

# CAS Ratemaking and Product Management Seminar Pricing Options for Risk Exposure Accumulation

Presented by: Marcus Yamashiro, FCAS MAAA  
March 11, 2015



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Risk Exposure Accumulation - Definition

• Risk of large aggregate losses from a single event or peril due to the concentration of insured risk exposed to that single event or peril

• Hurricane



• Earthquake/  
Fire following



• Asbestos



• Wildfire



• Tornado



• Pollution



---

---

---

---


---

---


---

---

Tornado risk is not limited to a coast or a fault line.  
It is concentrated in a multi-state region.



For perspective, Oklahoma is 69,960 square miles



Source: <http://www.spc.noaa.gov/fact/tornado/5Storm.html>  
Last storm listed is the May 20, 2013 Moore, OK tornado of 2013

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Tornadoes: How bad can they get?



- EF5 tornadoes have wind gusts of over 200 MPH -
  - May 31 2013, El Reno, Oklahoma tornado had speeds near 295 MPH
- Tornadoes can have tracks over 100 miles long
  - The El Reno Oklahoma tornado storm track was 16.2 miles long and 2.6 miles wide at its widest point: (Manhattan is 2.3 miles wide at its widest point)
- An EF5 tornado once lifted and threw a 160,000 pound tanker several hundred feet.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Tornadoes: How bad can they get?



	DATE	LOCATION(S)	ACTUAL \$	INFLATION ADJUSTED* \$
1	22 May 2011	Joplin, MO	2,800,000,000	2,907,000,000
2	27 April 2011	Tuscaloosa, AL	2,450,000,000	2,543,690,000
3	8 Jun 1966	Topeka, KS	250,000,000	1,797,810,000
4	11 May 1970	Lubbock, TX	250,000,000	1,502,960,000
5	3 May 1999	Oklahoma City, OK	1,000,000,000	1,401,730,000
6	27 Apr 2011	Hackleburg, AL	1,290,000,000	1,339,330,000
7	3 Apr 1974	Xenia, OH	250,000,000	1,183,600,000
8	6 May 1975	Omaha, NE	250,603,000	1,084,430,000
9	10 Apr 1979	Wichita Falls, TX	277,841,000	893,853,000
10	3 Jun 1980	Grand Island, NE	285,050,000	807,953,000

[http://www.spc.noaa.gov/faq/tornado/damage\\$.htm](http://www.spc.noaa.gov/faq/tornado/damage$.htm)  
 \*2013 dollars, using the U.S. Federal Reserve Bank's Consumer Price Index calculations [available online](#).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### Risk Exposure Accumulation: Management Options

- Exclude the Risk through Marketing and Underwriting Rules
- Measure the risk of adding one more policyholder to a territory
  - Marginal VaR
  - Marginal CTE
- Transfer the Risk through Reinsurance and Alternative Risk Transfer
- Price the average cost of capital to a reinsurer of the current book
  - Capital Consumption model
- Price for the retained risk through Risk loads
- Price the average cost of capital to an investor of the current book
  - Risk loads based on CAT bond pricing
- Reduce the risk through Property level mitigation credits and inspections




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

What is the Risk Load?



- Starting with an Ordinary Premium Equation where is the risk load?

$$P(terr) = \frac{LLAE(terr)+F}{1-V-p} + risk\ load?$$

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

What is the Risk Load?



- According to ASOP 30: Treatment of Profit and Contingency Provisions and the Cost of Capital in Property Casualty Insurance Ratemaking

2.3 **Cost of Capital**– The rate of return that capital could be expected to earn in **alternative investments of equivalent risk**; also known as opportunity cost (italics, bold and color added)

3.1 **Estimating the Cost of Capital and Underwriting Profit Provision**– Property/casualty insurance rates should provide for all expected costs, including an appropriate **cost of capital** associated with the specific **risk transfer**. **This cost of capital can be provided for by estimating that cost and translating it into an underwriting profit provision**, after taking leverage and investment income into account. Alternatively, the actuary may develop an underwriting profit provision and test that profit provision for consistency with the cost of capital. The actuary may use any appropriate method, as long as such method is consistent with the considerations of this standard. ... (truncated, italics, bold and color added)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

What is the Risk Load?



