BEYOND FUND-LEVEL D&O ANALYSING INSURANCE FOR APAC FUND MANAGERS

RISK INSIGHT SERIES

MAY 2026

Contents

Introduction 3

Background 4

1. Personal and Fund-Level D&O 5

2. . Investment Management Liability 7

3. W&I Insurance and Deal Protection 9

4. Portfolio Cyber and Operational Risk 11

5. Implications for Fund Managers and Insurers 13

Summary 15

References 16

AI Disclosure: This article was created with the assistance of AI tools for research and drafting. It was reviewed, edited, and fact-checked by our human editorial team before publication.

Introduction

The Asia-Pacific private capital market has become increasingly central to the global flow of institutional money. The region bucked the wider private equity slowdown in 2024, with buyout fund-raising up thirteen percent year on year, and fund managers report unprecedented optimism: eighty-seven percent surveyed by Bain expect returns to hold or improve over the next three to five years.[1] At the same time, the top twenty funds now account for more than forty percent of regional deal value, concentrating capital and exposure in a small number of large managers.[1]

The operating environment has also become more demanding. Regulators across the region have tightened expectations of fund managers, with the Monetary Authority of Singapore, the Securities and Futures Commission in Hong Kong, the Financial Services Agency in Japan, and the Australian Securities and Investments Commission each formalising governance and conduct standards over the past two years. LPs have become more rigorous in their operational due diligence, with insurance arrangements now a routine line item on the diligence checklist. Deal complexity has risen alongside capital deployment, particularly in cross-border transactions, tokenised real-world assets, and the growing use of continuation vehicles and GP-led secondaries. Each of these shifts adds something to the liability profile that the firm's cover is being asked to absorb.

Beyond the headline figures, fund managers in APAC sit at the centre of three distinct sets of relationships: with their own investors (LPs), with the portfolio companies they back, and with the regulators that supervise their operations. Each relationship generates its own categories of claim, its own liability profile, and its own demand on the insurance arrangements behind the firm.

The default assumption at many fund managers, particularly emerging managers and smaller GPs, is that fund-level Directors and Officers cover is sufficient. It is not. A fund-level D&O policy is one part of an insurance picture that should also include Investment Management Liability for the manager entity, Side A and outside directorship cover for individual partners sitting on portfolio company boards, Warranty and Indemnity insurance for transactions, and a coordinated portfolio company programme covering cyber, crime, D&O, and specie risks.[2] Each line responds to a different category of claim. Together they form a coherent insurance picture. In isolation, each leaves a gap that often becomes visible only when something goes wrong.

The consequence of leaving the picture incomplete is rarely visible until a claim arises. A regulatory investigation against the manager entity that the fund-level D&O does not respond to. A partner sued individually as a portfolio company director without dedicated personal protection. A warranty claim surfacing months after closing where no W&I was placed and the seller no longer has the cash to settle. A cyber breach at a portfolio company that flows upstream to LP relationships. Each scenario describes a specific gap in a specific line of cover, and each one is recoverable through targeted policy design but unrecoverable once the claim has hit and the cover does not respond.

This report examines those gaps. It maps the insurance categories that matter for APAC fund managers, why fund-level D&O alone is structurally inadequate to the risk profile, and what fund managers, LPs, and portfolio company boards need to understand about how their exposures actually interact.

Background

How Fund Managers in APAC Built a Multi-Line Exposure

The expansion of private capital in APAC over the past decade has been accompanied by an equivalent expansion in liability exposure. The same factors that have driven institutional appetite for the region (deal flow, valuation arbitrage, demographic tailwinds) have also pushed fund managers into more complex transactions, larger commitments, and a wider footprint of portfolio company sectors. Each of those shifts has added something to the liability profile that fund-level Directors and Officers cover was never designed to absorb.

The default starting point for most fund managers is a single fund-level D&O policy. That policy responds to claims against the fund's directors and officers in their fund capacities, defence costs for regulatory inquiries directed at the fund, and certain entity-level claims against the fund itself. What it does not respond to is everything that happens outside the four walls of the fund.

