Exploring the Fundamental Insurance Equation

PATRICK STAPLETON, FCAS

PRICING MANAGER ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY PSTAP@ALLSTATE.COM

CAS RPM March 2016

CAS 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.

Purpose of an Indication

An indication calculates the percent change in premium needed to cover **expected future** losses and expenses while making targeted underwriting profit for policies written and renewed during the following 12 month time period

The purpose of the indication is **not** to recoup losses paid out in the past

Fundamental Insurance Equation

- CAS Statement of Principle: "A rate provides for <u>all</u> <u>costs</u> associated with the transfer of risk."
- Premium= Losses + LAE + UW Expenses + UW Profit
- Key is to find appropriate balance
 - Ratemaking is prospective
 - Balance should be attained at the <u>aggregate</u> and individual levels

Two Methods to Determine Rate Level Adequacy Pure Premium Method Indicated Avg Rate = $\frac{\text{Pure Prem (including LAE)} + \text{Fixed UW Expense Per Exposure}}{1.0 - \text{Variable Expense \%} - \text{Target UW Profit \%}}$ Indicated Change = <u> Indicated Avg Rate</u> <u> Projected Avg Premium @ Current Rate Level</u> Loss Ratio Method Indicated Change = $\frac{\text{Loss&LAE Ratio} + \text{Fixed Expense Ratio}}{1.0 - \text{Variable Expense \%} - \text{Target UW Profit \%}}$

Pure Premium Vs. Loss Ratio

When to use Pure Premium Method

- Historical premium data is unreliable
- New company

When to use Loss Ratio Method

- Historical exposure data is unreliable
- Exposures are not well defined

Exposures

Must Be <u>P</u>roportional

Losses should be highly correlated with exposures

Must Be <u>P</u>ractical

• Easy, Objective, and Inexpensive

Must Consider Historical <u>P</u>recedence Regulators and Transition Costs

Data Aggregation for Losses

<u>Calendar Year</u>

- Transactional
- Fixed at year end

<u>Accident Year</u>

- Tied back to when accident occurs
- Will develop over time

Policy Year

- Tied back to when policy was written
- Will develop over time

<u>Report Year</u>

- Tied back to when accident was reported
- Will develop over time

<u>Single Example</u>

- Policy written 11/1/10
- Accident occurs 10/1/11
- Accident reported 1/15/12
- Payment of 10k on 2/1/12
- Payment of 5k on 5/1/13



Development of statewide indicated rate level change

| | "In order to cover our future losses and expenses and make our desired profit, we need to increase our current premium by 16.2%" | |
|---|--|----------|
| 1 | Indicated provision for loss and loss adjustment expense | \$117.48 |
| 2 | Indicated provision for fixed expense | \$15.46 |
| 3 | Variable expense and profit ratio | 28.7% |
| 4 | Indicated average premium [(1) + (2)] \div [1 - (3)] | \$186.45 |
| 5 | Projected average earned premium at current rates | \$160.51 |
| 6 | Indicated rate level change [$(4) \div (5)$] - 1 | 16.2% |

Step 1

Development of Indicated Provision for Loss and Loss-Adjustment Expense

Development of statewide indicated rate level change

"How much do we expect to pay for future losses?"

| 1 | Indicated provision for loss and loss adjustment expense | \$117.48 |
|---|--|----------|
| 2 | Indicated provision for fixed expense | \$15.46 |
| 3 | Variable expense and profit ratio | 28.7% |
| 4 | Indicated average premium [(1) + (2)] \div [1 - (3)] | \$186.45 |
| 5 | Projected average earned premium at current rates | \$160.51 |
| 6 | Indicated rate level change [(4) ÷ (5)] - 1 | 16.2% |

Adjustments to Losses

The first step in estimating the future losses is to start with the historical accident year losses

However, because we are pricing for a *future period*, there are adjustments that are needed in order to bridge the gap



