

Intermediate Track II

Investigating and Detecting Change

2011 CLRS

September 15-16, 2011

Las Vegas, Ne

Introduction

The Ideal Situation

Loss reserve data should contain a long, stable history of homogeneous claim experience, where no significant operations changes materially affect either the mix of business or the handling of claims, and there should be a sufficient number of claims to produce credible loss patterns.

Introduction

The Reality

Virtually all elements of “The Ideal” are periodically violated:

1. The Mix Changes
2. Claim Handling Changes
3. Case Reserves are Strengthened/Weakened
4. Other Factors
 - ◆ Changes in Deductibles, Limits, SIRs
 - ◆ Changes in Reinsurance
 - ◆ Tort Reform, other law changes
 - ◆ New Sources of Loss
 - ◆ Changes in the Economy

Introduction

This Session Will Discuss

- ◆ The potential impact of mix changes
- ◆ Changes in claim closing patterns
- ◆ Changes in case reserve adequacy
- ◆ What Else?

*CHANGE
IN
MIX*

Change in Mix

Cumulative Paid Losses (Combined)

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>			
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>	<u>Ultimate</u>
2007	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$5,100	\$5,100
2008	2,000	4,000	5,100	5,100
2009	2,000	4,000		5,100
2010	2,000			5,100

Change in Mix

Cumulative Paid Losses (Category A)

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>			
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>	<u>Ultimate</u>
2007	\$1,500	\$1,800	\$2,100	\$2,100
2008	1,500	1,800	2,100	2,100
2009	1,500	1,800		2,100
2010	500			700

Develops quickly

Most of \$ paid within 12 months

Change in Mix

Cumulative Paid Losses (Category B)

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>			
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>	<u>Ultimate</u>
2007	\$500	\$2,200	\$3,000	\$3,000
2008	500	2,200	3,000	3,000
2009	500	2,200		3,000
2010	1,500			9,000

Develops slower than Category A

Most of \$ paid between 12-24 months

Change in Mix

Paid Loss Ultimate Comparison

Accident Year 2010 ultimate loss if change in mix is ignored: \$5,100 (*i.e. unchanged from 2009*)

Accident Year 2010 ultimate if data is separately analyzed: \$9,700 (*i.e. sum of two category ultimates*)

Change in Mix

Key Principle

Always search for subdivisions of data related to possible causes of variable loss development

Change in Mix

Suggested Subdivisions of Data Include

Primary:

1. Geographic
2. New Products vs. Old
3. Subline or Coverage
4. Deductibles or Policy Limits
5. Type of Loss Payment (e.g., Medical vs. Indemnity)

Reinsurance:

1. Attachment Point
2. Production Source
3. Line or Subline

Change in Mix

How Do You Decide?

Ask:

1. Underwriters
2. Claims Department
3. Agents
4. Actuaries

The Key:

Learn as much as possible about the book of business you are evaluating.

- ◆ What it has been historically
- ◆ What it is becoming

Change in Mix

What Should be Done if Mix Change Includes New Business for Which You Have Insufficient Data?

Seek Alternative Sources of Data

Perhaps general liability book formerly was comprised solely of “OL&T” exposures, but in recent years began adding “M&C” risks.

Possible Solution: Relate ISO development patterns for M&C to OL&T and modify development factors for your analysis.

Discuss Potential Impacts with Claims, Underwriting, Other Actuaries

- ◆ Length of Tail
- ◆ Frequency
- ◆ Severity
- ◆ Loss Ratios

CLAIM CLOSING PATTERNS

Claim Closing Patterns

What is driving the divergence?

Unadjusted Paid Loss Development Method

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>			
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>	<u>Ultimate</u>
2008	\$1,000	\$4,000	\$6,000	\$6,000
2009	1,000	3,500		5,250
2010	750			4,219

Incurred Loss Development Method

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>			
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>	<u>Ultimate</u>
2008	\$2,000	\$5,000	\$6,000	\$6,000
2009	1,967	4,917		5,900
2010	1,867			5,600

Claim Closing Patterns

- 1) Review Closing Rates to Determine Whether There Has Been a Change
- 2) Seek Independent Confirmation That a Change Has Occurred
- 3) Restate Historical Closed Claims Using Current Closing Rates
- 4) Restate Historical Paid Losses Using Restated Closed Claims
- 5) Apply Standard Loss Development Method To Restated Paid Losses

