2010 CAS Ratemaking and Product Management Seminar

Kelly McKeethan, FCAS, MAAA, CPCU

March 17, 2010

2010 CAS RPM Seminar



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.

Account Proposals: A Team Effort

Outline

 • Introduction
 3

 • Background
 4

 • Process Description
 5-7

 • Process Evolution
 8-12

 • Impact on Operation
 13-17

 • Observations
 18

Account Proposals: A Team Effort Introduction Setting – any corporate board room • Question – "Why aren't we making money?" No shortage of opinions -- CEO - "The actuaries don't know how to rate the business!" - Actuary - "The underwriters have opened the floodgates!" - Underwriter - "You should see the kind of business we write!" - Marketing - "The CEO told us to grow!" Does the circular blame game sound familiar? Doesn't have to be this way March 17, 2010 2010 CAS RPM Seminar Account Proposals: A Team Effort Background Small personal lines carrier that writes through affinity relationships Example – individual would buy personal auto insurance via payroll deduction - Other examples include associations and other groups Company has to sell at two levels Corporate Account Individual Topic appropriate for both commercial and personal lines – both levels are discussed in today's presentation 2010 CAS RPM Seminar Account Proposals: A Team Effort Process Description Marketing Department reaches out to prospective accounts - Direct to account Broker (usually large employers use for benefits administration) – often the broker initiates the process

farch 17, 2010 2010 CAS RPM Seminar

U/W receives submission and makes decision – consider phase of U/W Cycle

· If there is an interested prospect -

Reject
 Accept
 Accept worditions
 Waiting period
 Portion of the group
 Lower group discount

Process Description

- What would happen if rejection rate was high
- U/W "We're just doing our jobs"
- Marketing frustration
- Internal Marketing Reps got on-board with type of accounts to target
 - W/o mentioning specific industries, commonly held notions of "good" and "bad" accounts not always true - judgment based on experience
- Brokers had upper hand in relationship based on size
 - Still have to maintain U/W discipline have to say "no" some times
 - Balancing act

March 17, 2010 2010 CAS RPM Seminar

Account Proposals: A Team Effort

Process Description

- If U/W acceptance, complete Request for Proposal (RFP) submit information in the following areas -
 - Background Info on Company History and Results
 - Billing capabilities
 - On-site visits and campaign roll-outs
 - On-line service for sales, customer service, payment, and claims
 - % of Quotes Accepted
 - Performance Metrics Claims, Service, Sales
 - Experience Level of Management and Customer-Facing Associates
 RATES!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- · How to determine rate competitiveness?

March 17, 2010 2010 CAS RPM Seminar

Account Proposals: A Team Effort

Process Evolution

- Initially broker or account would send dec pages from key individuals our Telesales reps would input the information into system and generate $% \left(\mathbf{r}\right) =\left(\mathbf{r}\right)$
- Implemented a check Actuarial would verify that system input matched dec page detail
- - Dec Pages typically don't contain information on all rating variables
 - Sales associates are used to taking information verbally but not in writing
 - Make decision based on small sample size
- Needed a better solution

Process Evolution

- Each weakness addressed
 - Lack of information on dec page
 - Lack of information on dec page

 Typically no more than 75% of rating variables are known with information that appears on a dec page could be much lower

 Other 25% have to make assumptions

 Make assumptions to our benefit but be reasonable —

 Make assumptions to our benefit but be reasonable —

 Don't apply homeower discount if address listed as apartment

 Don't apply multi-policy discount of competitor known to offer such but discount not included in list of discounts on dec page

 Otherwise we lose credibility with the account

 ALWAYS STATE ASSUMPTIONSIBILITIES

 SALWAYS STATE ASSUMPTIONSIBILITIES

 SALVAYS STATE ASSUMPTIONSIBILITIES

 SALVAYS TON OR PROPRIEM

 Actuarial took responsibility of generation promision still had opermising reviewed by
 - - Actuarial took responsibility of generating premium still had premiums reviewed by another individual in Actuarial maintain credibility internally and externally
 - Example early in process we compared 6-mo premiums with competitor 12-mo

March 17, 2010 2010 CAS RPM Seminar 10

Account Proposals: A Team Effort

Process Evolution

- · Each weakness addressed (continued)
 - Decision based on small sample size

 - Developed multi-policy comparison that was representative of book
 Large brokers already had in place but had to be reviewed for reasonableness —
 Example one of five policies had an uncommon kuxy car -research showed hat
 a key competitor had an unusually low rating factor assigned to this make/model