Loss Development

Trend

Adjustments to Losses

Loss development

- Technique of using historical patterns to estimate the ultimate loss amount based on losses incurred or paid to date
- WHY?? Accident Year losses develop for two reasons
 - 1. New losses emerge after year end
 - 2. Incurred loss (paid + reserve) on known claims increase because either
 - a. Reserves are increased

or

b. Paid loss exceeds the case reserve

Loss Development Methods

Development

- Each method makes assumptions about the nature of loss development.
- Each method makes assumptions about future loss development based on past loss development.
- The appropriateness of those assumptions influences the accuracy of the method. Therefore, the best method depends on the situation at hand.

• Common Methods include:

- $\circ~$ Chain Ladder Method Next Slide
- Expected Loss Ratio (ELR) Method A Priori Loss Ratio
- Bornhuetter-Ferguson Blending of Actual and Expected
- Berquist-Sherman Adjusts for Reserving/Payment Patterns
- Regression Linear or Exponential (Curve Fitting)

Step 1

Development of Indicated Provision for Loss and Loss-Adjustment Expense Comprehensive Coverage

Paid Loss

Physical damage coverages tend to settle quickly with little development

| | | | | | | | (ultimate) |
|--------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|---------------------------|
| FAY | 15 Months | 27 Months | 39 Months | 51 Months | 63 Months | 75 Months | 87 Months |
| 12/31/2007 | 2,997,407 | 3,087,330 | 3,149,076 | 3,180,567 | 3,180,567 | 3,180,567 | 3,180,567 |
| 12/31/2008 | 4,727,364 | 4,869,185 | 4,966,568 | 5,016,234 | 5,016,234 | 5,016,234 | 5,016,234 |
| 12/31/2009 | 4,064,114 | 4,186,038 | 4,269,758 | 4,312,456 | 4,312,456 | 4,312,456 | 4,312,456 |
| 12/31/2010 | 4,421,474 | 4,554,119 | 4,645,201 | 4,691,653 | 4,691,653 | 4,691,653 | |
| 12/31/2011 | 5,954,188 | 6,132,814 | 6,255,470 | 6,318,025 | 6,318,025 | | |
| 12/31/2012 | 4,734,276 | 4,828,961 | 4,973,830 | 5,023,568 | Estimat | e of "ultimat | e" losses for |
| 12/31/2013 | 2,847,187 | 2,961,074 | 2,990,685 | | | e of animat | 1/201/ ie |
| 12/31/2014 | 2,445,244 | 2,518,601 | | | ¢2 612 | $\frac{1}{624 \times 4} \frac{1}{273}$ | 1/201415 1 02 v 1 01 v |
| 12/31/2015 | 3,612,634 - | | | | 33,012,034 X 1.03 X 1.02 X 1.01 X | | |
| | | | | | 1.00 X | 1.00 X 1.00 = | : |
| | 15-27 | 27-39 | 39-51 | 51-63 | 63-75 | 75-87(ultima | ite) |
| 2nd prior | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| 1st prior | 1.04 | 1.03 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Current vear | 1 00 | 1 01 | 1 01 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 00 | |
| , | 1.03 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| 3 year | 1.03 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |

Trend

Trend Trend Trend

• Why?

 To estimate **future** values in order to account for expected differences between the historical period and the period for which rates are being set

• How?

- Identify trend amount
- Identify trend period



Projection date is average earned date for all policies written during the policy period

We can choose to assume a 1-year pricing period, yielding a projection date 9 months past the effective date for a 6 month policy, and 12 months past the effective date for an annual policy

Trend Amount

Trend

State XX Wicked Good Insurance Company Private Passenger Auto: Property Damage Liability Pure Premium Trend - Regional Data

6 pt

1.6%



Trend Amount

Trend

State XX Wicked Good Insurance Company Private Passenger Auto: Property Damage Liability Pure Premium Trend - Regional Data



| Exponent | ial Trend | Select | ons* |
|----------|-----------|----------------|--|
| 20 pt | -1.2% | Current | -0.5% |
| 12 pt | -0.9% | Projected | 0.5% |
| 6 pt | 1.6% | * Calculated U | sing Frequency and Severity Trend Selections |

