Intermediate Track 1: Forensics of the Commercial Auto Cycle...And Where to Now

CARe Seminar, June 6-7, 2016 Boston, Massachusetts

Kevin Hilferty, Guy Carpenter (Moderator) Mike Mahoney, Senior Actuary, Liberty Mutual Reinsurance John Buchanan, Principal – Excess and Reinsurance, Verisk / ISO

Antitrust Notice

The Casualty Actuarial Society is committed to adhering strictly to the letter and spirit of the antitrust laws. Seminars conducted under the auspices of the CAS are designed solely to provide a forum for the expression of various points of view on topics described in the programs or agendas for such meetings.

- Under no circumstances shall CAS seminars be used as a means for competing companies or firms to reach any understanding – expressed or implied – that restricts competition or in any way impairs the ability of members to exercise independent business judgment regarding matters affecting competition.
- It is the responsibility of all seminar participants to be aware of antitrust regulations, to prevent any written or verbal discussions that appear to violate these laws, and to adhere in every respect to the CAS antitrust compliance policy.



IT1: Forensics of the Commercial Auto Cycle...And Where to Now Description

This session will tackle the anatomy of the Commercial Auto results over the last underwriting cycle, including analyzing the components underlying the loss ratio rises and reserve strengthening in the last few years. A look back, ex-ante, review of what we knew and how we might have known it earlier. The session will include both a quantitative and qualitative review of what happened, lessons learned, and what might happen in the current market.

Moderator :

Kevin Hilferty, Guy Carpenter

Presenter:

Mike Mahoney, Senior Actuary, Liberty Mutual Reinsurance John W. Buchanan, Principal, Excess & Reinsurance, Verisk / ISO

CARe IT1: Forensics of Commercial Auto Agenda

- Introduction
 - Kevin Hilferty 5 minutes
- Historical Commercial Auto Results
 - Mike Mahoney 30 minutes
- Analyzing More Recent Results and Role of Benchmarking in the Underwriting Cycle

- John Buchanan 35 minutes

• **Q&A** 5 minutes

To the extent there is time, will pause for questions after each of the Three main sections. Otherwise, will have questions at the end.





Kevin Hilferty

Section 2

Historical Commercial Auto Results Mike Mahoney

US P&C Primary Industry Commercial Auto/ Truck Liability/ Medical

- 1. Losses grew less than 3% per year over last 20 years.
- 2. Premium remained static from 1987 to1999 as losses grew more than 50%
- 3. Commissions appear remarkably stable.
- 4. 2006 was still very profitable. Premium and loss static since 2003.

Accident	Gross Earned	Commission	Estimated	Estimated	Discounted
Year	Premium	Ratio	Ultimate Loss	Ultimate LR	Loss & Comm Ratio
1984	6.46		8.41	130%	109%
1985	8.66		9.65	111%	91%
1986	13.11		9.88	75%	69%
1987	14.99		10.80	72%	71%
1988	14.76		11.41	77%	74%
1989	15.04		12.18	81%	76%
1990	15.02		11.83	79%	74%
1991	14.75	12.2%	10.80	73%	70%
1992	14.87	11.4%	10.95	74%	72%
1993	15.23	11.3%	11.78	77%	77%
1994	15.75	11.3%	13.15	83%	85%
1995	15.12	12.1%	12.54	83%	81%
1996	15.27	12.2%	13.22	87%	84%
1997	15.34	12.7%	14.05	92%	90%
1998	15.13	13.0%	14.58	96%	94%
1999	15.54	12.7%	16.44	106%	104%
2000	17.00	12.5%	17.09	101%	98%
2001	18.54	12.9%	16.75	90%	88%
2002	21.83	12.6%	16.30	75%	79%
2003	23.96	12.3%	15.99	67%	73%
2004	24.59	12.7%	15.88	65%	73%
2005	25.14	12.3%	16.47	66%	73%
2006	24.85		16.96	68%	73%
Total	380.94		307.12	81%	
Annual Growth	1				
1987-2006					
(Exp. Fit)	3.0%		2.7%		
1097-2006	2 7%		2 10/		

Page 7

Source: AM Bests Averages and Averages and primary company Annual Statements

US P&C Primary Industry Commercial Auto/ Truck Liability/ Medical

- 1. Restated Loss Ratio is remarkably stable.
- 2. Only a small residual cyclical effect.

Conclusion:

Soft market u/w losses were driven by inadequate premium rather than extraordinary growth in losses.