When a partner sits on a portfolio company board (which is the entire point of an active VC or growth investor) the personal exposure that attaches to that directorship sits outside the fund. Standard outside directorship liability extensions on a fund D&O policy are typically excess of the portfolio company's own D&O, and they typically protect only the named partner, not the other directors of the portco.[3] The protection is real but the limits are shared across every portco the fund has invested in, which can create concentration problems at the most stressed moments.

When LPs raise complaints about valuation, fee allocation, side letters, conflicts of interest, or breach of fiduciary duty, the appropriate response is not fund-level D&O but Investment Management Liability cover for the manager entity itself.[5]

Hedge fund, private equity, and venture capital firms are exposed to professional liability claims for management errors, regulatory investigations, or client disputes; the cover for those claims sits in a different policy with different triggers.[19]

When a transaction closes, the warranties given by the seller (and the indemnities backing them) become a potential source of post-completion dispute. Across APAC, Warranty and Indemnity insurance has moved from a useful tool to a standard feature of mid-market M&A, with premium rates declining for a fourth consecutive year and capacity of over AUD 1 billion now achievable on a per-transaction basis.[8] For sellers, it removes warranty escrow from the deal and frees up returns. For buyers, it provides a creditworthy counterparty for warranty claims that may exceed what the seller can comfortably pay.

When a portfolio company suffers a cyber incident, a fraud loss, or a director-level claim, the consequences increasingly travel upstream to the fund.[13] A recent and watched-closely case in the United States alleges a private equity sponsor is responsible for a data breach at its portfolio company on the basis that cost-reduction measures including the offshoring of cybersecurity functions contributed to the incident.[14] That theory has yet to be tested at trial, but the question it raises (whether a sponsor's operational decisions can attach liability for downstream losses) is one APAC fund managers should expect to face as the market matures.

The cumulative result is that fund managers face a multi-line insurance need that has not always been mapped against the actual risk profile. Each policy line covers one slice of the exposure. The work of fitting them together into a coherent whole is the work most firms have not yet done.

Personal and Fund-Level D&O

Where Partner Exposure Outruns Fund Coverage

Directors and Officers insurance for a fund manager is rarely a single product. It is typically three distinct policies, each responding to a different category of claim, each with its own limits, exclusions, and triggers. Treating any one of the three as a substitute for the other two creates exposure that the firm and its partners may not have fully mapped.

Layer One: Fund-Level GP D&O

The most familiar element is the fund-level Directors and Officers policy held by the general partner. It responds to claims against the fund's directors and officers acting in their fund capacities, defence costs for regulatory inquiries directed at the fund, and entity-level claims against the fund itself.[4] It is the policy most fund managers think of first when asked whether they have D&O cover.

What it does not cover is the personal exposure that attaches to individual partners when they sit on portfolio company boards or when they act in capacities outside the fund. It also does not respond to claims against the manager entity itself when the entity's professional services give rise to a claim. Those exposures need their own policies.

Layer Two: Investment Management Insurance for the Manager Entity

The manager entity, the management company or advisory firm that provides investment services to the fund, sits one level above the fund itself and faces a different liability profile. Claims arising from negligent advice, breach of fiduciary duty, valuation errors, regulatory investigations of the manager (as distinct from the fund), and disputes with LPs about manager conduct all attach to the manager entity, not the fund.[5] Investment Management Insurance is the policy designed to respond.

A well-structured IMI policy combines Directors and Officers cover for the manager entity, Professional Indemnity cover for the investment services provided, and Crime cover for losses arising from internal or third-party dishonesty.[5] The combination is critical, because many of the most consequential claims against fund managers blur the lines between governance failure, professional negligence, and operational fraud, and a single-line policy may leave the firm arguing with multiple insurers about which one responds.

Layer Three: Portfolio Company D&O with Side A Protection

Each portfolio company carries its own D&O exposure, and the cover for it sits with the portco, not the fund. For the partners that the fund places on portco boards, two questions matter: whether the portco's D&O is sufficient to defend the directors in the event of a claim, and whether the partners have personal protection in the event that the portco's indemnification fails.

Side A coverage is the answer to the second question. It protects directors personally when corporate indemnification is unavailable, which is exactly the scenario that arises when a portco becomes insolvent, is acquired, or faces a derivative claim against its own directors.[2] For partners on multiple .

portco boards, the Side A position matters more than any other single coverage feature, because it is the only line that responds when everything else has failed.