Loss Adjustment Expenses



- Costs incurred by a company during the claim settlement process.
- Two types
 - Allocated Loss Adjustment Expense (ALAE)
 - Costs that can easily be related to individual claims
 - Typically included with loss (loss development triangle)
 - Unallocated Loss Adjustment Expense (ULAE)
 - Costs that are more difficult to assign to particular claims
 - Must determine proper allocation method for ratemaking

Large Losses / Catastrophes



- Large individual losses and catastrophes can add unwanted volatility
- General approach to ratemaking:
 - 1) Remove either a portion, or all large loss and/or catastrophes
 - 2) Replace with a more stable alternative, typically:
 - A) Average over a longer time period (with judgment)
 - B) In case of some types of catastrophes, a model
- We do this to optimize the credibility and relevancy of the data

Step 1

Development of Indicated Provision for Loss and Loss-Adjustment Expense Comprehensive Coverage

| | | | | Catastrophe | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Calendar year | Total incurred losses | Catastrophe losses | Incurred losses ex- catastrophes | losses Percent | |
| 1991 | \$ 2,062,835 | \$ 283,155 | \$ 1,779,680 | 15.9% | |
| 1992 | 1,967,170 | 50,023 | 1,917,147 | 2.6% | |
| 1993 | 2,084,698 | 14,710 | 2,069,988 | 0.7% | |
| 1994 | 3,179,286 | 932,774 | 2,246,512 | 41.5% | |
| 1995 | 2,737,399 | 169,844 | 2,567,555 | 6.6% | |
| 1996 | 3,320,365 | 82,416 | 3,237,949 | 2.5% | |
| • | • | • | • | | |
| • | • | • | • | | |
| • | • | • | • | | |
| 2013 | 13,064,311 | 6,233,048 | 6,831,263 | 91.2% | |
| 2014 | 7,583,256 | 1,216,266 | 6,366,990 | 19.1% | |
| 2015 | 8,468,534 | 1,157,517 | 7,311,017 | 15.8% | |
| 25-year aggr | egate average | \$21,391,353 | \$120,831,928 | 17.7% | |

Step 1

Development of Indicated Provision for Loss and Loss-Adjustment Expense Comprehensive Coverage

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------|
| Fiscal year ending | Earned exposures | Accident Year non- catastrophe ultimate loss | Average catastrophe factor | Accident year ultimate loss (2) * (1+(3)) | Ultimate Loss and LAE | Factor to adjust for loss trend | Projected ultimate loss and LAE | Projected average loss and LAE (7) / (1) | Year weights |
| 12/31/2013 | 31,619 | \$ 3,020,592 | 0.177 | \$3,555,237 | \$4,099,188 | 1.040 | \$4,263,156 | \$ 134.83 | 14% |
| 12/31/2014 | 37,813 | 2,594,664 | 0.177 | 3,053,920 | 3,521,170 | 1.040 | 3,662,017 | 96.85 | 43 |
| 12/31/2015 | 40,847 | 3,833,388 | 0.177 | 4,511,898 | 5,202,218 | 1.040 | 5,410,307 | 132.45 | 43 |



Indicated Provision for Loss & LAE

\$117.48

Accident year weights depend on number of paid claims

Accident year data ties back all losses to the year in which the accident occurred regardless of the year losses were paid

Expense Types



4 Expense Types

- Commissions and Brokerage
- Taxes, Licenses, and Fees
- Other Acquisitions
- General Expense

General approach to ratemaking

- 1) Calculate ratios of expenses to premium using historical data
- 2) Determine what % of each expense type is fixed and variable
- 3) Apply total fixed and variable expenses appropriately

Profit Provision

• 2 sources of profit

- Investment Income (Capital + Policyholder Supplied Funds)
- Underwriting Profit
- Calculate Underwriting Profit that achieves a target Rate of Return on Equity
- For some long-tailed lines, investment income is large enough to accept an underwriting loss!