Claim Closing Patterns

Data Needed

- ◆ Paid Loss Development Triangle (slide 15)
- ◆ Reported Claims Development Triangle (slide 19)
- ◆ Projected Ultimate Claims (slide 19)
- ◆ Closed Claims Development Triangle (slide 19)

- ◆ Calendar period data offers alternative perspective and added insight (slide 22)

Claim Closing Patterns

*Step 1: Review Closing Rates to Determine
Whether There Has Been a Change*

Claim Closing Patterns

Accident Year	Reported Claims			
	<u>Months of Development</u>			
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>Ultimate</u>
2008	500	900	1,000	1,000
2009	480	880		980
2010	450			900

Accident Year	Closed Claims		
	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>
2008	250	810	1,000
2009	240	704	
2010	180		

Claim Closing Patterns

Closed / Reported

Accident <u>Year</u>	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36</u>
2008	50.0%	90.0%	100.0%
2009	50.0%	80.0%	
2010	40.0%		

Closed / Ultimate

Accident <u>Year</u>	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36</u>
2008	25.0%	81.0%	100.0%
2009	24.5%	71.8%	
2010	20.0%		

Claim Closing Patterns

Calendar period data from the Claim Department may also offer a useful tool for monitoring change.

- ◆ New Reported Claims

- ◆ Open Claims

- ◆ Closed Claims

Claim Closing Patterns

<u>Calendar Year-end</u>	(1) New Reported Claims	(2) Open Claims @ year-end	(3) In-Force Claims = (1) + prior year (2)	(4) Closed Claims	(5) Closure Rate = (4) / (3)
2006	1,000	340	1,340	1,000	74.6%
2007	1,000	340	1,340	1,000	74.6%
2008	1,000	340	1,340	1,000	74.6%
2009	980	330	1,320	990	75.0%
2010	950	446	1,280	834	65.2%

1,280 = 950 + 330

Columns (1), (2) and (4) derived from slide 19

Claim Closing Patterns

Note that the slowdown in claims closing produces LOWER estimated reserves with the paid development method (will you look a gift horse in the mouth?)

Applies to incurred losses as well

Claim Closing Patterns

Step 2: Seek Independent Confirmation that a Change Has Occurred

- ◆ Ask the Claims Department About Changes in:
 - ❖ Opening and Closing Practices
 - ❖ The Claims Handling Environment
 - ❖ Levels of Staffing, Reorganizations
 - ❖ Definition of a Claim (e.g., Multiple Claimants)

Claim Closing Patterns

*Step 3: Restate Historical Closed Claims Using
Current Closing Rates*

Claim Closing Patterns

Adjusted Closing Percent (see slide 20)

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36</u>
2008	20.0%	71.8%	100.0%
2009	20.0%	71.8%	
2010	20.0%		

Adjusted Closed Claims

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>
2008	200	718	1,000
2009	196	704	
2010	180		

Ultimate Claims (slide 19) * Adjusted Closing %

$$200 = 1,000 * 20.0\%$$

$$718 = 1,000 * 71.8\%$$

$$196 = 980 * 20.0\%$$

Claim Closing Patterns

*Step 4: Restate Historical Paid Losses Using
Restated Closed Claims*

Claim Closing Patterns

Linear Interpolation of Adjusted Paid Losses

Accident Year 2008 @ 12 Months	<u>Age 0</u>	<u>Age 12</u>
Actual Closed Claims (slide 19)	0	250
Actual Paid Loss (slide 15)	0	1,000
Therefore, 200 Claims would expect to have \$800 paid loss		
AY 2008 @ 12 Months	$\frac{200 - 0}{250 - 0}$	$\times (1,000 - 0) + 0 = 800$

Accident Year 2008 @ 24 Months	<u>Age 12</u>	<u>Age 24</u>
Actual Closed Claims (slide 19)	250	810
Actual Paid Loss (slide 15)	1,000	4,000
Therefore, 718 Claims would expect to have \$3,507 paid loss		
AY 2008 @ 24 Months	$\frac{718 - 250}{810 - 250}$	$\times (4,000 - 1,000) + 1,000 = 3,507$

