloyd’s of London published its first ESG report asking its managing agents not to cover new coal power plants and coal mines, or oil sands and Arctic energy exploration activities.

A year later, while insured losses from natural catastrophes caused by climate change were surpassing the $100 billion mark, International Energy Agency (IEA) experts and IPCC scientists concluded for the first time that we must urgently stop the development of new oil and gas fields after 2021 in order to reach net-zero emissions by 2050 on a 1.5°C pathway. The IEA mentioned several important milestones in its Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario (NZE) that would see carbon neutrality by mid-century:

- For coal, no new unabated coal plants approved for development after 2021, and a coal phase-out of unabated coal by 2030 in advanced economies and by 2040 globally.
- For oil and gas, no new oil and gas fields approved for development after 2021 – applicable to both conventional and unconventional new oil and gas fields.

These statements from IEA experts should have encouraged Lloyd’s of London to update and strengthen its fossil fuel guidelines to remain consistent with its net-zero pledge. But Lloyd’s of London went in the completely opposite direction. In its second ESG report, it decided to downgrade its initial commitments: as of 2022, Lloyd’s of London only encourages its managing agents to adopt its already-outdated fossil fuel exclusions.

These steps backwards are even more surprising when we know that, between its two ESG guidelines, Lloyd’s of London decided to join the NZIA, thus committing to transition its insurance and reinsurance underwriting portfolios to net-zero greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2050. Its NZIA membership must not hide the “elephant in the room”: Lloyd’s is still refusing to take a clear stance on coal and oil and gas expansion, and it remains entirely silent on conventional oil and gas while its members continue to insure this expansion globally.

The IEA, the original mission of which consisted of ensuring energy safety, stipulated in 2022 that even the war in Ukraine could not justify a new wave of fossil fuel infrastructure. Lloyd’s of London’s current “encouragement” to only exclude new coal plants and mines and certain energy exploration activities in Arctic and oil sands is far from being consistent with these imperatives. At the same time, many managing agents are still not compliant with Lloyd’s of London’s initial fossil fuel exclusions, making its market even further remote from adequately responding to the climate emergency.

I think it’s important we have a flexible approach to managing agents and challenge where needs to be challenged, but ultimately hopefully we’ll be seeing some positive actions being taken by managing agents.

Rebekah Clement, Sustainability director, Lloyd’s of London
## Comparison of alignment between Lloyd’s of London fossil fuel guidelines and its top 20 Managing Agents commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 20 Lloyd’s managing agents</th>
<th>Estimated managed GWP (in £million) - 2021</th>
<th>NZIA Signatory</th>
<th>Aligned with Lloyd’s coal guidelines</th>
<th>Aligned with Lloyd’s unconventional oil and gas guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beazley Furlonge</td>
<td>4,311</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit Syndicates</td>
<td>3,318</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiscox Syndicates</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RiverStone Managing Agency</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot Underwriting*</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBE Underwriting*</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaucer Syndicates</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokio Marine Kiln Syndicates*</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXIS Managing Agency*</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Managing Agency*</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopius Managing Agents</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXA, XL Underwriting Agencies*</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Amlin Underwriting*</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RenaissanceRe Syndicate</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argo Managing Agency**</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascot Underwriting</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich Re Syndicate*</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argenta Syndicate Management*</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEGIS Managing Agency</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrium Underwriters</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total &quot;Yes&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AXA, AXIS, Hannover Re, Munich Re, MS&AD, QBE, Tokio Marine confirmed that their fossil fuel policy is group wide and applies to their managing agent. Liberty Mutual Agency indicates in its Climate Wise report that it follows Liberty Mutual’s coal policy. AIG did not answer our inquiry regarding Talbot Underwriting.

**In February 2023, Argo completed the sale of Argo Lloyd’s syndicate 1200 (around £600 million of gross written premium in 2021)

### Specific cases

**ARGO GROUP**

The managing agent set measures to screen its business related to coal and oil sands. These measures are not aligned with Lloyd’s fossil fuel guidelines.