Accident	Gross Earned	Estimated	Estimated	Smoothed	Restated
Year	Premium	Ultimate Loss	Ultimate LR	Premium	Loss Ratio
1984	6.46	8.41	130%		
1985	8.66	9.65	111%		
1986	13.11	9.88	75%		
1987	14.99	10.80	72%	14.99	72%
1988	14.76	11.41	77%	15.43	74%
1989	15.04	12.18	81%	15.89	77%
1990	15.02	11.83	79%	16.35	72%
1991	14.75	10.80	73%	16.84	64%
1992	14.87	10.95	74%	17.34	63%
1993	15.23	11.78	77%	17.85	66%
1994	15.75	13.15	83%	18.37	72%
1995	15.12	12.54	83%	18.92	66%
1996	15.27	13.22	87%	19.48	68%
1997	15.34	14.05	92%	20.05	70%
1998	15.13	14.58	96%	20.64	71%
1999	15.54	16.44	106%	21.25	77%
2000	17.00	17.09	101%	21.88	78%
2001	18.54	16.75	90%	22.53	74%
2002	21.83	16.30	75%	23.20	70%
2003	23.96	15.99	67%	23.88	67%
2004	24.59	15.88	65%	24.59	65%
2005	25.14	16.47	66%	25.31	65%
2006	24.85	16.96	68%	26.06	65%
Total	380.94	307.12	81%		
Annual Growth				3.0%	

US P&C Primary Industry Commercial Auto/ Truck Liability/ Medical

- 1. It is astounding that from 1989 to 2001 original12 month LR was always between 80 and 85 while the ultimate LR varied between 73 and 106.
- 2. 1991 had a 12 mo LR of 82 and 1999 had a 12 mo LR of 85!!!!!

Acci	dent	Gross Earned	Estimated	Estimated	Original 12 Mo
Ye	ar	Premium	Ultimate Loss	Ultimate LR	Ultmate LR
	1984	6.46	8.41	130%	
	1985	8.66	9.65	111%	
	1986	13.11	9.88	75%	
	1987	14.99	10.80	72%	
	1988	14.76	11.41	77%	
	1989	15.04	12.18	81%	82%
	1990	15.02	11.83	79%	83%
	1991	14.75	10.80	73%	82%
	1992	14.87	10.95	74%	81%
	1993	15.23	11.78	77%	81%
	1994	15.75	13.15	83%	82%
	1995	15.12	12.54	83%	83%
	1996	15.27	13.22	87%	81%
	1997	15.34	14.05	92%	84%
	1998	15.13	14.58	96%	85%
	1999	15.54	16.44	106%	85%
	2000	17.00	17.09	101%	84%
	2001	18.54	16.75	90%	80%
	2002	21.83	16.30	75%	73%
	2003	23.96	15.99	67%	69%
	2004	24.59	15.88	65%	67%
	2005	25.14	16.47	66%	67%
	2006	24.85	16.96	68%	
otal		380.94	307.12	81%	

Page 9

Source: AM Bests Averages and Averages and primary company Annual Statements



Source - AM Bests Aggregate and Averages, Annual Statements, CARE 2008 presentation by Isaac Mashitz



Page 11

	Ultimate Losse US Gross Dom CA/GL/WC/PL	ate Losses Compared to GDP ^{Sw} ross Domestic Product L/WC/PL					
1. Insured loss as							
a % of GDP	Assidant	Ultimate Losses					
grew by about	Accident	Fillidiy					
25% in soft	1995	55 36	7 398	AS a % 01 GDP 0 75%			
market and	1996	58.06	7,330	0.75%			
returned to	1997	64 14	8 304	0.77%			
normal levels	1998	74.93	8.747	0.86%			
as market	1999	84.36	9,268	0.91%			
bardonod	2000	90.46	9,817	0.92%			
nalueneu.	2001	93.58	10,128	0.92%			
2. I believe this	2002	89.23	10,470	<mark>0.85%</mark>			
explains	2003	85.21	10,971	0.78%			
residual	2004	85.34	11,734	0.73%			
cyclical offect	2005	92.28	12,455	0.74%			
ofter promium	2006	101.16	13,246	0.76%			
alter premium			A	verage			
smoothing in		E 00/	19	995 - 2006			
earlier	Annual Growth	5.6%	5.4%	0.81%			
exhibits.	Exponential Fit	4.9%	5.2%				

Amounts in USD Billions

Source – AM Bests Aggregate and Averages, Annual Statements, CARE 2008 presentation by Isaac Mashitz

Industry versus GDP update





Source – AM Bests Aggregate and Averages, Annual Statements, CARE 2008 presentation by Isaac Mashitz



Conclusion - Two recessions did not seem to impact the business noticeably Source - AM Bests Aggregate and Averages, Annual Statements, CARE 2008 presentation by Isaac Mashitz Page 15



Same looking patterns, so recession seems like not the story. Note - Reinsurance results are 52% more volatile than primary

