# **RELATIVE UNPAID CLAIMS LOSS RESERVING**

# Bertram Horowitz, Inc.

## Actuarial & Risk Consultants

Bertram A. Horowitz, President email: <u>bert@bertramhorowitz.com</u>

> September 18, 2019 Austin, Texas CLRS

# Outline

- Basic Triangle LDF Methods
- Relative Unpaid Claims Loss Reserving Model
- Illustrative Method
- Estimating Model Parameters
- Empirical Results
- Conclusion, Future Research

All dollars \$000 Omitted

Examples use actual data from CAS Loss Reserve Data Base

Table Numbering from Actual Paper

### Basic Triangle Methods – Rooted in LDFs

#### Payment Development Triangle

#### **CUMULATIVE LOSS PAYMENTS**

Accident	As of	As of	As of	As of	As of	As of	As of	As of	As of	As of
Year	<u>1 Year</u>	2 Years	<u>3 Years</u>	4 Years	5 Years	6 Years	7 Years	8 Years	<u>9 Years</u>	10 Years
										1
1988	3,962	26,287	53,000	92,637	106,336	116,677	120,616	123,777	125,856_	127,920
1989	6,066	28,297	60,135	84,025	103,086	117,532	122,380	126,114	131,199	
1990	3,751	31,503	68,116	100,424	112,788	123,077	129,081_	132,513		
1991	3,336	46,188	95,800	135,163	153,146	165,430_	178,462			
1992	6,647	49,319	94,860	129,306	148,235_	165,476				
1993	8,056	81,087	147,732	193,275	217,199					
1994	9,720	65,339	130,303_	186,750						
1995	7,171	82,822_	160,302							
1996	16,696_	88,800								
1997	21,098									

	<u>1-2 Years</u>	2-3 Years	<u>3-4 Years</u>	<u>4-5 Years</u>	5-6 Years	<u>6-7 Years</u>	<u>7-8 Years</u>	8-9 Years	9-10 Years
3 Yr. Wt'd LDF (a)	7.055	1.912	1.366	1.133	1.096	1.059	1.028	1.029	1.016

(a) 8-9 Years = 2 Yr. Wt'd LDF; 9-10 Years 1 Year LDF

## Basic Triangle Methods – Rooted in LDFs

<u>Method</u>	<u>Requirements</u>
Payment Development	Payment Development Triangle Select Payment Development LDFs
Incurred Development	Payment Development Triangle + Case Reserves Triangle Select Incurred Development LDFs
Bornhuetter-Ferguson	Incurred (Payment) Development Triangle Select Expected Losses Select LDFs
Cape Cod	Incurred (Payment) Development Triangle Expected Losses derived from experience Select LDFs
Frequency/Severity (Counts/Averages)	Frequency (Claim Count) Development Triangle Severity (Averages) Development Triangle Select LDFs, disposal rates, and/or trend factors

## **Relative Unpaid Claims Model - Concept**

#### **INCREMENTAL LOSS PAYMENTS**



## Relative Unpaid Claims Model – Concept

d = accounting date year-end 1997  $U_{1988,1997}$  = accident year 1988 unpaid loss as of d

#### **INCREMENTAL LOSS PAYMENTS**



If  $U_{1988,1997}$  known and all  $r_i$  known, then all  $U_{i,1997}$  are known

## **Relative Unpaid Claims Model – Formally**

**Definitions:** For consecutive accident years m through n (n>m), define:

 $U_{i,j}$  = accident year *i* unpaid losses as of year-end j  $j \ge i$ 

 $p_{i,j}$  = accident year *i* payments during calendar year j j  $\geq i$ 

As of accounting date year-end d, define the ratio of unpaid loss at common maturities:

$$r_i = \frac{U_{i,d}}{U_{i-1,d-1}}$$
  $m+1 \le i \le n$ ,  $d \ge n$ ,  $U_{i-1,d-1} \ne 0$ 

 $r_i$  equals the **relativity** of accident year i unpaid losses as of accounting date year-end d to accident year i-1 unpaid losses as of accounting date year-end d-1.