 - Broker did agree it was unreasonable and changed to a more common vehicle
 Broader context of competitive analysis became familiar with products offered
 by key competitors in marketing niche goes back to competing at two levels –
 corporate and individual
 - Moved from playing defense to playing offense
 - Developed a multi-policy comparison that was more favorable to us, given our knowledge of our competitors once again, need to be reasonable to maintain credibility
 - Example don't apply college graduate discount to all when only 25% of pop. has degree At individual level developed marketing tool see next page

March 17, 2010 2010 CAS RPM Seminar

Account Proposals: A Team Effort

Process Evolution

- New Marketing Tool
 - Used a Rating Software Vendor to get current rates for market share leaders
 - Entered our standard policy set into vendor system to get competitors' rates
 Generated our rates from internal system

 - Induce encuent
 cheaper pricing from vendor w/o our rates
 avoided having to send updated rates to vendor and check vendor's accurate computation of
 - our rates

 maintained relative anonymity
 - · Produced spreadsheet that contained a 2-dimensional matrix with competitor and risks
 - Key in a zip code and push Enter –
 Within seconds the matrix was populated
 - Very powerful, aggressive marketing tool reps loved it and used it to write new accounts!!

Process Evolution

- Another area of aggressiveness inspired by the Account Proposal process -
 - Rate Filings
 - Depending on several factors, we would use rates lower than those filed in proposal quotes
 Phase of U/W Cycle

 - General Points —
 Imperative to state assumptions!
 Team Effort proposed to Chief Actuary, who took to CEO and Chief Underwriting Officer

March 17, 2010

2010 CAS RPM Seminar

13

Account Proposals: A Team Effort

Impact on Operation

- Clearly the Rate Filing process was impacted by the Account Proposal Process
- Not just a simple base rate decrease
 - Discounts
 - Actuarially sound match rate with risk
 Only apply to certain % of in-force business "more bang for buck"

 - Critical at the corporate account level

 Would compare list of discounts—existence of discount some times more important than
 the amount of the discount
 In some cases the number of discounts was more important than the bottom-line premium!
 - Team Effort to Offer Discount

March 17, 2010

2010 CAS RPM Seminar

14

Account Proposals: A Team Effort

Impact on Operation

- Discount Implementation
 - Marketing input on which discounts were **more** valuable
 - Sales input on how to position the discount for the customer
 U/W input on how to verify qualification for the discount

 - Systems input on how to program the discount
- Discounts implemented set stage for next phase new rating plan

March 17, 2010 2010 CAS RPM Seminar 15

Impact on Operation

- New Rating Plan
 - Background previous private passenger auto rating plan was traditional 3-tier (preferred, standard, and non-standard) structure using traditional tiering variables (insurance history, driving record, etc.)
 - New Plan 15-tier rating plan using wider array of tiering variables and discounts in addition to those filed in earlier phase
 - Similar approach to Discount implementation -
 - Studied Competitors (both in marketing niche and market share leaders) and picked the "best of the best" rating variables each person in Actuarial responsible for researching one company and presenting to a multi-department team
 Each department gave input as before

 - Impact
 More pricing points better match rate with risk
 - Wider range of rating factors enabled writing of broader range of risks at account and individual levels

March 17, 2010 2010 CAS RPM Seminar

Account Proposals: A Team Effort

Impact on Operation

- Continued Evolution from Rate Review process to State Review process

 - Continued Evolution from Kate Keview process to State Review

 Rate Review traditional approach driven by Actuarial

 rate level indications (limited credibility in most states due to small size)

 competitive position vs. one market share leader –

 territorial relativities

 increased finitis factors

 deductible relativity factors

 class plan factors

 class plan factors
 - State Review = Rate Review + Additional Items from multiple areas:

March 17, 2010 2010 CAS RPM Seminar

Account Proposals: A Team Effort

17

Impact on Operation

- Additional Items from multiple areas:
 - Actuarial analyzed corporate account experience

 - loss ratio
 distribution of business by key variable (territory, increased limit, etc.)
 - competitiveness
 closure rate

 - penetration
 - Marketing discussion of prospects and their locations
 - Sales closure rates
 - Compliance regulatory environment
 - U/W any restrictions on non-renewals and cancellations
 - Led to broad, free-flowing discussions on overall strategy rather than narrow focus on rate levels and relativities

- Observations

 Still healthy conflict between Marketing and Underwriting otherwise someone's not doing their job right –

 If no rejections either Marketing isn't aggressive enough or Underwriting isn't tough enough
- Team Effort Actuarial led, but all other areas were heavily involved

 - New whole was greater than the sum of the parts
 New ground was plowed no old ground was dug up lack of "turf wars"
- Made ourselves relevant remember this quote
 - "Actuaries are pursuing greater precision in areas of decreasing relevance" CAS Report of the CEO Advisory Task Force 11/1/1999