Source - AM Bests Aggregate and Averages, Annual Statements, CARE 2008 presentation by Isaac Mashitz



US Reinsurance Industry Reserve Development All Lines - Net - \$ Billions

- 1. Historically for reinsurers, adverse development only occurred during soft market accident years.
- 2. Historically for reinsurers, hard market years develop favorably.
- 3. For reinsurers, the years 1989-1996 are remarkably stable

Source: Bests Aggregates and Averages Page 18

Accident	Original	Developed	Adv/ (Fav)	Percent	
Year	Reserves	Reserves	Dev	Develop	after
1984	3.6	6.0	2.4	67%	10 years
1985	4.2	5.6	1.4	33%	10 years
1986	6.2	5.5	(0.7)	-11%	10 years
1987	6.7	5.1	(1.6)	-24%	10 years
1988	6.0	4.9	(1.1)	-18%	10 years
1989	6.1	5.8	(0.3)	-5%	9 years
1990	6.4	6.1	(0.3)	-5%	10 years
1991	7.2	6.8	(0.4)	-6%	10 years
1992	7.7	7.7	-	0%	10 years
1993	8.3	7.8	(0.5)	-6%	9 years
1994	8.9	8.5	(0.4)	-4%	10 years
1995	9.6	9.0	(0.6)	-6%	10 years
1996	10.1	10.6	0.5	5%	10 years
1997	10.1	11.5	1.3	13%	10 years
1998	10.0	14.2	4.3	43%	9 years
1999	12.2	18.5	6.3	52%	8 years
2000	13.0	19.8	6.8	52%	7 years
2001	17.2	20.3	3.1	18%	6 years
2002	13.7	14.3	0.6	4%	5 years
2003	14.8	13.0	(1.8)	-12%	4 years
2004	15.4	14.3	(1.2)	-8%	3 years
2005	18.0	17.9	(0.1)	-1%	2 years
2006	12.8	12.8			1 year
1984-85	7.8	11.6	3.8	49%	
1986-88	18.9	15.5	(3.4)	-18%	
4000.00	64.9	60 0	(2.0)	20/	
1909-90	64.3	62.3	(2.0)	-3%	
1997-2001	62.5	84.3	21.9	35%	
2002-2006	74.8	72.3	(2.5)	-3%	
Soft Market	70.3	95.9	25.7	37%	84-85 & 97-01
Hard Market	93.7	87.8	(5.9)	-6%	86-88 & 02-06
Stable Market	64.3	62.3	(2.0)	-3%	89-96





Boston, Massachusetts June 6, 2016



SERVE | ADD VALUE | INNOVATE

John Buchanan, FCAS, MAAA Principal, Excess and Reinsurance

🖉 | 🌌

IT 1: Forensics of the Commercial Auto Cycle Agenda

Benchmarking Analysis Framework

- Benchmarking components
- Where are we in the underwriting cycle?
- Assessing confidence

Commercial Auto Experience Through 12/31/2015

- Raw experience and on-level
- Using rate changes and power units (TTT)
- Ground-up and excess indications
- Frequency, severity, layer increased limits factors

Qualitative vs. Quantitative

- Historical issues and reconciling to graphs
- Future and Emerging Issues

• Where to Now?

- Impact Telematics, improved class plans, exposure bases

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary

21

SERVE | ADD VALUE | INNOVATE

Benchmark Assessment Matrix A Suggested Framework

- All information received can be slotted ("pigeonholed") for further analysis
- Set up an initial matrix of lines of business and types of analyses of interest to a primary company or reinsurer
 - US some 30 LOBs and 20 types of analyses
 - Trends, LDFs, ILFs, rate changes ..., cycle analysis
 - Similar for Global
- Visual framework to systematically:
 - Survey and slot internal and external info into each cell
 - Assess confidence of each item in each cell
 - Establish priorities for pricing projects direct and proxy
- Ultimately chief actuaries and upper management use all information to assess market cycles for each LOB
- Framework for slotting actuarial presentations, including today's



Benchmarking Components Primary and Excess

- Trends
- Loss Development Factors
- Rate Changes
- Ground Up Loss Costs
- Excess Loss Factors
- Allocated Loss Adjustment Expenses
- Loss Ratios
- Emerging Issues
- Line of Business Correlations

Where are we in the Underwriting Cycle?