**Model:** Beginning with initial value  $U_{m,d}$ , each  $U_{i,d}$  (m + 1  $\leq$  i  $\leq$  n) may be computed using the recursive algorithm:

.......

$$U_{m+1,d} = r_{m+1} [U_{m,d} + p_{m,d}]$$
$$U_{m+2,d} = r_{m+2} [U_{m+1,d} + p_{m+1,d}]$$

$$U_{n,d} = r_n [U_{n-1,d} + p_{n-1,d}]$$

## **Relative Unpaid Claims Model – Formally**

Model proof relies upon  $U_{i-1,d-1} = U_{i-1,d} + p_{i-1,d}$ 

Model exact representation of unpaid losses

### To Apply Model in a Method:

 $p_{i,d}$  typically known as part of the historical data base

 $r_i$  typically unknown; estimated

 $U_{m,d}$  typically unknown; estimated analogous to tail factor development methods

### Case Reserve Ratios – Candidate for Estimated $r_i$

**CASE RESERVES** 



## Estimate $r_i$ Using Case Reserve Ratios

#### TABLE 3.1

#### **ASSUMPTIONS SELECTION**

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) = (3) / [Prior(2)]	(5)
				Selected Unpaid
	Case	Case		Loss of Oldest
Accident	Reserves	Reserves	Selected Ratio	Accident Year
Year	as of 12/31/96	as of 12/31/97	Unpaid Loss	as of 12/31/97
1			Selected r <sub>i</sub>	Selected U <sub>1988,1997</sub>
1988	1,588	116		1,048
1989	2,838	1,419	0.8935768	
1990	4,883	1,436	0.5059901	
1991	7,016	3,282	0.6721278	
1992	23,466	11,991	1.7090935	
1993	31,248	15,482	0.6597631	
1994	56,994	46,505	1.4882552	
1995	66,826	55,399	0.9720146	
1996	54,941	70,761	1.0588843	
1997		61,839	1.1255529	

(1) m=1988; n=1997

(2), (3) CAS Loss Reserve Data Base [7]

(5) CAS Loss Reserve Data Base [7] = company filed loss reserves (including IBNR) as of 12/31/97

## Estimate Unpaid Losses Using Table 3.1 Assumptions

#### TABLE 3.2

#### INDICATED UNPAID LOSSES

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Case			
	Reserve	Incremental	Indicated	
Accident	Ratio	Paid Loss	Unpaid Loss	Actual
Year	Unpaid	During 1997	as of 12/31/97	Emergence
i	Selected r <sub>i</sub>	Pi,1997	Indicated U <sub>i,1997</sub>	
1988		2,064	1,048	1,048
1989	0.8935768	5,085	2,781	2,229
1990	0.5059901	3,432	3,980	4,875
1991	0.6721278	13,032	4,982	8,939
1992	1.7090935	17,241	30,787	27,175
1993	0.6597631	23,924	31,687	38,236
1994	1.4882552	56,447	82,764	75,947
1995	0.9720146	77,480	135,315	130,558
1996	1.0588843	72,104	225,325	216,789
1997	1.1255529	21,098	334,772	309,458
Total			853,442	815,254
(1) m=1988; n=	=1997			
(2) Table 3.1, C	Column (4)			
(3) CAS Loss R	eserve Data Base [7]		Within	5%
(4) d=1997			<b>v</b> vrennn	370

For i = m = 1988: Table 3.1, Column (5)

For  $1989 \le i \le 1997$ : (2)x[Prior (3)+Prior(4)]

(5) Computed from CAS Loss Reserve Data Base [7]

Actual Emergence = cumulative losses paid subsequent to 12/31/97 through nine years subsequent to accident year + company filed loss reserves (including IBNR) nine years subsequent to accident year

## Initial Observations Using Rudimentary Table 3.1 Assumptions

### Table 3.2 Method vs. Basic Triangle LDF Methods:

Direct vs. indirect

More efficient to apply

Only requires experience from most recent calendar year; no triangle; no LDFs

To effectively apply, need only – calendar year d payments by accident year; each case reserve ratio at common maturities reasonably correspond to the respective ratio of total unpaid (including IBNR) losses; reasonable estimate of unpaid losses for the oldest included accident year