- By-Peril Premium Equation Separates Premium into Perils.

$$P(terr) = P_{Non-CAT}(terr) + P_{CAT}(terr)$$

- Where Each Peril has its own Profit Load.

$$P(terr) = \frac{E(LLAE_{Non-CAT}(terr)) + F}{1 - V - p_{Non-CAT}} + \frac{E(LLAE_{CAT}(terr)) + F}{1 - V - p_{CAT}(terr)}$$

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### What is the Risk Load?



- Risk Load is embedded in the CAT Premium.

$$P_{CAT}(terr) = \frac{E(LLAE_{CAT}(terr)) + F}{1 - V - P_{CAT}(terr)}$$

$$P_{CAT}(terr) = \frac{E(LLAE_{CAT}(terr)) + F}{1 - V} + risk\ load(terr)$$

- Risk Load is a function of CAT Profit Load, variable expenses and CAT Premium.

$$risk\ load(terr) = \frac{P_{CAT}(terr)P_{CAT}(terr)}{(1 - V)}$$

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### What is the Risk Load?



Simplified Process for territories (rather than lines of business) based on Appendix B of Don Mango's Capital Consumption paper:

- Generate Modeled Scenarios of Losses for all territories.
- For each scenario, calculate capital depletion costs
  - Apply a risk-averse utility function to aggregate depleted capital.
- For each scenario, allocate capital depletion costs back to territory
  - Allocate proportionally to all territories having an underwriting loss.
- Risk load by territory is expected value of depletion costs.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### A Good Risk Averse Utility Function?

- Expected Excess Return (Risk Load) = (Yield – Risk Free rate) – Expected Default Loss  
= Yield Spread - Expected Default Loss
- \$100 capital investment with \$10 return, and 2% chance of \$50 losses has
  - Yield spread of 10% - 5% = 5%
  - Expected Loss of (2% x \$50)/\$100 = 1%
  - Expected excess return (risk load) of 5% - 1% = 4%
  - Profit multiple of 4% / 1% = 4
- \$100 capital investment with \$30 return, and 20% chance of \$50 losses has
  - Yield spread of 30% - 5% = 25%
  - Expected Loss of (20% x \$50)/\$100 = 10%
  - Expected excess return (risk load) of 25% - 10% = 15%
  - Profit multiple of \$15 / \$10 = 1.5

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### A Good Risk Averse Utility Function?

- The **profit multiple** is an expression of a **risk averse utility function**.
- The Capital Consumption Method estimates excess return based on the Utility of a capital call. With simple assumptions, the **Capital Call Charges** could also be converted to **Profit Multiples** as described by Chernick and Anderson:

Capital Call Range	Capital Call Charge	Profit Multiple
0 - 5000	1.25	1.25
5001 - 10000	1.5	2.1
10001 - 20000	2	3.25
20001 -	4	7.06

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

### A Good Risk Averse Utility Function?



- Chernick and Anderson described excess return based on Cat Bonds.
- They calculate profit multiples from those excess returns and fit a curve to them by probability of loss.
- It is well-known that the bond market expresses risk aversion.

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

### A Good Risk Averse Utility Function?



- Chernick and Anderson described excess return based on Cat Bonds.
- They calculate profit multiples from those excess returns and fit a curve to them by probability of loss.
- But does regression alone result in the desired degree of risk aversion?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



Three related risk load pricing methods

Capital Consumption method:

total capital call: Risk averse utility function based on its total capital magnitude

CAT Bond Risk Load method

Tranched capital: Risk load based on CAT bond prices by default probability

Corporate Bond, Constant Pseudo-Sharpe Ratio method

Tranched capital: Charges based on Corporate Bonds and constant Sharpe Ratio

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Example: Triangular Tornado State



•Set-up of example:

- Properties in a set of 10 territories
- Simulation of the impact on those properties of random weather events
- Uniform tornado risk in all territories
- Capital adequate to cover all risks in the simulation

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Example: Triangular Tornado State



• Scenario

- Triangular Tornado State with equal sized (latitude/longitude) territories 1-10
- # of Insured Homes & Average Insured Values are listed below.

Triangular State - Territory Numbers				Triangular State - Insured Home Counts				Triangular State - Average Insured Values			
1	2	4	7	41,577	3,016	2,413	2,099	218,191	213,680	722,031	126,706
	3	5	8		17,839	2,548	5,063		107,361	98,780	219,714
		6	9			5,099	919			225,545	102,921
			10				1,243				293,849

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Example: Triangular Tornado State



- For our example, Cholesky decomposition of the matrix below of correlations (then rescaling) was used to convert 10 independent uniform random variables between 0 and 1 to 10 correlated uniform random variables from 0 to 1. These variables represent percentiles of random lognormal "percentage loss" variables with  $\mu = -4$  and  $\sigma = 0.5$ .