Side A operates as the director's last line of defence. Where Side B reimburses the company for indemnification it has provided, and Side C provides entity-level cover for claims against the company itself, Side A is the only element that responds when the company cannot or will not indemnify the director, the scenario that arises when the company is insolvent, when shareholders bring a derivative claim, or when the indemnification itself is challenged.[2] For partners across multiple portfolio company boards, examining the Side A position at each portco, with attention to limits, priority of payments, and whether the cover ringfences directors from entity exposure, is a discipline that pays for itself the first time a portco runs into difficulty.

The Outside Directorship Problem

A subtle but important issue sits across all three layers: outside directorship cover. The fund-level D&O policy will typically extend coverage to a partner sitting on a portfolio company board only as excess of the portco's own D&O cover and only for the named partner. It does not provide entity coverage for the portco itself and it does not protect the other directors on the portco board.[3]

The practical implication is that a partner sitting on five portfolio company boards is sharing the outside directorship sub-limit across all five exposures. A single bad year at one portco can deplete the sub-limit and leave the partner under-protected at the others. Dedicated personal D&O cover for senior partners is the increasingly common response, particularly for those on a high number of boards or those whose portfolio companies operate in regulated industries.[20]

At the firm level, the practical implication is that D&O arrangements should be reviewed at each fund anniversary, at each material change in portfolio composition, and whenever a partner joins a new portco board. Renewing on prior-year terms is the single most common source of unintended gaps. A focused review of limits, sub-limits, and Side A positions against the current board portfolio is a discipline that both protects partners and demonstrates governance maturity to LPs conducting operational due diligence.

Investment Management Liability

When LPs Sue, and Why the Claim Trend Has Shifted

The relationship between general partners and limited partners has always carried the potential for dispute. What has changed in recent years is the frequency, the formality, and the categories of claim. Disputes that would once have been resolved quietly within the fund are increasingly spilling into court, into arbitration, and into regulatory complaint.[6]

Why LP-GP Disputes Are Rising

Several factors have converged. Performance pressure from the post-2021 fund-raising slowdown has made underperformance harder for LPs to absorb without question. Continuation vehicles and GP-led secondary transactions have introduced structural conflicts of interest that LPs are pushing back against more aggressively.[6] Regulatory scrutiny of valuation practices has tightened, with enforcement actions for miscalculation of management fee offsets putting the question of fee allocation back on the agenda.[7]

Underneath the headline issues, the most common triggers for LP claims tend to cluster around four categories: performance and valuation disputes, conflicts of interest and self-dealing, disclosure and reporting failures, and fee and expense allocation challenges. None of these is new. What has changed is the willingness of LPs to formalise the complaint into a claim, and the willingness of courts and arbitrators to engage with the underlying merits.

Where Investment Management Insurance Responds

Investment Management Insurance is the appropriate response to LP claims because it is the policy designed to protect the manager entity (rather than the fund itself) against claims arising from the provision of investment services.[5] Professional Indemnity within the IMI programme responds to claims of negligent advice, valuation error, or breach of fiduciary duty in the conduct of investment management. Directors and Officers cover within IMI responds to claims against the directors and officers of the manager entity. Crime cover responds to losses arising from dishonest acts.

The combination matters because LP claims rarely fit neatly into a single coverage box. A claim that begins as a complaint about valuation can include allegations of inadequate disclosure, breach of fiduciary duty, and conflicts of interest, each of which triggers a different element of the IMI programme. A policy that combines the relevant covers reduces the risk of coverage disputes between insurers at exactly the moment the manager needs unified defence.[19]

The Crime element of an IMI policy is often the least discussed and increasingly the most consequential. Social engineering fraud, where attackers impersonate executives or counterparties to redirect wire transfers, has become a prominent claim category for fund managers across the region. Internal misappropriation, while rarer, remains a tail risk for any firm handling capital. A Crime cover within IMI responds to both, but the wording matters: social engineering exclusions and low sub-limits on funds transfer fraud are common in older policies.[5] For managers operating with smaller back-office teams or those that have scaled rapidly without proportional investment in controls, the Crime line deserves specific underwriting attention rather than acceptance of standard wordings.