### **Potential Distortions**

Though Table 3.2 Method uses the ratio of case reserves to estimate  $r_i$ , several potential distortions in any measure or proxy for  $r_i$ :

Internal (e.g., mix of business shifts, changing claim procedures or case reserve adequacy) External (e.g., law changes, inflation, social influences) Credibility (i.e., randomness, sparseness- unrepresentative of the future) Bertram Horowitz, Inc. Actuarial & Risk Consultants

## Estimating Relative Unpaid Losses $r_i$

### **Reproduction of Actual Emergence**

Table 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 of Paper illustrate

#### Case Reserve Ratios as per Table 3.1, 3.2 Example

### **Advantages**

Typically readily available

Reflects actual loss experience

If claims personnel have behaved consistently, case ratio as measure of the ratio of all unpaid losses (including IBNR) intuitively appealing

### Potential Distortions

Non-homogenous mix of business

Different levels of adequacy - changing conditions (e.g., claims personnel practices) external conditions (e.g., inflation).

Common time maturity could correspond to different stages of development Relativity of IBNR losses may be different than the corresponding case reserve ratio Low credibility, sparse case reserve experience

### **Calendar Year d Reported Emergence**

#### **APPENDIX B, SHEET 1**

#### SECTION 3 EXAMPLE BUSINESS SEGMENT HISTORICAL INCREMENTAL PAID LOSSES AND CASE RESERVES

		Case		Case																
	Paid	Reserves	Paid	Reserves																
Accident	During	as of	During	as of																
Year	Year 1	<u>Year 1</u>	Year 2	<u>Year 2</u>	Year 3	<u>Year 3</u>	Year 4	<u>Year 4</u>	Year 5	<u>Year 5</u>	Year 6	<u>Year 6</u>	Year 7	<u>Year 7</u>	Year 8	<u>Year 8</u>	Year 9	<u>Year 9</u>	Years 10	<u>Year 10</u>
1988	3,962	18,455	22,325	32,519	26,713	24,536	39,637	10,366	13,699	6,640	10,341	3,393	3,939	4,025	3,161	3,177	2,079	1,588	2,064	116
1989	6,066	18,674	22,231	27,084	31,838	16,408	23,890	13,583	19,061	10,691	14,446	6,809	4,848	3,791	3,734	2,838	5,085	1,419		
1990	3,751	15,681	27,752	32,388	36,613	26,127	32,308	19,254	12,364	12,150	10,289	6,913	6,004	4,883	3,432	1,436				
1991	3,336	22,485	42,852	38,265	49,612	40,475	39,363	24,041	17,983	16,674	12,284	7,016	13,032	3,282						
1992	6,647	31,730	42,672	48,726	45,541	43,345	34,446	25,248	18,929	23,466	17,241	11,991								
1993	8,056	44,945	73,031	69,391	66,645	48,541	45,543	31,248	23,924	15,482										
1994	9,720	41,128	55,619	62,428	64,964	56,994	56,447	46,505												
1995	7,171	51,969	75,651	66,826	77,480	55,399														
1996	16,696	54,941	72,104	70,761																
1997	21,098	61,839																		

CAS Loss Reserve Data Base [7]