Accident Year 2009 @ 12 Months	<u>Age 0</u>	<u>Age 12</u>
Actual Closed Claims (slide 19)	0	240
Actual Paid Loss (slide 15)	0	1,000
Therefore, 196 Claims would expect to have \$817 paid loss		
AY 2009 @ 12 Months	$\frac{196 - 0}{240 - 0}$	$\times (1,000 - 0) + 0 = 817$

Claim Closing Patterns

*Step 5: Apply Standard Loss Development Method
to Restated Paid Losses*

Claim Closing Patterns

Adjusted Paid Loss Development Method

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>
2008	\$800	\$3,507	\$6,000
2009	817	3,500	
2010	750		

From slide 28

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12-24</u>	<u>24-36</u>	<u>36-Ult</u>
2008	4.38	1.71	
2009	4.28		
Selected	4.33	1.71	1.00
CDF	7.41	1.71	1.00
Ultimate	5,561	5,988	6,000

Claim Closing Patterns

Impact of Adjustment

<u>Acc Yr</u>	<u>Revised Forecast</u>	<u>Original Forecast</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	Slide 30	Slide 15	
2008	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$0
2009	5,988	5,250	738
2010	<u>5,561</u>	<u>4,219</u>	<u>1,342</u>
Total	\$17,549	\$15,469	\$2,080

The slowdown in claims closing produces LOWER estimates!

AND the revised forecast is IN LINE with the incurred method estimate of \$17,500 (slide 15).

*CASE
RESERVE
ADEQUACY*

Case Reserve Adequacy

What is driving the divergence?

Accident <u>Year</u>	<i>Incurring Losses (\$000)</i>			Projected <u>Ultimate</u>
	<u>Months of Development</u> <u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>	
2008	10,000	40,000	50,000	50,000
2009	10,000	45,000		56,250
2010	10,417			55,340

Accident <u>Year</u>	<i>Paid Losses (\$000)</i>			Projected <u>Ultimate</u>
	<u>Months of Development</u> <u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>	
2008	2,000	24,000	50,000	50,000
2009	2,500	30,000		62,500
2010	3,125			78,125

Case Reserve Adequacy

What if claim closing patterns are not changing?

Accident <u>Year</u>	<i>Reported Claims</i>			
	<u>Months of Development</u>			
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>Ultimate</u>
2008	5,000	8,000	10,000	10,000
2009	5,000	8,000		10,000
2010	5,000			10,000

Accident <u>Year</u>	<i>Closed Claims</i>		
	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>
2008	1,000	6,000	10,000
2009	1,000	6,000	
2010	1,000		

Case Reserve Adequacy

- 1) Review Paid-To-Incurred Triangles
- 2) Review Trends in Average Paid Claims Versus Trends in Average Case Reserves
- 3) Review Potential Reasons for Observed Trends
- 4) Adjust Historical Case Reserves to Current Adequacy Levels
- 5) Calculate Adjusted Incurred Losses
- 6) Project Ultimate Losses Using Adjusted Incurred Losses and Standard Loss Development

Case Reserve Adequacy

Step 1: Review Paid - To - Incurred Triangles

Case Reserve Adequacy

Accident <u>Year</u>	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36</u>
2008	20%	60%	100%
2009	25%	67%	
2010	30%		

[paid loss / incurred loss from slide 33]

Ratios are increasing. Since settlement rates appear consistent, may be due to a decrease in case reserve adequacy.

Case Reserve Adequacy

*Step 2: Review Trends in Average Paid Claims
Versus Trends in Average Case Reserves*

Case Reserve Adequacy

Accident Year	<u>Average Paid Loss</u>		<u>Average Case Reserves</u>	
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>
2008	2,000	4,000	2,000	8,000
2009	2,500	5,000	1,875	7,500
2010	3,125		1,823	
Trend	25%	25%	-4.5%	-6.3%

Avg Paid \$ = Paid \$ Triangle (Slide 33) / Closed Claim Triangle (Slide 34) *
1,000

Avg Case Reserves = (Incurred \$ Triangle - Paid \$ Triangle (Slide 33)) /
(Reported Claim Triangle - Closed Claim Triangle (Slide 34)) *
1,000 **OBSERVATION: CASE RESERVE WEAKENING**

Case Reserve Adequacy

Step 3: Review Potential Reasons for Observed Trends

- ◆ Is the book shifting to a lower severity mix?
- ◆ Have policy limits and/or reinsurance retentions kept pace with claims inflation?
- ◆ Has anything material changed in the handling of claims?
 - ❖ Turnover in claim department staff
 - ❖ Changes in philosophy

If you conclude there has been case reserve weakening (or strengthening), adjust the data. Here's one approach.