Development of statewide indicated rate level change

| | "How much premium do we need to cover future losses and expenses and still make our desired profit?" | |
|---|--|----------|
| 1 | Indicated provision for loss and loss adjustment expense | \$117.48 |
| 2 | Indicated provision for fixed expense | \$15.46 |
| 3 | Variable expense and profit ratio | 28.7% |
| 4 | Indicated average premium [(1) + (2)] + [1 - (3)] | \$186.45 |
| 5 | Projected average earned premium at current rates | \$160.51 |
| 6 | Indicated rate level change [(4) ÷ (5)] - 1 | 16.2% |

Detailed Calculations Recall formula for indicated average premium



1 — Variable expense/profit ratio

Total needed average premium

$$\frac{\$117.48 + \$15.46}{1 - 0.287} = \$186.45$$



• Without this adjustment, premium trends could be severely distorted.

Current Rate Level Methods



- Extension of Exposures
 - Re-rate all historical policies using current rating structure
 - The most accurate method
- Parallelogram Method
 - Assumes policies are written uniformly across time
 - Applies an average factor to historical periods

Choice of method will depend on data restraints and accuracy thresholds

A trade-off between accuracy and time



Step 5

Development of Projected Earned Premium at Present Rates

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Fiscal year ending | Earned exposures | Earned premium at current rates | Factor to adjust to projected premium level | Projected earned premium at current rates 2 x 3 | Projected earned premium at current rates 4 / 1 | Experience year weights |
| 12/31/2015 | 40,847 | 6,427,796 | 1.020 | 6,556,351 | 160.51 | 100% |

Projected average earned premium at current rates \$ 160.51

"At Current Rates" means that premium has been adjusted for historical rate changes by bringing past premiums to Current Rate Level

Development of statewide indicated rate level change

| | "In order to cover our future losses and expenses and make our desired profit, we need to increase our current premium by 16.2%" | |
|---|--|----------|
| 1 | Indicated provision for loss and loss adjustment expense | \$117.48 |
| 2 | Indicated provision for fixed expense | \$15.46 |
| 3 | Variable expense and profit ratio | 28.7% |
| 4 | Indicated average premium [(1) + (2)] \div [1 - (3)] | \$186.45 |
| 5 | Projected average earned premium at current rates | \$160.51 |
| 6 | Indicated rate level change [(4) ÷ (5)] - 1 | 16.2% |

Credibility

• Where can credibility be used?

- Overall indication
- An individual loss estimate
- Loss trends
- Large Loss / CAT provisions
- How?
 - Choose a method
 - Choose a complement of credibility

Credibility Methods

- <u>Classical Credibility</u> (a.k.a Limited Fluctuation) goal is to limit the effects that random fluctuations in the data can have on an estimate
- <u>**Buhlmann Credibility**</u> (a.k.a. Least Squares Credibility) – goal is to make estimation errors as small as possible (minimize the squared error)

Credibility weighted estimate is calculated as
 Z * (Observed Estimate) + (1-Z) * (Complement)

Complement of Credibility

Desired traits

- 1) Accurate
- 2) Unbiased
- **o** 3) Statistically independent from the base statistic
- 4) Available
- 5) Easy to compute
- 6) Logical relationship to base statistic

 Examples include other lines of business, countrywide data, industry data, or other competitor information to name a few.

Acting on Rate Indications

Considerations

- Regulatory
 - Some states impose certain methodologies and restrictions that need to be considered
 - Profit provisions are also capped in certain states
 - Use of modeled losses to account for hurricanes
- Operational
 - A small rate increase in a small book of business may not be efficient to pursue
- Marketing
 - Acting on rate indications has desired and undesired consequences that must be balanced