#### **APPENDIX B, SHEET 2**

#### SECTION 3 EXAMPLE BUSINESS SEGMENT HISTORICAL ONE YEAR REPORTED EMERGENCE

Accident Year		Case Reserves as of <u>Year 1</u>	One Year Reported as of <u>Year 2</u>	Case Reserves as of <u>Year 2</u>	One Year Reported as of <u>Year 3</u>	Case Reserves as of <u>Year 3</u>	One Year Reported as of <u>Year 4</u>	Case Reserves as of <u>Year 4</u>	One Year Reported as of <u>Year 5</u>	Case Reserves as of <u>Year 5</u>	One Year Reported as of <u>Year 6</u>	Case Reserves as of <u>Year 6</u>	One Year Reported as of <u>Year 7</u>	Case Reserves as of <u>Year 7</u>	One Year Reported as of <u>Year 8</u>	Case Reserves as of <u>Year 8</u>	One Year Reported as of <u>Year 9</u>	Case Reserves as of <u>Year 9</u>	One Year Reported as of <u>Year 10</u>
1988		18,455	54,844	32,519	51,249	24,536	50,003	10,366	20,339	6,640	13,734	3,393	7,964	4,025	6,338	3,177	3,667	1,588	2,180
1	Year LDF		<u>2.972</u>		1.576		2.038		<u>1.962</u>		2.068		2.347		<u>1.575</u>		<u>1.154</u>		<u>1.373</u>
1989		18,674	49,315	27,084	48,246	16,408	37,473	13,583	29,752	10,691	21,255	6,809	8,639	3,791	6,572	2,838	6,504	1,419	
1	Year LDF		<u>2.641</u>		<u>1.781</u>		2.284		<u>2.190</u>		1.988		1.269		<u>1.734</u>		<u>2.292</u>		
1990		15,681	60,140	32,388	62,740	26,127	51,562	19,254	24,514	12,150	17,202	6,913	10,887	4,883	4,868	1,436			
1	Year LDF		<u>3.835</u>		<u>1.937</u>		<u>1.974</u>		<u>1.273</u>		<u>1.416</u>		<u>1.575</u>		<u>0.997</u>				
1991		22,485	81,117	38,265	90,087	40,475	63,404	24,041	34,657	16,674	19,300	7,016	16,314	3,282					
1 1	Year LDF		<u>3.608</u>	10 59 (	<u>2.354</u>	10.015	<u>1.566</u>	25 2 40	<u>1.442</u>		<u>1.157</u>		2.325						
1992	V IDD	31,730	91,398	48,726	88,886	43,345	59,694	25,248	42,395	23,466	29,232	11,991							
1002	Year LDF	44.045	<u>2.880</u>	(0.201	<u>1.824</u>	40 5 44	<u>1.3//</u>	21 240	<u>1.679</u>	15 400	1.246								
1995	VeelDE	44,945	142,422	69,391	115,180	48,541	1 502	51,248	39,406	15,482									
1004	i ear LDF	41 1 29	<u>3.109</u> 118.047	62 128	<u>1.000</u> 121.058	56 004	<u>1.382</u> 102.052	46 505	1.201										
1994	Vear I DE	41,120	2 870	02,420	1 954	50,994	1 806	40,505											
1995		51 969	142 477	66 826	132 879	55 399	1.000												
1	Year LDF	51,909	2 742	00,020	1 988	55,577													
1996	i cui iibi	54,941	142.865	70.761	1000														
1	Year LDF	,	2.600	,															
1997		61,839	`																
W'td Avg. D	ev. Factor		2.7249017		1.8627350		1.6082550		1.4460186		1.2571046		1.7282284		<u>1.3999528</u>		1.6909393		1.3727960

One Year Reported as of Year x = Appendix B, Sheet 1: Paid During Year x + Case Reserves as of Year x Wt'd Avg. Dev. Factor equals dollar weighted average of (up to 3) most recent years underlined 1 Year LDFs

#### **TABLE 4.3.1**

#### **ASSUMPTIONS SELECTION**

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5) = (3)x(4)	(6) = (5) / [Prior (2)]	(7)
	Unpaid Loss		Selected	Estimated Unpaid		Selected Unpaid
	as of 12/31/96	Case	One Year	Loss as of 12/31/97		Loss of Oldest
Accident	Reported	Reserves	Development	Reported	Selected Ratio	Accident Year
Year	as of 12/31/97	as of 12/31/97	Factor	as of 12/31/98	Unpaid Loss	as of 12/31/97
i					Selected r <sub>i</sub>	Selected U <sub>1988,1997</sub>
1988	2,180					1,048
1989	6,504	1,419	1.3727960	1,948	0.8935768	
1990	4,868	1,436	1.6909393	2,428	0.3733378	
1991	16,314	3,282	1.3999528	4,595	0.9438465	
1992	29,232	11,991	1.7282284	20,723	1.2702701	
1993	39,406	15,482	1.2571046	19,462	0.6657941	
1994	102,952	46,505	1.4460186	67,247	1.7065192	
1995	132,879	55,399	1.6082550	89,096	0.8654103	
1996	142,865	70,761	1.8627350	131,809	0.9919475	
1997		61,839	2.7249017	168,505	1.1794715	