The Valuation Dimension

Valuation disputes deserve specific attention. They arise from incentive structures that are inherent to private capital, where the sponsor sets the marks on illiquid assets and the LPs rely on those marks for their own reporting and decisions.[7] Where LPs allege they were induced to roll investments over or were misled into exiting based on incomplete information, the resulting claim sits squarely within Investment Management Liability cover.

For APAC fund managers, the valuation question has additional dimensions. Currency exposure, less liquid local markets, and the rising prevalence of cross-border deals all introduce judgment calls into the marking process. A robust valuation policy, documented and consistently applied, is both a compliance discipline and a precondition for insurers to underwrite the IMI programme with confidence.

Side Letters and MFN Conflicts

A less visible but increasingly active area of dispute involves side letters and most-favoured-nation clauses. Where one LP has negotiated terms that another LP later discovers were more favourable, the resulting claim can attach to the manager entity for failures of disclosure or for breach of MFN provisions. The cover for those claims sits within IMI, but the language is sufficiently nuanced that managers should review their wordings specifically against the kinds of side-letter arrangements they have entered into.

Beyond disputes with LPs, IMI is also the appropriate response to regulatory enquiries and supervisory investigations directed at the manager entity.

APAC regulators have become more active in their oversight of fund managers, with information requests, inspections, and enforcement actions all rising in frequency.[19] Defence costs alone can exhaust modest sub-limits quickly. Where a regulatory action escalates to a contested enforcement proceeding, the cover position matters as much as the underlying merits. IMI wordings should be reviewed specifically for how regulatory defence costs are treated, whether the cover advances costs during the investigation or only after a formal claim has been made, and how the policy interacts with the manager entity's other defence resources.

W&I Insurance and Deal Protection

How APAC PE and VC Lock in Returns at Closing

Warranty and Indemnity insurance has moved from optional to standard across APAC mid-market M&A. The market has matured to the point where premium rates have declined for a fourth consecutive year, with Australia and New Zealand reaching a historical low of 0.88 percent in 2025, down from 1.09 percent in 2024.[8] Capacity of over AUD 1 billion is now achievable on a per-transaction basis, and insurer competition has broadened the appetite for risks that previously sat outside the standard W&I framework.[10]

What W&I Insurance Does

The basic mechanic is straightforward. A W&I policy provides insurance cover for losses arising from breaches of the warranties given by the seller in a sale and purchase agreement. The cover responds to the buyer where it is buyer-side W&I (the more common structure in modern APAC deals) or to the seller where the policy is structured on a seller-side basis. The premium is paid as a one-time amount at closing, typically as a percentage of the cover limit.[9]

The transactional consequence is significant. Without W&I, sellers typically agree to a portion of the consideration being held in escrow to fund any warranty claims, often for one to two years post-closing. With W&I, the escrow can be eliminated or substantially reduced, freeing up returns at closing and removing a friction point in deal negotiation.[11] For private equity sellers, this matters because escrow funds cannot be distributed to LPs until the warranty period expires.

Buyer-Side and Seller-Side Structures

Buyer-side W&I is the dominant structure in APAC deals today. The buyer takes the policy in its own name, names itself as the insured, and looks to the insurer for indemnification in the event of a warranty breach.[12] The advantages are clear: the buyer has direct recourse to a creditworthy insurer, the seller's exposure is capped at whatever residual amount the buyer has chosen to retain on the seller's risk, and the negotiation around warranty caps becomes substantially easier.

Seller-side W&I is less common but has its own use cases. It functions as indemnity cover for the seller against its own potential exposure to warranty claims, allowing the seller to give fuller warranties without retaining the corresponding contingent liability on its books. In APAC, seller-side is most often seen where a fund is exiting and wants to wind up cleanly without leaving warranty exposure unresolved.