Case Reserve Adequacy

*Step 4: Adjust Historical Case Reserves to
Current Adequacy Levels*

Case Reserve Adequacy

Assumption:

25% is the Actual Rate of Claim Inflation (slide 39)

Accident Year	<u>Adjusted Average Case Reserves</u>		
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36</u>
2008	1,167	6,000	0
2009	1,458	7,500	
2010	1,823		

$1,167 = 1,823 / (1.25^2)$

$1,458 = 1,823 / 1.25$

$6,000 = 7,500 / 1.25$

Note: Use paid data for inflation assessment.

Case Reserve Adequacy

Step 5: Calculate Adjusted Incurred Losses

Case Reserve Adequacy

	Paid to Date Losses (slide 33)	+	# of Open Claims (slide 34)	x	Adjusted Average Case Reserves (slide 42)/1000	=	Adjusted Incurred Losses
AY 2008 @ 12 Months	2,000	+	4,000	x	1.167	=	6,667
AY 2008 @ 24 Months	24,000	+	2,000	x	6.000	=	36,000
AY 2009 @ 12 Months	2,500	+	4,000	x	1.458	=	8,334

Case Reserve Adequacy

*Step 6: Project Ultimate Losses Using Adjusted
Incurred Losses and Standard Loss
Development*

Case Reserve Adequacy

Adjusted Incurred Losses

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36+</u>
2008	\$6,667	\$36,000	\$50,000
2009	8,334	45,000	
2010	10,417		

from slide 44

Accident Year	<u>Months of Development</u>		
	<u>12-24</u>	<u>24-36</u>	<u>36-Ult</u>
2008	5.40	1.39	
2009	5.40		
Selected	5.40	1.39	1.00
CDF	7.50	1.39	1.00
Ultimate	78,125	62,500	50,000

Case Reserve Adequacy

Impact of Adjustment

Accident <u>Year</u>	Original Incurred Estimate (Slide 33)	Original Paid Estimate (Slide 33)	Revised Incurred Estimate (Slide 46)
2008	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
2009	56,250	62,500	62,500
2010	<u>55,340</u>	<u>78,125</u>	<u>78,125</u>
Total	\$161,590	\$190,625	\$190,625

What Else?

- ◆ Deductibles/Limits/SIRs change
- ◆ Reinsurance Arrangements Change
- ◆ Tort Reform
- ◆ New Sources of Loss
- ◆ Changes in the Economy

Deductibles/Limits/SIRs change

- ◆ Deductibles may change the number of claims
- ◆ May change loss \$ as well
- ◆ Need to review profile of deductibles and limits – inherent assumption is no change
- ◆ Treat like change in mix

Reinsurance Arrangements

Change

- ◆ Effect on total net liability
- ◆ Might also affect claims handling
e.g., if retention is limited to \$100,000 by reinsurance, is there an incentive to settle a \$500,000 case more quickly than if you were on the hook for the whole thing?

Tort Reform

- ◆ Change in benefits which would affect severity and payout (e.g. cost containment)
- ◆ Change in statute of limitations (frequency change, less “tail” development)
- ◆ New patterns – e.g., ability to do lump-sum settlements of permanent workers’ comp claims

New Sources of Loss

- ◆ Mold
- ◆ Terrorism
- ◆ Asbestos – just keeps on running
- ◆ Stacking of auto limits

Conclusion

- ◆ Know what's going on in the company
- ◆ Know what actuarial methods can and can't do
- ◆ Pick the right tool for the job
- ◆ BE AWARE!

Summary

Assumption of long, stable history is often violated.

- ◆ The mix of business can change
- ◆ Claim closing patterns can change
- ◆ Changes in case reserve adequacy can change

Looking Ahead

Session 3 presents two case studies.

» Think about what's going on.

» Decide how to evaluate the impact.