(1) m=1988; n=1997

(2) Appendix B, Sheet 2; One Year Reported final diagonal

(3) Appendix B, Sheet 2; final diagonal

(4) Appendix B, Sheet 2; final underlined row

(7) CAS Loss Reserve Data Base [7] = company filed loss reserves (including IBNR) as of 12/31/97

#### **TABLE 4.3.2**

#### INDICATED UNPAID LOSSES

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		Incremental	Indicated	
Accident	Selected Ratio	Paid Loss	Unpaid Loss	Actual
Year	Unpaid Loss	During 1997	as of 12/31/97	Emergence
i	Selected r <sub>i</sub>	Pi,1997	Indicated U <sub>i,1997</sub>	
1988		2,064	1,048	1,048
1989	0.8935768	5,085	2,781	2,229
1990	0.3733378	3,432	2,937	4,875
1991	0.9438465	13,032	6,011	8,939
1992	1.2702701	17,241	24,190	27,175
1993	0.6657941	23,924	27,584	38,236
1994	1.7065192	56,447	87,900	75,947
1995	0.8654103	77,480	124,919	130,558
1996	0.9919475	72,104	200,770	216,789
1997	1.1794715	21,098	321,847	309,458
Total			799,986	815,254
(1) m=1988; n=	=1997		26/	
(2) Table 4.3.1,	Column (6)			

(3) Table 3.2, Column (3)

(4) d=1997

For i = m = 1988: Table 4.3.1, Column (7)

For  $1989 \le i \le 1997$ : (2)x[Prior (3)+Prior(4)]

(5) Computed from CAS Loss Reserve Data Base [7]

Actual Emergence = cumulative losses paid subsequent to 12/31/97 through nine years subsequent to accident year

+ company filed loss reserves (including IBNR) nine years subsequent to accident year

Within 2%

## Estimating Relative Unpaid Losses $r_i$

#### Steady State Value for $r_i = 1 + \text{trend rate}$

Steady State = same real (without consideration of unpaid loss frequency trend and severity trend) unpaid claim exposure as of common maturities for each accident year

#### **Earned Premium**

#### TABLE 4.5

(1)	(2)	(3)=(2)/[Prior(2)]
Accident	Earned	Indicated Ratio
i i i	Premium	Indicated r <sub>i</sub>
1988	138 743	
1989	163,183	1.1761530
1990	162,184	0.9938780
1991 1992	177,393	1.0937762 1.1148692
1993	225,434	1.1398797
1994	267,578	1.1869461
1995	318,426 363,402	1.1412447
1997	400,300	1.1015349

#### Strength:

Ratio of successive accident year earned premium may provide stability and credibility to corresponding  $r_i$  indications

#### **Potential weaknesses:**

Change in premium adequacy

Measure relative total accident year exposure rather than relative unpaid loss exposure

Actual loss experience not directly reflected

Appropriate to complement with other  $r_i$  measures since estimated  $r_i$  based solely upon earned premium ignores impact of recent loss experience through valuation date

### Estimating Relative Unpaid Losses $r_i$

### **Unpaid Claim Counts and Severity Indices**

Estimated 
$$r_i = \frac{Estimated C_{i,d}}{Estimated C_{i-1,d-1}} x \frac{Estimated S_{i,d}}{Estimated S_{i-1,d-1}}$$