Triangular State - Matrix of Territorial Correlations of Uniformly Distributed Random Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1.00	0.42	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-
2	0.42	1.00	0.42	0.42	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
3	0.09	0.42	1.00	0.09	0.42	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00
4	0.01	0.42	0.09	1.00	0.42	0.01	0.42	0.09	0.01	0.00
5	0.01	0.09	0.42	0.42	1.00	0.42	0.09	0.42	0.09	0.01
6	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.42	1.00	0.01	0.09	0.42	0.09
7	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.42	0.09	0.01	1.00	0.42	0.01	0.00
8	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.09	0.42	0.09	0.42	1.00	0.42	0.01
9	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.09	0.42	0.01	0.42	1.00	0.42
10	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.00	0.01	0.42	1.00

\*Correlations selected based on distance from distance between centroids, with non-diagonal scaled to be positive definite

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Example: Triangular Tornado State



- For each iteration / for each of territories 1 to 10, the CAT losses are calculated as  $CAT\ Losses = (insured\ home\ count) \times (Average\ Insured\ Value) \times (Percentage\ Losses)$
- Average CAT losses by territory across all scenarios are listed below. The total across all territories is \$333,110

Triangular State - Territory Numbers

1	2	3	4	5	6	7					
	3	5	6								
		4	5	6							
			4	5	6						
				4	5	6					
					4	5	6				
						4	5	6			
							4	5	6		
								4	5	6	
									4	5	6

Triangular State - Average Losses in 100's

187,009	12,543	33,612	5,016
	37,267	4,905	20,839
		22,810	1,800
			7,540

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Example: Triangular Tornado State



BAA Bond Default Rate	0.27%
BAA Risk Load / Capital	2.31%
Tranche A Default Rate	0.27%
Tranche A Capital	213,603
Tranche A Risk Load	4,924
Tranche A Std Dev	5,229
Pseudo-Sharp Ratio	94%

- To determine the Sharpe Ratio, we first aligned the 90-year Moody's BAA rated corporate bond default rate with the Tranche A default rate.
- We then applied the BAA rated bond's Risk Load as a % of Capital i.e. Expected Excess Return / Capital to our Tranche A Capital to determine the Tranche A risk load.
- We then calculated the standard deviation of simulated losses (excess of the mean) within the Tranche A band.
- The final Sharpe Ratio is the excess return divided the risk (i.e.  $Tranche\ A\ Risk\ Load / Tranche\ A\ Standard\ Deviation$ ).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



### Example: Triangular Tornado State



Calculation/Source	Tranches								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
(1) Loss Prob Low Selected	0.00%	0.27%	1.00%	1.50%	2.50%	5.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%
(2) Loss Prob High Selected	0.27%	1.00%	1.50%	2.50%	5.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.93%
(3) Avg Default Prob (1)+(2)/2	0.14%	0.90%	1.25%	2.00%	3.75%	7.50%	15.00%	25.00%	35.51%
(4) EL (est)	209	626	382	729	2,150	4,735	9,556	9,818	10,999
(5) (Revolvs) between (6) and (7)	5,229	7,778	3,307	4,936	10,497	15,878	21,878	16,260	14,213
(6) Lower Limit From simulation	386,397	663,663	632,312	596,139	535,230	469,995	423,646	364,208	333,110
(7) Upper Limit* From simulation	1,000,000	786,397	663,663	632,312	596,139	535,230	469,995	403,646	364,208
(8) Capital (7)-(6)	213,603	122,934	31,151	37,173	59,909	65,235	66,349	39,438	31,097
(9) Risk Load (Share Ratio x (5))	4,904	7,334	3,114	4,648	9,865	14,911	20,412	15,311	13,402
(10) Risk Load/Capital (9)/(8)	2.31%	5.96%	10.00%	12.50%	16.50%	22.92%	30.76%	38.82%	43.10%
(11) Profit Multiple (10)/(9)	23.6	11.7	8.1	6.4	4.6	3.2	2.1	1.6	1.2
(12) Recovery Rate (1-(11)/(12))	63.80%	49.10%	38.22%	27.93%	27.41%	27.99%	17.02%	13.90%	

- The Sharpe Ratio calculated on the previous page is used to calculate the Risk Load (9).
- Lower Limit (6) corresponds to a 1-(2) Value at risk.
- The Lower Limit (6) at Tranche I of 333,110 equal to the all scenario mean of 333,110.