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary



Source: Adapted from IT2 Intermediate / Advanced - CARe May 2014 (JBuchanan)



Commercial Auto – TTT- Countrywide Average Ground-up Loss Ratios @12/31/2015 Before Rate Level Changes

Analysis Method A	: Premium (no ra priori Trend = 0.03 INCURRED	ate change)			
AY	Ultimate INDEMNITY & ALAE	Total Loss Ratio	YTY Change	Ultimate Premium	80.0%
2001	2.683.675.861	74.8%		3.588.742.631	
2002	2,421,386,973	62.3%	-16.71%	3,888,880,055	60.0%
2003	2.452.868.136	61.1%	-1.93%	4.014.464.636	
2004	2.531.795.163	63.4%	3.76%	3.992.503.146	50.0%
2005	2,587,402,721	61.7%	-2.68%	4,191,394,636	50.0%
2006	2.577.834.225	56.4%	-8.59%	4.572.993.699	40.00
2007	2,597,030,409	57.1%	1.24%	4,546,807,464	40.0%
2000	2,040,171,099	50.0%	-1.40%	4,171,400,000	20.0%
2009	2,129,040,163	54.4%	-3.37%	3,911,917,967	50.0%
2010	2.324.556.274	61.4%	12.87%	3.784.931.314	20.0%
2011	2.616.186.513	69.5%	13.19%	3,764,687,780	20.0%
2012	2.675.907.159	69.5%	0.00%	3.848.116.211	10.0%
2013	2.823.855.622	66.7%	-4.03%	4.233.212.067	10.0%
2014	2,955,641,408	65.6%	-1.65%	4,507,618,886	0.0%
2015	3,169,521,802	66.4%	1.22%	4,771,845,144	
Total/Average	38,894,874,328	62.9%	-0.58%	61,789,515,699	2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014
	Trend 7 year		2.46%		
	Trend - all year		0.27%		- IOLAI LOSS RALIO

Source: ISO SOLM 2016 v1 - losses developed to ultimate using 5-year VWA; premiums developed to ultimate using Earned Premium triangle ISO MarketWatch for Rate changes - Auto Commercial Liability - through 12/31/2015 (adjusted policy year to accident year)

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary



Source: ISO SOLM 2016 v1 - losses developed to ultimate using 5-year VWA; premiums developed to ultimate using Earned Premium triangle ISO MarketWatch for Rate changes - Auto Commercial Liability - through 12/31/2015 (adjusted policy year to accident year assuming 6 mo. policies)

Commercial Auto - TTT- Countrywide Average Ground-up Loss Costs @12/2015 Per Exposure Unit (Power Units)



Source: ISO SOLM 2016 v1 - losses developed to ultimate using 5-year VWA; premiums developed to ultimate using Earned Premium triangle ISO MarketWatch for Rate changes - Auto Commercial Liability - through 12/31/2015 (adjusted policy year to accident year using 6mo policy term assumption)

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary



Source: ISO SOLM 2016 v1 - losses developed to ultimate using 5-year VWA; premiums developed to ultimate using Earned Premium triangle

ISO MarketWatch for Rate changes - Auto Commercial Liability - through 12/31/2015 (adjusted policy year to accident year using 6 mo policy term assumption)

NB: additional variables such as truck employment, truck tonnage, new heavy truck sales, and other economic indicators should be explored to help analyze residual trend indications (see Dave Clark – IT2 and C28); other Emerging Issues variables described in slides 48-54 should also be reviewed.

Commercial Auto – TTT - Countrywide Average Ground-up Average Severity @ 12/2015

Illustrative



Source: ISO SOLM 2016 v1 - losses developed to ultimate using 5-year VWA; premiums developed to ultimate using Earned Premium triangle ISO MarketWatch for Rate changes - Auto Commercial Liability - through 12/31/2015 (adjusted policy year to accident year using 6 mo policy term assumption)

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary



3.48%

3.58%

49.0

3.43%

4.58%

55.4%

4.11%

1.58%

1.90%

66.2

3.94%

7 year Trend - Freq

7 year Trend - Sev

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015

-State Q -State X -State Y -Countrywide

Commercial Auto - TTT - State Differences Excess Frequency >10k @12/2015 Using On-Level Premium and Assuming 3% Severity Trend