“A W&I policy provides insurance cover for losses arising from breaches of the warranties given by the seller in a sale and purchase agreement. “

Knowledge Scrapes and Synthetic Warranties

Two features of the modern W&I market deserve specific attention. The first is the knowledge scrape, a policy modification that removes the requirement that the seller had knowledge of the breach for the warranty claim to attach. This expands the buyer's recovery position significantly and is now a standard ask in competitive APAC processes.[11]

The second is the synthetic warranty, where the insurer effectively adds warranties to the policy that were not given in the underlying sale agreement. This is more common in distressed sales, secondary deals, or situations where the seller is unwilling or unable to give comprehensive warranties. For buyers, it provides protection where the underlying SPA would not. For insurers, it requires more diligence and a higher premium.[9]

W&I is the most visible product in the transactional insurance toolkit but it is not the only one. Tax Indemnity insurance addresses identified tax exposures that cannot easily be wrapped into the W&I policy, particularly where the issue is known to both parties and quantifiable. Contingent risk insurance addresses specific identified risks, such as pending litigation, environmental exposure, or regulatory uncertainty, that would otherwise become a sticking point in negotiation.[10] Title insurance, more common in real estate, also has APAC applications in any deal where title to material assets is at issue. For fund managers running active transaction pipelines, treating W&I as one tool among several rather than the only tool available widens the negotiating room and improves deal certainty.

Anatomy of a W&I Claim

When a warranty breach surfaces post-closing, the policy mechanics matter as much as the cover limit. The buyer typically has a defined notification window in which to alert the insurer to a discovered breach, often within months of discovery. Failure to notify within the window can void the claim regardless of merit.[9]

Breach categories fall into four broad groups: financial (errors in the accounts, misstated revenues, undisclosed liabilities), tax (undisclosed tax exposures or incorrect tax treatments), intellectual property (ownership disputes, infringement claims), and employment (undisclosed claims, terminations handled incorrectly). Each carries its own typical settlement profile. Tax claims tend to be the most predictable; IP claims tend to be the most contested.

The insurer investigates, often appointing forensic accountants or specialist counsel, before adjusting the claim. Recovery timelines vary widely. Straightforward financial claims may settle in six to twelve months; complex IP or contested tax claims can take two to three years to resolve.[11]

What makes a deal W&I-ready is also worth understanding. Insurers look for three things: a defensible diligence process documented in the data room, a sale and purchase agreement negotiated by counsel familiar with W&I market norms, and a seller willing to engage with the underwriting process.[11] Where any of the three is weak, the policy that emerges from the placement will have wider exclusions, lower limits, or higher retentions. The most expensive W&I placements are not the ones with the highest premiums but the ones that produce cover so narrow that a real claim would not respond. Engaging the broker and underwriter early in the deal process, ideally before the SPA is finalised, is the most reliable way to keep the cover usable when needed.

Portfolio Cyber and Operational Risk

How a Single Portfolio Event Travels Upstream

The traditional separation between portfolio company exposures and fund-level exposures is dissolving. A breach at one portfolio company can now plausibly trigger claims against the GP, against fund-level D&O, and against LP relationships, in ways that the typical portfolio company insurance arrangement was not designed to coordinate.

Seventy-two percent of private equity firms across the US and EMEA suffered a serious cyber incident within their portfolio in the last three years, with the average cost of a single significant incident reaching USD 3.4 million.[15] Ninety-six percent of PE firms expect the importance of portfolio cybersecurity to increase over the next twelve months.[16] In APAC, the same dynamics apply, often with the added complication of cross-border data flows, varied breach notification regimes, and an insurance market that is still adapting to the new claim patterns.

Why Portfolio Cyber Events Flow Upstream

The traditional assumption was that a cyber breach at a portco was the portco's problem. That assumption is no longer safe. A breach can erode fund-level returns directly, through the diminished value of the affected portco, and indirectly, through the broader impact on the fund's reputation, the partners' personal credibility, and the LPs' willingness to commit to subsequent funds.[17]

Beyond reputational and economic flow-through, there is now an emerging legal theory that holds sponsors directly responsible for portco breaches where the sponsor's operational decisions can be shown to have contributed to the failure.

A pending case in the United States alleges a private equity sponsor is responsible for a data breach at its portfolio company on the basis that cost-reduction measures including the offshoring of cybersecurity, engineering, and IT functions to contractors contributed to the breach.[14] The complaint also alleges the sponsor laid off domestic cybersecurity staff before the incident.[14]

The theory has yet to be tested at trial, and US litigation does not automatically translate to APAC jurisprudence. But the underlying question (whether a sponsor's operational decisions can attach liability for downstream losses) is one APAC fund managers should expect to face as the market matures and as litigation funders look for new sources of recovery.[13]

Master Programmes Across Portfolios

For fund managers with multiple portfolio companies in similar sectors, a master cyber programme negotiated across the portfolio can deliver both better terms and more consistent governance. A master arrangement of this kind typically takes the form of a framework agreement with a panel of insurers, under which each portco can be onboarded at standardised terms, with shared limits available across the portfolio and a single broker managing renewals.[17]

The advantages are significant. Coverage gaps between portcos are easier to identify and remediate. Renewal cycles are streamlined. Limits can be uplifted across the portfolio more efficiently. And the manager has a single source of truth on the portfolio's aggregate cyber exposure, which is critical information for LP reporting and for governance at the fund level.