### Risk Accumulation Loads as a Percentage of Losses Profit Multiple Based on Corporate Bonds & Constant Sharpe Ratio



- Directly allocated Risk Loads**
  - The Risk Load for a given Territory/Scenario is calculated as the sum/product of the losses and the profit multiple by tranche.
  - The Risk Load for a given Territory is the average of the Loads for all Scenarios of that Territory.
- Risk Accumulation Load for a Territory** is estimated as Risk Load for that Territory minus the smallest Risk Load of all Territories.
- Is the Magnitude of the Risk Accumulation load appropriate? Will it impact retention and close ratios?
- Marginal Surplus Method Risk Loads**
  - The Load for a given Territory is the usual Marginal Surplus Method. Risk load for Territory N is allocated based on the standard deviation of aggregate losses for all territories, minus the standard deviation of aggregate losses less the losses for Territory N.
- Marginal Variance Method Risk Loads**
  - The Load for a given Territory is the usual Marginal Variance Method. Risk load for Territory N is allocated based on the Variance of aggregate losses for all territories, minus the Variance of aggregate losses less the losses for Territory N.

### Risk Accumulation Loads as a Percentage of Losses Profit Multiple Based Regression on CAT Bond Data



- Directly allocated Risk Loads**
  - The Risk Load for a given Territory/Scenario is calculated as the sum/product of the losses and the profit multiple by tranche.
  - The Risk Load for a given Territory is the average of the Loads for all Scenarios of that Territory.
- Risk Accumulation Load for a Territory** is estimated as Risk Load for that Territory minus the smallest Risk Load of all Territories.
- Is the Magnitude of the Risk Accumulation load appropriate? Will it impact retention and close ratios?
- Marginal Surplus Method Risk Loads**
  - The Load for a given Territory is the usual Marginal Surplus Method. Risk load for Territory N is allocated based on the standard deviation of aggregate losses for all territories, minus the standard deviation of aggregate losses less the losses for Territory N.
- Marginal Variance Method Risk Loads**
  - The Load for a given Territory is the usual Marginal Variance Method. Risk load for Territory N is allocated based on the Variance of aggregate losses for all territories, minus the Variance of aggregate losses less the losses for Territory N.

Closing Steps

- Calculate territorial CAT premium:  $P_{CAT}(terr) = \frac{E(LLAE_{CAT}(Terr))+F}{1-V} + risk\ load$
- Calculate territorial Profit load:  $p_{CAT}(Terr) = \frac{risk\ load(1-V)}{P_{CAT}(terr)}$
- Now we can calculate variable, territorial risk loads for each policyholder's individual premium amount.

$$P(Terr) = \frac{E(LLAE_{Non-CAT}(Terr)) + F}{1 - V - p_{Non-CAT}} + \frac{E(LLAE_{CAT}(Terr)) + F}{1 - V - p_{CAT}(Terr)}$$

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Questions?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Key References:

Bodie, Zvi; Kane, Alex; Marcus, Alen; [Investments, Eighth Edition](#); Published by McGraw-Hill; 2009.  
 Chemick, David R.; Anderson, Paul D.; "Using Cat Bonds to Develop Risk Loads"; CAS Ratemaking & Product Management Seminar – Severe Weather Workshop, 2013.  
 Efinance.org; <http://efinance.org.ca/ca/EEben/Corporate%20default%20and%20Recovery%20Rates,1920-2010.pdf>; *This was a source for Moody's Bond Default rates.*  
 Government Publishing Office; [www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/ERP-2011/xls/ERP-2011-table73.xls](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/ERP-2011/xls/ERP-2011-table73.xls) *This was a source for Moody's Bond yields and interest rates.*  
 Jorion, Philippe; [Value at Risk: The New Benchmark for Managing Financial Risk, Third Edition](#); published by McGraw-Hill; 2007.  
 Lam, James; [Enterprise Risk Management: from Incentives to Control](#); published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2003.  
 Mango, Don; "Capital Consumption: An Alternative Methodology for Pricing Reinsurance"; ASTIN Colloquium; 2003.  
 SIFMA; <http://www.sifma.org/research/statistics.aspx> *This was a source for average maturities of Corporate Bonds.*

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---