Illustrative



33

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary

SERVE | ADD VALUE | INNOVATE Commercial Auto – TTT – Countrywide Excess Layer Losses to compare to ILF's @ 12/2015 Illustrative Analysis Method: Premium (MW rate change) Apriori Trend = 0.03 INCURRED 30.0% INDEMNITY & Total Loss YTY Chang ALAE 900,472,751 17.1% 5,259,313,191 25.0% 2001 2002 2003 850,017,180 895,208,665 16.8% 18.9% 5,058,540,638 -1.75% 4,738,768,792 12.50% 20.0% 2004 2005 967,012,506 991,762,034 4,473,817,476 4,651,561,274 21.6% 14.29% 21.3% -1.39% 2006 2007 996,606,811 1,010,286,630 19.5% 19.4% 5,115,704,280 5,214,341,935 -8.45% 15.0% -0.51% 18.8% 18.0% 4,934,409,650 4,695,638,350 2008 928.512.806 -3.09% 2009 042,913,152 4.261 10.0% 2010 936,502,478 20.4% 13.33% 4,586,874,534 2011 1.081.656.974 23.8% 16.67% 4.551.143.714 5.0% 5.04% 2012 1,118,274,300 25.0% 4,478,943,135 1,166,903,259 1,195,408,670 2013 25.1% 0.40% 4,642,446,939 25.5% 1.59 4,692,777,431 2014 0.0% 2015 1 316 964 903 27.6% 8.24% 4,771,845,144 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 15,198,503,119 71,866,126,484 Total/Average 21.1% 3.76% Trend 7 year 6.36% —Total Loss Ratio Trend - all year

Source: ISO SOLM 2016 v1 - losses developed to ultimate using 5-year VWA; premiums developed to ultimate using Earned Premium triangle ISO MarketWatch for Rate changes - Auto Commercial Liability - through 12/31/2015 (adjusted policy year to accident year assuming 6 mo. policies)

2.939

Commercial Auto - TTT - State Differences Excess Partial Loss Ratios 900x100k @12/2015 Using On-Level Premium and Assuming 3% Severity Trend

Illustrative

	Countrywide	State Q	State X	State Y	° Commercial Auto - TTT
2001	17.1%	20.6%	15.4%	12.3%	6 900x100 Loss Patio - 3% Trend - MW Promium Base
2002	16.8%	21.7%	16.9%	15.1%	500X100 LOSS Ratio - 5/0 Hend - WW Freihidin Dase
2003	18.9%	18.2%	20.4%	19.8%	6
2004	21.6%	24.1%	21.5%	15.2%	
2005	21.3%	25.1%	24.0%	24.3%	
2006	19.5%	24.7%	19.4%	17.5%	
2007	19.4%	18.2%	21.7%	14.3%	
2008	18.8%	20.9%	19.2%	18.1%	
2009	18.0%	21.8%	18.9%	10.9%	
2010	20.4%	24.3%	28.3%	16.0%	
2011	23.8%	29.3%	24.9%	10.6%	
2012	25.0%	32.2%	32.2%	15.4%	6
2013	25.1%	26.2%	26.1%	13.3%	6
2014	25.5%	31.9%	28.6%	16.4%	2001 2002 2003 2005 2005 2005 2005 2006 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014
2015	27.6%	38.3%	37.1%	16.9%	2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2013
Year Trend	6.36%	7.58%	7.47%	5.69%	
ess vs GU trend	0.52%	0.52%	-0.55%	-0.07%	Sale a Sale i Sale i Country inde