**Liberty Mutual Group**

The managing agent only decided to restrict its business with certain companies heavily involved in the coal sector and did not rule out its potential support for new coal projects. It has not yet implemented exclusions regarding exploration projects in Arctic and tar sands aligned with Lloyd’s fossil fuel guidelines.

**MS Amlin**

The managing agent set exclusions for new coal mines and plants aligned with Lloyd’s coal guidelines but has not yet implemented exclusions regarding exploration projects in Arctic and tar sands aligned with Lloyd’s fossil fuel guidelines.
2. FOSSIL FUEL UNDERWRITING - BENCHMARK OF THE TOP 20 MANAGING AGENTS

In the absence of guidance aligned with genuine net zero commitments from Lloyd’s of London, and in the absence of enforcement of even the weak initial ESG recommendations Lloyd’s has provided, its market members have designed and implemented a variety of differing commitments regarding fossil fuels, or have made no commitments at all. Only a rare few, driven more by their parent company commitments than by any recommendations or action by Lloyd’s, have policies that, while not perfect, can be recognised as currently best in class.

a. Climate laggards

It is very surprising to spot managing agents that are members or signatories of major “sustainable insurance initiatives” in the list of climate laggards, such as RiverStone Managing Agency, RenaissanceRe Syndicate Management and Ascot Underwriting; two ClimateWise members that have not yet implemented any fossil fuel exclusion policy, neither for coal nor oil and gas activities.

Do not respect Lloyd’s guidance on tar sands and Arctic oil & gas

Do not respect Lloyd’s guidance on coal

The ESG guidance from Lloyd’s on coal and oil and gas is far from the best standard among European insurers and reinsurers.


This figure increases to nine managing agents that have not yet implemented the Lloyd’s unconventional oil and gas guidance: RiverStone Managing Agency, Chaucer Syndicates, RenaissanceRe Syndicate Management, Ascot Underwriting, Aegis Managing Agency, Atrium Underwriters, Liberty Managing Agency, MS Amlin Underwriting and Argo Managing Agency.

b. Managing agents and coal

According to our assessment, only 12 of the top 20 managing agents have set coal policies consistent with Lloyd’s of London’s “encouragement” to stop underwriting new cover for coal mines and plants, while only six have set comprehensive coal project exclusions for new coal mines, plants and their dedicated infrastructure: Argenta Syndicate Management, AXA XL Underwriting Agencies, AXIS Managing Agency, Canopus Managing Agents, Munich Re Syndicate and QBE Underwriting.

AXA XL and AXIS Managing Agency have gone further by setting underwriting exclusions for companies developing new coal projects (mine, plant, dedicated infrastructure) and committing to a comprehensive coal phase-out by 2030 in OECD/European countries and by 2040 globally.

c. Managing agents and Arctic oil and gas

Eleven out of the managing agents assessed in this briefing have set a variety of differing underwriting restrictions for oil and gas exploration activities located in the Arctic Area, following the unconventional oil and gas
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CLASSIFICATION OF LLOYD’S MANAGING AGENTS ACCORDING TO THEIR FOSSIL FUEL POLICY

QBE Underwriting
- Canopius Managing Agents
- Talbot Underwriting
- Brit Syndicates
- Hiscox Syndicates
- Tokio Marine Kiln Syndicates
- Beazley Furlonge

Munich Re Syndicate
- Argenta Syndicate Management
- AXA XL Underwriting Agencies
- AXIS Managing Agency

MS Amlin Underwriting
- Liberty Managing Agency
- Argo Managing Agency
- RiverStone Managing Agency
- Chaucer Syndicates
- Renaziance Syndicate Management
- AEGIS Managing Agency
- Atrium Underwriters

SLOW MOVERS

Managing agents aligned with Lloyd’s guidelines on fossil fuels

MANAGING AGENTS

FRONT RUNNERS

Managing agents which go beyond initial Lloyd’s guidelines on fossil fuels

ULTIMATE LAGGARDS

Managing agents without any fossil fuel policy or a policy not aligned with Lloyd’s guidelines on fossil fuels


However, because Lloyd’s has not given even the most basic guidance on what definition of the Arctic its recommendations refer to, the scope of its managing agents’ commitments regarding Arctic oil and gas exploration activities differ from one another.