Cyber Diligence at Deal Closing

The single most consequential point in a portco's cyber risk profile is often the moment of deal closing. The diligence done at that point determines the cover the new owner can place, the price at which they can place it, and the gaps the new owner inherits. A portco acquired without cyber diligence may carry unidentified vulnerabilities that surface within months of closing, at which point the cover the new owner placed at acquisition may not respond.[13]

Cyber diligence has not yet been universally adopted as a standard step in APAC mid-market deal processes. Where it has been added, it tends to surface issues that materially affect transaction terms: undisclosed prior incidents, weak access controls, dependencies on legacy systems, or vendor relationships that create concentration risk. The diligence itself is relatively inexpensive; the consequences of skipping it can be substantial.

The Portfolio Risk Map

Beyond cyber, the portfolio company programme should map across four operational risk categories. The first is cyber and data breach, addressed above. The second is portfolio company D&O with Side A protection, ensuring directors are protected even where the portco itself cannot indemnify. The third is crime and social engineering fraud, which has emerged as a distinct category of loss as fraudsters increasingly target the finance teams of mid-market portcos. The fourth is specie and digital asset custody, relevant for any portco holding crypto, digital tokens, or other high-value items that fall outside conventional property cover.[16]

Each category is a distinct policy line. The work of mapping them together, with consistent triggers, coordinated notification provisions, and limits that aggregate sensibly across the portfolio, is what separates a well-managed portfolio set of cover from an opportunistic collection of individual policies.

Implications for Fund Managers and Insurers

What Both Sides of the Market Need to Do Differently

The insurance picture for APAC fund managers is structurally more complex than the default approach (a single fund-level D&O policy plus whatever portco cover happens to be in place) is built to handle. The gap between what fund managers are exposed to and what their current insurance lines respond to has widened, and most firms have not yet done the mapping work to see where they sit.

For Fund Managers

The starting point for any fund manager is an honest cross-reference between the firm's actual activities and its actual insurance arrangements. The compliance team can describe what the firm does. The legal team can describe what the LPs require. The finance team can list the policies in force. What is rarely produced is the matrix that maps each activity to the policy that responds, with explicit identification of where the matrix has gaps.

Practical steps follow from this. First, fund-level D&O should be reviewed against the manager entity's IMI programme to ensure there is no overlap that wastes premium and no gap that leaves a category of claim unaddressed.[5] Second, outside directorship cover should be reviewed against the actual board portfolio of each partner, with explicit attention to whether dedicated personal D&O is needed for the most exposed partners.[3] Third, the portfolio company cover should be reviewed as a portfolio rather than as individual policies, with consistent triggers, coordinated notification provisions, and aggregate limits that reflect the firm's risk concentration.

For emerging managers, the temptation is to delay the work on the basis that the fund is small and the cost of comprehensive cover seems disproportionate to the AUM. The counter-argument is that emerging managers carry the highest concentration of personal exposure (each partner is more exposed because there are fewer partners) and the least capacity to absorb a claim that the insurance does not respond to. The case for getting the architecture right at fund formation, rather than retrofitting it after the first claim, is strongest at the smallest end of the market.[20]

For institutional allocators moving into DeFi, the work is similar but inverted. The traditional PI and D&O coverage that protects portfolio company decisions may not respond to losses arising from on-chain activity, and the assumption that existing coverage extends to digital asset exposure is rarely correct.[18]

For LPs

Limited partners conducting operational due diligence on GPs increasingly include insurance review as a standard line item. The questions worth asking are not whether the GP has D&O cover (almost all do) but whether the GP has IMI for the manager entity, what the Side A position looks like across the partners' board portfolios, and how the portfolio company cover is structured.