35

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary

SERVE | ADD VALUE | INNOVATE Commercial Auto – Lengthening Loss Development View at 2010: Ex-ante 5 years – excess layer 900x100k Illustrative State Major Class Data Threshold Min Data Threshold Max Paid/Incurred Loss Type Trend Countrywide CA 100,001 1,000,000 INCURRED INDEMNITY Line of Business Market State Countrywide 3.0% 24 617,774,125 610,836,081 643,345,945 36 756,950,801 783,181,509 871,990,360 888,136,006 72 938,273,843 984,022,031 1,071,732,446 60 912,791,715 969,817,214 1,047,350,457 1,069,796,753 12 352,883,222 361,574,320 375,819,924 48 842,517,130 917,409,907 999,072,041 1,019,035,751 84 949,819,880 988,320,401 1,080,432,924 1,078,134,771 96 950,724,785 989,207,712 1,083,276,328 AY 1997 AY 1998 AY 1999 AY 2000 364 230 36 668,607,352 1.078.665.399 1.080.449.826 AY 2000 AY 2001 AY 2002 AY 2003 AY 2004 AY 2005 646,234,901 647,590,063 673,313,688 1,075,065,638 980,217,784 1,007,869,678 855,175,814 998,697,134 1,028,546,796 1,032,712,610 1,036,330,034 362,874,309 836,254,069 850,101,251 924,343,635 949,105,547 958,498,124 989.067.394 975,097,181 1,005,607,530 1,075,494,990 1,112,068,639 927,380,059 951,649,708 981,263,268 1,006,014,437 373,693,137 428,699,656 444,161,637 744,516,910 771,183,404 1,011,867,427 1,058,416,374 1,056,701,234 1,097,265,890 1,074,042,654 1,120,755,518 AY 2005 AY 2006 AY 2007 AY 2008 AY 2009 AY 2010 AY 2011 1,120,755,516 1,131,489,486 1,146,898,069 1,035,845,596 437,386,107 462,185,649 766,785,312 801,737,481 963,240,899 991,509,745 1,066,637,325 1,112,815,458 1,088,630,104 1,118,547,727 1,129,332,037 1,146,546,479 1,120,449,052 978,115,334 1,013,557,136 883,104,169 927,787,928 969,387,048 1,035,435,988 1,125,676,152 1,194,878,815 425,290,636 334,768,535 722,271,219 624,898,496 888,533,303 1,027,136,175 948,485,344 1,051,546,587 1,034,021,517 949,819,735 776,064,454 365,740,409 990,396,802 372,698,496 783.041.966 AY 2012 AY 2013 AY 2014 AY 2015 1 168 866 896 1,042,048,655 1,079,354,243 423,223,216 448,843,946 796,628,773 849,643,294 837,690,338 'Y tots-2014,2015 18,120,331,965 19,430,015,200 15,321,892,201 48/36 1.113 1.171 1.146 20.0% 60/48 1.083 1.057 1.048 24/12 1.751 1.689 1.712 36/24 1.225 1.282 1.355 84/72 1.012 1.004 1.008 08/96 1.002 1.001 1.000 72/60 1.028 1.015 1.023 96/84 1.001 1.001 1.003 AY 1997 AY 1998 AY 1999 AY 2000 .147 .836 .328 1.050 1.008 1.000 .002 0.999 AY 2000 AY 2001 AY 2002 AY 2003 AY 2003 AY 2004 AY 2005 AY 2006 AY 2007 0.998 1.781 1.323 1.168 1.030 1.004 1.002 1.001 1.803 1.802 1.737 1.736 1.291 1.263 1.034 1.039 1.001 0.998 1.109 1.119 1.017 1.017 1.005 1.002 0.999 1.001 1.095 1.113 1.107 1.098 1.242 1.046 0.999 1.003 1.000 1.016 1.753 1.256 1.001 1.002 1.043 1.014 1.002 AY 2008 1.698 1.230 1.101 1.013 1.007 1 0 0 2 1.036 1.867 1.805 1.858 1.882 1.893 1.138 1.120 1.137 1.122 1.242 1.287 1.265 1.308 1.270 1.051 1.068 1.061 45 1.022 1.001

5 year ATA/ATU Factor

5 Ex Ante

1.76

Commercial Auto – ERLI Warning View at 2010: Ex-ante 5 years – excess layer 900x100k

									ustra
AY	Actual n-6	Actual n-5	5-Yr ATA	Expected n-5	AY	Actual increase Ex	pected increase A	ctual - Expected	%
2005	1,097,265,890	1,112,068,639	1.0135	1,112,059,126	2005	14,802,749.0	14,793,235.6	9,513.4	0.1%
2006	1,066,637,325	1,112,815,458	1.0403	1,109,570,434	2006	46,178,133.0	42,933,109.1	3,245,023.9	7.6%
2007	991,509,745	1,088,630,104	1.1063	1,096,882,077	2007	97,120,359.0	105,372,332.4	(8,251,973.4)	-7.8%
2008	722,271,219	888,533,303	1.2391	894,986,382	2008	166,262,084.0	172,715,163.5	(6,453,079.5)	-3.7%
2009	334,768,535	624,898,496	1.7525	586,678,587	2009	290,129,961.0	251,910,051.5	38,219,909.5	15.2%
2010		372,698,496			2010				
Sum x2010	12,419,753,463	13,029,933,029		13,010,201,530	Sum x2015	610,179,566	590,448,067	19,731,499	3.3%
1996-1999	3,028,045,461	3,027,332,760		3,027,933,529	2001-2004	(712,701)	(111,932)	(600,769)	-536.7%
2000-2004	5,179,255,288	5,175,654,269		5,182,091,395	2005-2009	(3,601,019)	2,836,107	(6,437,126)	-227.0%
2005-2009	4,212,452,714	4,826,946,000		4,800,176,606	2010-2014	614,493,286	587,723,892	26,769,394	4.6%
300,000,00 250,000,00 200,000,00 150,000,00 100,000,00 50,000,00	00.0 00.0 00.0 00.0 00.0 00.0							- 15.0% - 10.0% - 5.0% - 0.0% 5.0% 10.0%	
	2	005	2006	2007		2008	2009		
			Actual incre	ase Expect	ed increase	. —%			

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary



Source: ISO SOLM 2016 v1 - losses developed to ultimate using 5-year VWA (refresh each year); premiums developed to ultimate using Earned Premium triangle ISO MarketWatch for Rate changes - Auto Commercial Liability - through 12/31/2015 (adjusted policy year to accident year using 6 mo policy term assumption)