Two managing agents define the Arctic by referring to the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) definition without the Norwegian territories (AXA XL Underwriting Agencies and Munich Re Syndicate); three managing agents define the Arctic by referring to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (Hiscox Syndicates, Tokio Marine Kiln Syndicates and AXIS Managing Agency); Argenta Syndicate Management defines the Arctic by referring to the Arctic Circle, which runs in a circle of latitude 66.34°; and four managing agents do not define the Arctic area at all (Brit Syndicates, Talbot Underwriting, QBE Underwriting and Canopius Managing Agents).

d. Managing agents and tar sands

The same list of managing agents that committed not to insure oil and gas exploration activities in the Arctic also decided to rule out support for exploration activities in tar sands. For many reasons, tar sands have been flagged by studies as one of the most polluting types of oil to produce, involving huge amounts of energy and heavy land clearing for extraction. According to Rystad Energy, one barrel of oil from tar sands could emit up to three times more CO2 than a barrel from oil sources.

However, according to the Global Oil and Gas Exit List (GOGEL) developed by the German NGO Urgewald, tar sands are responsible for only 1.5% of potential oil and gas short-term expansion globally, while other unconventional sectors, such as shale oil and gas, could be responsible for around 29% of global oil and gas short-term expansion.

By targeting exploration activities in only two unconventional oil and gas sectors, Lloyd’s of London sends a misleading signal to its managing agents that oil and gas expansion in conventional and other unconventional sectors is not an issue. In 2022, more than half of oil and gas expansion still comes from conventional oil and gas sources.

e. Managing agents and conventional oil and gas

Argenta Syndicate Management and Munich Re Syndicate seem to have read the latest IEA recommendations carefully. The two managing agents committed in 2022 not to provide insurance cover for new oil and gas fields following the oil and gas policies of their parent companies, Hannover Re and Munich Re, respectively. AXA XL Underwriting Agencies, applying the AXA group oil and gas policy, has gone in the same direction but is only halfway there with its commitment not to underwrite risks related to new oil fields.

Finally, none of the top 20 managing agents has ruled out insuring companies that are planning new upstream oil and gas projects (exploration/development of new oil and gas fields).
Comparison of underwriting policies of Lloyd’s of London’s top 20 managing agents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 20 Lloyd’s managing agents</th>
<th>Exclusion of new coal projects (mines, plants, dedicated coal infrastructure)</th>
<th>Exclusion of coal developers</th>
<th>Coal phase-out</th>
<th>Exclusion of new upstream oil and gas projects</th>
<th>Exclusion of upstream oil and gas developers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Munich Re Syndicate</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argenta Syndicate Management</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXA XL Underwriting Agencies</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXIS Managing Agency</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBE Underwriting</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopius Managing Agents</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot Underwriting</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beazley Furlonge</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit Syndicates</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiscox Syndicates</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokio Marine Kiln Syndicates</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Amlin Underwriting</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Managing Agency</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argo Managing Agency</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RiverStone Managing Agency</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaucer Syndicates</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RenaissanceRe Syndicate</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascot Underwriting</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEGIS Managing Agency</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrium Underwriters</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Limited policy</td>
<td>Weak policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
<td>Stronger policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies on coal and oil and gas of the top 20 managing agents have been assessed based on the Reclaim Finance methodology used in its benchmark tools: the Coal Policy Tool and the Oil and Gas Policy Tracker.
Definition:

**Coal developer** – Companies are identified as coal developers if they meet at least one of the following criteria:

- **Mining**: companies engaged in coal exploration activities, planning to develop new coal mines, extending coal mines by applying for new permits, or involved in coal exploration activities.
- **Power**: companies planning to develop new coal-fired power capacity of at least 100 MW prorated (based on a company’s ownership of a project, or on the number of companies involved in a project).
- **Services**: companies involved in the development or expansion of coal transportation assets or infrastructure assets dedicated to support coal mines, coal transportation and coal-to-gas facilities.