Where these questions surface gaps, the LP has two interests to consider. The first is whether the gaps create exposure for the GP that could in turn create exposure for the LP through reduced fund returns. The second is whether the gaps reflect a broader governance question about how the GP thinks about risk management at the institutional level. Both are legitimate diligence concerns.

For Insurers and Underwriters

The underwriting opportunity in APAC fund manager insurance is substantial and growing. The capital flows are real, the regulatory environment is maturing, and the historical gap between coverage demand and coverage availability has begun to close. Insurers that develop the underwriting capability to assess fund manager risk on its own terms, with attention to fund strategy, portfolio composition, LP base, and governance quality, will be positioned to write profitable business as the market continues to develop.[18]

The insurers most exposed to mispricing are those that treat fund manager risk as a generic D&O extension or that rely on US loss data without adjusting for APAC market structure. Local LP litigation patterns are different. Local regulatory expectations are different. Local portfolio company sectors create different operational risk profiles. The underwriting needs to follow the local reality, not import assumptions from elsewhere.

The Direction of Travel

Over the next twelve to eighteen months, several trends are likely to converge. APAC private capital fund-raising will continue to recover from the post-2021 trough, with capital concentration in the largest managers continuing.[18] LP scrutiny of GP operations, including insurance arrangements, will continue to tighten. Cyber and operational risk at the portfolio company level will continue to create upstream exposure for sponsors. W&I capacity will remain ample and pricing will remain competitive.[8]

For fund managers, the implication is that the work of mapping the insurance lines against the actual risk profile is not a one-time exercise. It is an annual discipline, ideally coordinated with fund anniversaries, audit cycles, and LP reporting. For insurers, the implication is that the firms that engage substantively with the underwriting questions, rather than defaulting to off-the-shelf wordings, will earn the differentiated business that is now emerging in the APAC market.

Fund-level D&O is the start of the conversation. It should not be where the conversation ends.

Summary

Insurance for fund managers is a multi-line discipline. Most firms have not yet done the mapping.

Fund managers in APAC operate at the intersection of three demanding sets of relationships: with LPs, with portfolio companies, and with regulators. Each relationship generates its own categories of liability, and each requires a specific line of insurance to respond. Fund-level D&O is one piece of the picture, not the whole picture, and treating it as sufficient leaves exposures that often become visible only when a claim arises.

Investment Management Insurance is the policy designed for the manager entity itself, responding to LP claims, professional negligence, valuation disputes, conflicts of interest, and the operational risks that attach to the provision of investment services.[5] Personal D&O, particularly Side A cover, protects individual partners when corporate indemnification fails, and dedicated personal cover is increasingly the response for senior partners with high board exposure.[2] W&I insurance has matured into a standard feature of APAC mid-market M&A, with declining rates and rising capacity making it both more accessible and more useful than at any prior point.[8] Portfolio company cover, structured as a coordinated set of policies rather than a collection of individual ones, addresses the cyber, crime, D&O, and specie exposures that increasingly travel upstream to the fund.[17]

The structural shifts driving this complexity are not slowing. APAC private capital fund-raising is recovering, capital is concentrating in the largest managers, LP scrutiny of GP operations is tightening, and the legal theories that attach sponsor responsibility to portfolio company failures continue to develop.[13] Each of these shifts adds to the exposure profile that the insurance arrangements are being asked to respond to.

For fund managers, the most important action is also the most concrete: cross-reference what the firm actually does against what each policy actually covers. Identify the gaps. Address them through targeted programme design rather than through general additions of cover. Treat the architecture of the cover as a board-level governance topic, not an administrative renewal task.

For LPs and portfolio company directors, the same principle applies in inverse. The insurance arrangements of the GP, the manager entity, and the portfolio companies are now reasonable subjects of diligence and oversight. Where the arrangements do not match the activity, the consequences land on the people who relied on the assumption that they did.

For insurers, the APAC fund manager market represents a significant underwriting opportunity for those that engage substantively with the actual risk profile, and a significant pricing risk for those that do not.[18]

The era of fund-level D&O as a sufficient answer is closing. The era of the integrated insurance picture has arrived.