37



Umbrella and Excess: Commercial Auto Component Average Severities and Policy Limits



Source: ISO SOLM-UXS Losses unadjusted for rate changes



Rate Changes Through 6/30/2015 Liability & Physical Damage

Illustrative





Negative means more competitive (softer market) and positive means less competitive (harder market). Source: ISO MarketWatch – released 9/15/2015





SERVE | ADD VALUE | INNOVATE

Rate Change Observations

Rate change deterioration

- Overall rates were down by 1-5% per year from 2005 to 2011 (2007 to 2009 down by 3-5%)
- Taking premium size into consideration the rates related to the larger premium sizes are down by 3% to 9% per year from 2005 to 2012.
- These larger rate reductions may impact E&S, reinsurers and primary companies insuring larger auto fleets
- Large differentials by state and premium size
- Adverse loss ratio experience by state tends to give rise to subsequent rate activity



Commercial Auto Conclusions

- Long-term pricing reductions in the early to mid 2000s were partially offset by significant frequency reductions in that period
- Pricing continued to drop in the later 2000s, but frequencies leveled off presenting pent up pressure on results
- Loss ratios increased from 2009 to 2012 by over 25% from mid 50%'s to close to 70%: long-term severities increased, development factors lengthened, frequencies started to rise, excess layer %'s increased, rates were still dropping
- After **prices started to rise in 2012**, loss ratios leveled off are now trending back up again towards the mid 60%s
- It appears trends may not have been spotted by many carriers, as we have seen late emerging losses and significant subsequent years reserve strengthening
- Significant state and commercial auto type differences

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary

Emerging Issues Qualitative vs. Quantitative Analysis

Confidential - Not for Distribution without permission





Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis – Overview and Steps Reconciling and Projecting Expected Impacts on Trend Indications

Overview: Apply knowledge from internal and external sources

- Assess qualitative impacts affecting individual lines of business
- Evaluate impacts on combinations of lines under an ERM framework; historical and emerging

1. Start with a survey list of potential historical issues or topics

- e.g. impact of seat belt laws for Personal Auto or MPL under various time frames

2. Assess whether each item would have a positive or negative impact

 e.g. expected to reduce (positive) or increase (negative) the frequency trend, no impact or unknown

3. Attempt to quantify impact of each item

- Low, medium, high, or unknown
- 4. Reconcile various impact items, direction and magnitude, on historical frequency trend indications
 - Eyeball axiom do the two visuals line up across the time periods included?
 - Perhaps more rigorous trend analysis confidence level tests can be applied

5. Do the same for:

- Across line impacts under ERM (e.g. economy, climate change, etc.)
- Severity impacts and other items in Benchmark Assessment Matrix
- Future emerging issues

Source: CARe Seminar (CS1)– JBuchanan – 6/2013

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary

SERVE | ADD VALUE | INNOVATE

Frequency Trend Assessment Matrix Impact Illustration #1 – Personal Auto Cycle Components

			Personal Auto - Total						
	ISSUE/TOPIC	2H1990s	1H2000s	2H2000s	2010-13	FUTURE			
	Seat Belt Laws	м				1			
	Seat Belt Usage		L	L		✓			
	Airbags Laws/Technology	L	М	М	L				
e	Automobile Design	L	L	L					
.≥	Roadway Design	L	L	L					
ក្ត	Electronic Stability Control		L	н	L				
ğ	Vehicle Type (Unequal Size)		L	L	L				
5	Bumper Height		*	1	1				
ā	Graduated Licensing (Teenagers)		М	L					
g	Performance (more HP)		L	L	L				
٠Ę	Distracted Driving (use of Cell Phones, etc.)		L	м	м				
Ĕ	Economy (good mean more driving, vice-versa)	✓	L	М	L				
÷Ξ	Miles Driven (Price of Gasoline)			L	L				
_	Climate (severe weather change?)			<i>s</i>	1	~			
	Tort Reform	✓	*	✓	✓				
	Building Code Regulation/Construction								

Impact Color Keys:
Positive (Lower Frequency)
Negative (Higher Frequency)
Expected No Impact
Blank = N/A
 Some impact expected (TBD)
Impact Levels:
H = High
M = Medium
L = Low



Source: CARe Seminar (CS1)– JBuchanan – 6/2013

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary

Frequency Trend Assessment Matrix - Illustrative Impact Illustration #1 - Personal and Commercial Auto Cycle Components

