2009 CAS Ratemaking and Product Management Seminar

Kelly McKeethan, FCAS, MAAA, CPCU

Outline

•	Background	2-5
•	Specific Case Study	6-7
•	To Cap or Not to Cap – That is the ?	8-9
•	Capping 101	10-12
•	It's Not That Easy!!!!	13-15
•	Results	16
•	Reflections	17

- CAS Ratemaking Principle #3 A rate provides for the costs associated with an individual risk transfer
- Rate should vary with individual risk characteristics
- Not just theoretical concept, but has practical implications adverse selection

- Adverse selection my definition the increased likelihood of writing risks at inadequate rates due to using a less refined plan than competitors
- Simple example
 - * I have one rate of \$150 for all insureds
 - * Competitor has two rates \$200 for drivers under age 25 and \$100 for others

- Results
 - * Competitor writes all non-youthfuls b/c of lower rate (\$100 vs. \$150)
 - * I write all youthfuls b/c of lower rate (\$150 vs. \$200)
- Bottom Line I have written risks at \$150 that competitor has priced at \$200

- Assuming competitor's more-refined rating plan is correct I am underpriced
- Reality
 - * Much more complex numerous rating variables in Private Passenger Auto with many categories
 - * Differences not as drastic
- Upshot # pricing points has increased dramatically in recent years segment or die!!!

Specific Case Study

- Small PPA (Private Passenger Auto) carrier with traditional 3-tier rating plan based on driving record and insurance history
- Developed 15-tier plan based on market study
 - * Several new rating variables -
 - Credit Prior BI Limits Not-at-Faults
 - Homeowner Discount
 Avg Household Factor
 - College Grad Discount
 Gender Differences All Ages

Specific Case Study

- Incorporating all the new rating variables resulted in significant rate dislocation for the existing book – in a "revenue neutral" filing, 15-20% of the book would receive a rate increase of 20% or more!!
- Side note 15-20% of book received a decrease of 20% or more not as much concern!!!

To Cap or Not to Cap – That is the Question

- Argument 1 aka Alvin Actuary's Analysis
 - Let it Rip Don't cap
 - Capped premiums mean inadequate rates for significant portion of book
 - Policies receiving large increase are seeing their premiums come in line with market – they may shop but not leave
 - Implementation Issues stay tuned!!!

To Cap or Not to Cap – That is the Question

- Argument 2 aka Peter Product's Prognosis
 - Don't Upset the Book Cap
 - Small company anything that hurts retention drives up the expense ratio too much, given relatively high fixed expenses
 - Not enough marketing presence to offset the policy drain if we implement the full effect of the new rating plan
 - Understand the impact of adverse selection on the loss ratio but feel the impact of poor retention would be worse overall on the bottom line

Capping 101

- Decision Cap!!
- How to Cap Base Rule Cap at 20% for 3 terms
- Simple Example policy has premium of \$500 under prior rating plan.
 Premium cannot exceed \$500 X 1.20 = \$600 under new rating plan.

Capping 101

- Becomes Complex Very Quickly
- Other common situations add/remove driver, incur driving activity
- Simplified capping does not apply when newly incurred driving record point

Capping 101

- Handle with <u>Capping Factor</u>
- Prior Simple Example
 - * Prior premium was \$500
 - * New premium would be \$800 w/o cap
 - * Generate actual new premium by way of capping factor = \$500 X 1.2 divided by \$800 = \$600/\$800 = 0.75

0.75 applies throughout entire term

It's Not That Easy!!!!

- The <u>capping factor</u> of 0.75 is the ratio of \$600/\$800 where \$800 is a theoretical premium
- System did not store the <u>theoretical</u> premium mid-term changes did not reflect the <u>capping factor</u>
- Capping factor had to be hard-coded

It's Not That Easy!!!!

- Other difficulties
 - When policy changed after renewal notice was sent but before end of current term – current premium changed, so maximum premium in renewal term changed – renewal had to be re-sent, sometimes late
 - Policies not subject to cap at first renewal under new rating plan should not have been subject to capping at any point in time but were incorrectly capped upon subsequent renewals

It's Not That Easy!!!!

- The previous discussion was just on base case
- Different states had different requirements
 - One increase per year
 - Cap decreases as well as increases
 - Tier assignment could not change
 - Cap set below 20%, which meant more than three terms were needed to get to final rate

Results

- For the better part of a year, checked <u>all</u> capped policies pulled entire actuarial department away from other activities – opportunity cost of not making rate filings
- Policyholders received renewal notices late and then were hit with numerous premium revisions – negative impact on retention –

Was it worse than going all the way???

Reflections

- Cost-Benefit Analysis would be interesting
- Hindsight always 20/20 in this case?????
 - Arguments for capping still make sense from practical business standpoint
 - Considerations
 - Start with one small state and make sure it's working
 - Alternative divide new rating components into two groups and make two filings – DOIs granted approval easier than we anticipated – overall less work and likely higher retention