References

1. Bain & Company, "Asia-Pacific Private Equity Report 2025," March 2025. https://www.bain.com/insights/asia-pacific-private-equity-report-2025/

2. Woodruff Sawyer (now Gallagher), "GPL Guide for Venture Capital and Private Equity," 2025. https://woodruffsawyer.com/insights/GPL-guide-venture-capital-private-equity

3. The Coyle Group, "Outside Directorship Liability or ODL," 2025. https://thecoylegroup.com/odl-or-outside-directorship-liability/

4. Chubb, "Elite Private Equity & Venture Capital Insurance FAQs, Financial Lines," 2025. https://www.chubb.com/content/dam/chubb-sites/chubb-com/sg-en/customer-service-pdfs/elite-private-equity-venture-capital-insurance-brochure.pdf

5. Continuum, "Investment Management Insurance (IMI)," 2026. https://www.continuuminsure.com/coverage/investment-management-insurance/

6. Proskauer / The Capital Commitment, "Risk: Private Litigation Risk for GP-Led Secondary Transactions," April 2026. https://www.privateequitylitigation.com/2026/04/risk-6-private-litigation-risk-for-gp-led-secondary-transactions/

7. Jenner & Block, "Private Credit Valuations Under Pressure: Enforcement Trends, Litigation Risks and Mitigation Tactics," 2025. https://www.jenner.com/en/news-insights/publications/private-credit-valuations-under-pressure-enforcement-trends-litigation-risks-and-mitigation-tactics-private-equity-law-report

8. Gallagher (AJG Australia), "Australian M&A Insurance Trends: What Changed in 2025 and What Matters for 2026," 2025. https://www.ajg.com/au/news-and-insights/australian-m-and-a-insurance-trends/

9. Clifford Chance, "What's Market: Warranty and Indemnity Insurance in Australia," March 2025. https://www.cliffordchance.com/briefings/2025/03/what-market-warranty-and-indemnity-insurance-in-australia.html

10. Aon, "Warranty & Indemnity Insurance, Asia Pacific," 2025. https://www.aon.com/apac/transaction-solutions/wni-insurance

11. Goodwin, "Developments in W&I Insurance in Asia," March 2024. https://www.goodwinlaw.com/en/insights/publications/2024/03/insights-privateequity-practices-developments-in-wi-insurance-in-asia

12. Dentons Rodyk, "Recent Trends & Developments in W&I Insurance in the APAC M&A Landscape," February 2023. https://dentons.rodyk.com/en/insights/alerts/2023/february/13/recent-trends-developments-in-wi-insurance-in-the-apac-ma-landscape

13. Lockton, "Portfolio Company Data Breach Litigation Highlights Risk to Private Equity Sponsors," 2025. https://global.lockton.com/us/en/news-insights/portfolio-company-data-breach-litigation-highlights-risk-to-private-equity-sponsors

14. Womble Bond Dickinson, "Unprecedented: Private Equity Firm Potentially on Hook for Portfolio Company's Data Breach," 2025. https://www.womblebonddickinson.com/us/insights/alerts/unprecedented-private-equity-firm-potentially-hook-portfolio-companys-data-breach

15. Kroll, "Cybersecurity a Significant Threat to Private Equity Transactions," 2025. https://www.kroll.com/en/newsroom/private-equity-cybersecurity-significant-risk-financial-impact

16. AXA XL, "Why Cyber Resilience is a Priority for Private Equity Portfolio Companies," 2025. https://axaxl.com/fast-fast-forward/articles/why-cyber-resilience-is-a-priority-for-private-equity-portfolio-companies

17. WTW, "Cyber Risks in Private Equity," December 2024. https://www.wtwco.com/en-gb/insights/2024/12/cyber-risks-in-private-equity

18. Bain & Company, "Asia-Pacific Private Equity Report 2026," March 2026. https://www.bain.com/insights/asia-pacific-private-equity-report-2026/

19. The Hedge Fund Journal, "Professional Liability Insurance," 2025. https://thehedgefundjournal.com/professional-liability-insurance/

20. Silicon Valley Bank, "VC Insurance 101: Protecting Your Fund, Your Investors, and Yourself," 2025. https://www.svb.com/emerging-manager-insights/starting-a-fund/vc-insurance-101-protecting-your-fund-your-investors-and-yourself/

Continuum

Risk. Insurance. Technology.

hello@continuuminsure.com

www.continuuminsure.com