			Personal Auto - Total				Commercial Auto - TTT				
	ISSUE/TOPIC	2H 1990s	1H 2000s	2H 2000s	2010-15	FUTURE	2H 1990s	1H 2000s	2H 2000s	2010-15	FUTURE
	Seat Belt Laws	M				1	1	1	×	1	
	Seat Belt Usage		L	L		 					
	Airbags Laws/Technology	L	М	М	L		×	1	 Image: A set of the set of the	1	
	Automobile Design	L	L	L			✓	1	×	1	
	Auto Performance (more HP)		L	L	L						
	Roadway Design	L	L	L			 Image: A second s	1	1	 Image: A second s	
	Electronic Stability Control		L	Н	L		1	 ✓ 	 ✓ 	1	
	Vehicle Type (Unequal Size)		L	L	L						
Ð	Bumper Height		1	1	 Image: A second s						
÷	Graduated Licensing (Teenagers)		м	L							
S	Distracted Driving (use of Cell Phones, etc.)		L	м	м						
ă	Miles Driven (Price of Gasoline)			L	L		1	*	1	*	
S	Economy (good mean more driving, vice-versa)	1	L	м	L		1	*	1	*	
Historical P	Crash/testing Avoidance Systems (autobrake, forward collision warning, adaptive headlights, lane departure warning, AEB) Small overlap frontal Google driverless car Improved Risk Management Programs Mandatory Training Telematics / improved class plans / exposure bases						× ×	<i>*</i>		* * *	
	Tort Reform	✓	1	1	1						
	Propensity to sue										
	Social changes / Political Ideology										
	Deductible Increases										

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary

51

) 🛒

SERVE | ADD VALUE | INNOVATE

Frequency/Severity Trend Assessment Matrix – Illustrative Impact Illustration #1 -Commercial Auto Cycle Components (In Progress)

			Comm	nercial Aut	o - TTT		60.00	Commercial Auto - TTT
IS	SUE/TOPIC	2H 1990s	1H 2000s	2H 2000s	2010-15	FUTURE	50.00	Ground op Frequency - MW Fremium Base
Se	at Belt Laws	1	1	1	✓		40.00	<u> </u>
Se	at Belt Usage							
Air	rbags Laws/Technology	✓	✓	1	✓		30.00	
Au	utomobile / Truck Design	✓	✓	1	✓			
Au	to Performance (more HP)						20.00	
Ro	adway Design	1	1	1	1			
Ele	ectronic Stability Control	1	1	1	1		10.00	
Ve	chicle Type (Unequal Size)							
Bu	Imper Height							2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 201
Gr	aduated Licensing (Teenagers)							-Countrasida
P Dis	stracted Driving (use of Cell Phones, etc.)							
.З мі	iles Driven (Price of Gasoline)	1	1	1	1		10.00	Commercial Auto - TTT
	onomy (good means more driving, vice-versa)	1	1	1	1		9.00	Excess Frequency>10K - 3% Trend - MW Premium Base
ä	, (8,						8.00	\sim
S Cra	ash/testing Avoidance Systems (autobrake,						7.00	
e for	rward collision warning, adaptive headlights, lane						6.00	\sim
de	eparture warning, AEB)						5.00	
Sm Sm	nall overlap frontal						2.00	
Go	oogle driverless car						2.00	
을 ™	IC (Uber, Lyft, etc.)						1.00	
.S Ch	nanging demographics (younger as boomers retire)							
Bu	idget Constraints							2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 201
Re	egulatory changes (minimum age, mandatory rest)							Countrywide
Im	proved Risk Management Programs	1	1	1	✓			
Ma	andatory Training	<	1	1	✓		30.0%	Commercial Auto - TTT
Te	lematics / improved class plans / exposure bases				1		25.0%	900x100 Loss Ratio - 3% Trend - MW Premium Base
То	ort Reform						20.0%	\sim /
Pro	opensity to sue							
So	cial changes / Political Ideology						15.0%	
De	eductible Increases						10.0%	
Lin	mit Increases						5.0%	
	Impact Color Keys:						0.0%	
	Positive (Lower Frequency)			Impact Levels			1	2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2019
	Negative (Higher Frequency)	H = High					Countrywide	
	No Impact/Unknown			M = Medium				
	Blank = N/A			1=109			_	
-	- Come impact expected (TBD)		L	E - 2010		I	Sour	rce: ISO SOLM 2016 v1

2016 © Insurance Services Office Inc. All rights reserved. Confidential and Proprietary

Frequency Trend Assessment Matrix Impact Illustration #2 – MPL Cycle Components



SERVE | ADD VALUE | INNOVATE Emerging Issues - Illustration Assessing Impact by Line of Business Framework CAu CP-CAu-GL LOTM-HO-Total MPL OTN. (P-Fi Issues Emerging # perhaps cover at CARe Bermuda session Blank = N/A ne impact expected (TBD) Source: CARe Seminar (CS1)- JBuchanan - 6/2013