**Coal phase-out** – To effectively support a coal phase-out in line with a 1.5°C pathway, managing agents must commit to have no further insurance/reinsurance portfolio exposure to coal projects and companies active in OECD and European countries by 2030, and by 2040 worldwide.

**New upstream oil and gas projects** – Exploration or development of new oil and gas fields (i.e. fields that are not yet in production), or the redevelopment or expansion of existing fields already in production.

**Oil and gas developers** – Companies intending to add oil and/or gas resources to their production capacities in the short term (at least 20 million barrels of oil equivalent (mmboe) of resources to their production portfolio in the near future), i.e. resources associated with assets under development and field evaluation (the two stages preceding production), or in the long term by their involvement in exploration activities. Or, companies with oil and/or gas pipelines or LNG terminals proposed or under construction.

"Fossil fuel demand can be met through continued investment in existing assets and already approved projects, but without any new long lead time upstream conventional projects."

3. LLOYD’S OF LONDON’S MARKET SUPPORT TO HIGHLY CONTROVERSIAL CARBON BOMBS

Click on the maps to learn more about the projects

Trans mountain pipeline - TMX

Location: Canada  Status: Construction

Project: Tar sands pipeline extension (1,150km)

Purpose: Boosting oil sands transportation from 300,000 boe/d to around 900,000 boe/d between Edmonton (Alberta) and Burnaby (British Columbia).

Environmental impacts:
• More than 80 oil spills were reported within the period 1961 to 2016.

Social impacts: Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of Indigenous communities has not been secured.

Controversy level: Very high due to civil society’s opposition.

Lloyd’s of London’s involvement: Lloyd’s underwriters have been involved for years in this project at least from 2014 to 2020. Since the insurance contract renewal of August 2020, Trans Mountain has been allowed to hide its insurers by the Canada Energy Regulator (CER).

Top 20 managing agents who ruled out TMX – 5

Top 20 managing agents who did not rule out TMX - 15
This list includes Beazley Furlonge, Brit Syndicates, Chaucer Syndicates, Hiscox Syndicates, Liberty Managing Agency, MS Amlin, Tokio Marine Kiln Syndicates, and the others not mentioned above.

East African Crude Oil Pipeline - EACOP

Location: Uganda - Tanzania  Status: Construction

Project: Heated oil pipeline (1,440km – world’s longest heated pipeline)

Purpose: Allowing more than 200,000 boe/d to flow from the Tilenga and Kingfisher oil fields neighbouring Lake Albert in Uganda to the Indian Ocean in Tanzania.

Environmental impacts:
• The pipeline will pass next to the Lake Victoria, Africa’s largest lake, that more than 40 million people depend on for water and food production.
• It will cross more than 200 rivers and run through thousands of farms.

Social impacts: In total, this project will require the displacement of roughly 118,000 people along the pipeline’s route, primarily farming communities who live off their land.

Controversy level: Very high due to local and international opposition.

Lloyd’s of London’s involvement: Leading (re)insurers, including Munich Re, Allianz and Hannover Re have ruled out insuring the EACOP due to the serious environmental, social and governance impacts, many of which are inherent to the project. However Lloyd’s has so far refused to comment.