Where  $C_{i,j}$  = accident year *i* number of claims unpaid as of year-end j  $j \ge i$ 

$$S_{i,j}$$
 = accident year *i* unpaid severity as of year-end j  $j \ge i$ 

#### **Other Measures and Adjustments**

Other Measure Examples: payroll; number of vehicles; miles driven; operating expenditures; square footage; average occupied beds; outpatient visits; number of employees

**Claim analytics** 

Potential Adjustments: policy limits and deductibles; reinsurance provisions; and law changes

# **Optimal Application of Model**

### Optimal Estimated Relative Unpaid Claims $r_i$

Cannot be universally prescribed

Requires investigation and care

Sensitivity analysis

Credibility

### Optimal Oldest Included Accident Year Unpaid Losses ${m U}_{m,d}$

Analogous to tail development factor

Adapt methods from CAS Committee on Reserves "The Estimation of Loss Development Tail Factors: A Summary Report"

Credibility

Exclude oldest accident years?

## Empirical Evidence – CAS Loss Reserve Data Base

### **Qualifying Criteria**

- Actual emergence of at least \$25,000
- Positive earned premium for each calendar year 1989 through 1997
- Calendar year 1997 loss payments  $\geq$  0 for each accident year 1988 through 1997
- Each accident year 1988 1996 case reserve as of 12/31/96 ≥ \$25 and each accident year 1989 through 1997 case reserve as of 12/31/97 ≥ \$25
- No division by zero in working through any of the seven methods

### **Seven Unpaid Claim Methods**

<u>Basic</u>	Relative Unpaid Claim Model
Payment Development Method (a)	Relative Unpaid Claims Method 1 (d); $r_i$ per Table 3.2
Incurred Development Method (b)	Relative Unpaid Claims Method 2 (e); $r_i$ per Table 4.3.2
Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method (c) (Expected Losses = A/Y 1988-90 Incurred Development Loss Ratio)	Relative Unpaid Claims Method 3 (f) $r_i = .75(r_i \text{ per Table 3.2}) + .25(r_i \text{ per Table 4.5})$
	Relative Unpaid Claims Method 4 (g) $r_i = .75(r_i \text{ per Table 4.3.2}) + .25(r_i \text{ per Table 4.5})$

## Empirical Evidence – CAS Loss Reserve Data Base

TABLE 6

#### **RETROSPECTIVE ACCURACY TEST OF 12/31/97 UNPAID CLAIM ESTIMATES:** 46 Qualifying CAS Loss Reserve Data Base U.S. Property/Casualty Business Segments

(1)	(2)	(3)
	Number of Business	Number of Business
	Segments where	Segments where
	Estimate	Estimate
Loss Reserving	Falls Within 20%	Falls Within 10%
Method	of Actual Emergence	of Actual Emergence
Payment Development (a)	19	13
Incurred Development (b)	26	17
Bornhuetter-Ferguson (c)	32	21
Relative Unpaid Claims 1 (d)	30	16
Relative Unpaid Claims 2 (e)	27	18
Relative Unpaid Claims 3 (f)	38	21
Relative Unpaid Claims 4 (g)	33	23

(2) Number of 46 Business Segments where  $1/1.2 \le (\text{Estimated Unpaid Loss})/(\text{Actual Emergence}) \le 1.2$ 

(3) Number of 46 Business Segments where  $1/1.1 \le (\text{Estimated Unpaid Loss})/(\text{Actual Emergence}) \le 1.1$ 

Heuristic Comparison Indicates Relative Unpaid Claim Methods Perform Well Versus Comparable Basic Methods

# Model Conclusion; Future Research

### Conclusion

- Straightforward exact Relative Unpaid Claims Loss Reserving Model
- Generally requires less data and fewer assumptions than basic triangle LDF methods
- $\blacktriangleright$  Guidance provided on selecting appropriate estimates for  $r_i$  and  $U_{m,d}$
- Generally results in unpaid claim estimates as accurate as comparable basic reserving methods
- Practical, efficient and powerful reserving tool

#### **Future Research**

Develop techniques to further improve estimated parameter accuracy – alternative parameter estimate weightings, incorporate steady state properties

Cast Model in stochastic setting