Top 20 managing agents who ruled out EACOP – 9

Top 20 managing agents who did not rule out EACOP - 11
This list includes Brit Syndicates, Chaucer Syndicates, Hiscox Syndicates, Liberty Managing Agency, MS Amlin, Talbot Underwriting, Tokio Marine Kiln Syndicates, and the others not mentioned above.

Top 20 managing agents who ruled out EACOP – 9

Top 20 managing agents who did not rule out EACOP - 11
This list includes Brit Syndicates, Chaucer Syndicates, Hiscox Syndicates, Liberty Managing Agency, MS Amlin, Talbot Underwriting, Tokio Marine Kiln Syndicates, and the others not mentioned above.
**Ichthys LNG**

*Location:* Australia  
*Status:* Operating

**Project:** One of the world's biggest gas projects gathering extra large infrastructure, such as the world's largest semi-submersible production platform and the longest subsea pipeline of the southern hemisphere (890km).

**Purpose:** Exporting around 9 mtpa of LNG (roughly 10% of Australia's annual LNG exports).

**Environmental impacts:**
- Crosses a protected marine national park.
- One of the most carbon-intensive LNG projects in Australia due to high levels of gas flaring.

**Social impacts:** Not yet documented.

**Controversy level:** High due to local opposition to new or expanded gas projects in Australia (Barossa gas field, Scarborough gas field, etc.).

**Lloyd's of London's involvement:** Five managing agents of Lloyd's were involved in the project insurance policy of the onshore Ichthys LNG plant between 2012 and 2017. Navigators Underwriting Agency Limited and AmTrust Syndicates in addition to three managing agents, assessed in the report.

**Top 20 managing agents involved in Ichthys LNG - 3**  
Beazley Furlonge, Canopus Managing Agents and Talbot Underwriting. AmTrust Syndicates, which merged with Canopus in 2019, was also involved.

**Adani Carmichael mine**

*Location:* Australia  
*Status:* Construction

**Project:** One of the largest coal mines in Australia, which could produce 60 mtpa (million tons per annum) of coal at peak production.

**Purpose:** Extracting 2.3 billion tons of coal for export to Asia (mainly India).

**Environmental impacts:**
- The Adani Carmichael mine is known as a carbon bomb and could emit up to 2 billion tons of CO2 during its lifespan.
- Adani's Abbot Point coal port is nestled between ecologically significant wetlands, sacred Juru traditional sites, and the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area.

**Social impacts:** Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of Indigenous communities has not been secured.

**Controversy level:** Very high due to local and international opposition.

**Lloyd's of London's involvement:** The Lloyd's insurance market has been involved in providing insurance for the Carmichael coal project since 2019. Probitas has been named as insurer of the Carmichael rail line, coal haulage operation ( Bowen Rail Company) and NQXT coal port (formerly Adani Abbot Point Terminal).

**Top 20 managing agents who ruled out the Carmichael project – 16**  

**Top 20 managing agents who did not rule out the Carmichael project - 4**  
This list includes Aegis Managing Agency, and the others not mentioned above.
More than two years after Lloyd’s of London released its first ESG guidance for its managing agents, our assessment of the top 20 coal and oil and gas policies reveals that Lloyd’s of London is still missing a major portion of its ESG targets related to fossil fuels. It is also lacking proper implementation of its guidance by its members, including even the largest managing agents, such as Hiscox Syndicates, RiverStone Managing Agency and Chaucer Syndicates.

Rather than allowing its managing agents to pick up several indicators on the ESG menu, we call on Lloyd’s to set and monitor the adoption of a clear framework for its managing agents regarding their support for new fossil fuel projects. This framework must include the following minimum guarantees on underwriting practices and transparency:

- Immediately require Lloyd’s managing agents to align their practices with its policy on fossil fuels within a year after adoption by Lloyd’s, and set enforcement mechanisms and sanctions if they do not comply after the one-year deadline.
- Condition the approval of any new managing agent to full compliance with Lloyd’s fossil fuel guidance, making it mandatory for new managing agents at Lloyd’s to follow its fossil fuel guidance. This commitment must apply to current and future guidance on coal and oil and gas, which is updated annually.
- Monitor and transparently report in its annual ESG report a summary of all its managing agents policies on coal and oil and gas. This summary must include key indicators including:
  - Number and names of managing agents that implemented underwriting exclusions for risks related to new coal projects (mine, plants, infrastructure).
  - Number and names of managing agents that implemented underwriting exclusions for risks related to new unconventional upstream oil and gas projects.37
  - Number and names of managing agents “aligned” with Lloyd’s guidance on coal, tar sands and Arctic oil and gas.

Lloyd’s of London’s unwillingness to stop its members underwriting coal and fossil fuel expansion make a mockery of its membership of the NZIA and its claims to be a climate leader. Its current fossil fuel policy remains inconsistent with its net-zero pledge and we call on Lloyd’s to urgently, and no later than July 2023, update and strengthen its fossil fuel guidance by adding the following minimum standards on underwriting practices for its managing agents:

- Immediately stop offering any insurance and reinsurance services that support the expansion of coal, oil and gas production and phase out within two years all insurance services for fossil fuel companies that are not aligned with a credible 1.5°C pathway.

Lloyd’s of London managing agents can no longer afford to wait for Lloyd’s to implement more ambitious ESG guidelines. We encourage them to adopt comprehensive fossil fuel exclusion policies in line with the best practices of their peers and the recommendations of the Insure Our Future network, including a commitment not to support any new oil and gas projects, instead supporting provision of insurance coverage for renewable energy projects.

Convinced that Lloyd’s of London and its managing agents are all aware of the impacts climate change can have on their business, Reclaim Finance calls on them to provide the necessary policies and means within their business to achieve their common climate ambitions.

CONCLUSION

Delayed mitigation action will further increase global warming and losses and damages will rise and additional human and natural systems will reach adaptation limits (high confidence).

Synthesis report of the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report, March 2023
Management and Tokio Marine Kiln Syndicates (TMK) are Lloyd’s managing agents that are also members of ClimateWise.

Swiss Re Institute, Natural catastrophes in 2021: the floodgates are open, 30 March 2022.

The International Energy Agency was created during the first oil crisis of 1974 to ensure the security of oil supplies.

OECD and European countries.


In its World Energy Outlook 2022, the IEA slightly nuanced its statement referring to new oil and gas fields. It indicated that short-lived fields could be developed, although these should be avoided as much as possible and their emissions compensated by efforts to reduce emissions in other sectors.

Ascot Underwriting is also a member of the SMI’s Insurance Task Force.

For example: railways, export terminals.

Also called “coal developers”.

Global Oil & Gas Exit List

According to the GOGEL database, 52% of short-term oil and gas expansion comes from conventional sources.

Both conventional and unconventional oil and gas.


Munich Re, Munich Re’s approach to fossil fuels in underwriting and investment, 2022.

AXA, AXA Group Energy Policy Focus on the Oil and Gas industry, 29 October 2021.

Also called “oil and gas developers”.

Unconventional oil and gas definition: extra heavy oil (API < 15); tar sands; coal bed methane; fracking (shale oil and gas); ultra-deep water offshore oil and gas (depth > 1,500 metres); oil and gas resources located in the Arctic area as defined by the Arctic Council’s Assessment and Monitoring Programme (AMAP).
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Reclaim Finance is an NGO affiliated with Friends of the Earth France. It was founded in 2020 and is 100% dedicated to issues linking finance with social and climate justice. In the context of the climate emergency and biodiversity losses, one of Reclaim Finance’s priorities is to accelerate the decarbonization of financial flows. Reclaim Finance exposes the climate impacts of financial players, denounces the most harmful practices and puts its expertise at the service of public authorities and financial stakeholders who desire to bend existing practices to ecological imperatives.

contact@reclaimfinance.org