

Reinsurance Reserving & Portfolio Management

9th Capacity Building Seminar on General Insurance Amitabha Ray & Prerana Sadarangani

Agenda

Reinsurance Reserving

- Overview
- Basis of Reserving
- Types of Reinsurance Contracts
- Reinsurance Reserving Process
- Methodology
- Differences between primary & reinsurance

Portfolio Management

- Role of reserving actuaries
- Diagnostics



Reserving - An overview

Need for reserving

- Under-reserving
 - Future Claims
 - Speeds up payments of dividends & tax
- Over-reserving
 - lead to loss of confidence in the company
 - worsen solvency more capital!
 - can filter through to premium rating exercise etc
- Volatility in results can reduce shareholder confidence
- Senior management depend on the quarterly results to make business decisions

Responsibilities of reserving actuaries

- Ensure optimal reserving
- Local Statutory Reporting
- Governance/Risk Management Committees



Basis of Reserving

- Companies operates under several valuation frameworks to meet different stakeholder requirements
- For example, Reserves for Swiss Re's business are calculated under the following frameworks
 - **EVM:** Swiss Re uses its internal EVM methodology to provide an economic view of the business.
 - US GAAP: Swiss Re has adopted US GAAP for the preparation of its Group accounts.
 - Statutory: Rules are set locally at legal entity / branch level

Frameworks	Purpose	Uses	Methodology
EVM	Economic view (Best estimates)	 Planning, pricing & steering Performance measurement Asset liability management Analyst information 	 Best-estimate "Principles" based Swiss Re EVM methodology
US GAAP	Profit recognition US GAAP used for Group Reporting	 Comparable presentation of results with competitors for investors Profit recognition over time 	Primarily "Rules" based for P&C with assumptions locked in at inception
Local Statutory	Regulatory compliance Dividend paying ability	Statutory reservesRegulator solvency	 Set by local regulators "Principles" based in most other jurisdictions for Swiss Re with emphasis on prudence



Types of Reinsurance Contracts

- **Facultative**: One contract (e.g., bridge, tunnel etc)
- **Treaty**: Covers multiple policies which fit treaty specifications
- Types of cover
 - Proportional
 - Quota Share
 - Surplus
 - Non-Proportional
 - XOL (per risk, aggregate)
 - Stop Loss



Reinsurance Reserving Process- An Overview

Incurred but not Reported (IBNR)

- Reserves at inception of business is based on the **expected loss ratio**. If business performs exactly as priced there will be no run-off profit (or loss).
- Initial loss estimates are gradually replaced by **actual loss experience**; with ultimate loss estimates updated quarterly using actuarial techniques such as Chain Ladder or Bornhuetter-Fergusson (BF).
- Actual losses are likely to differ from initial estimates, so producing **reserve development** (favourable or adverse). This can have **multiple causes** including bias in the initial loss ratios, changing assumptions e.g. inflation, normal claims variability and premium development

Case Reserves

- Generally case reserves "follow cedent", however there are cases where claims team deem that a different value would be appropriate
 - In such cases ACRs (Additional Case Reserves) are established



Reserving

Portfolio Segmentation

- Sufficient data is required to use actuarial techniques
- Reserving actuaries use a "top-down" approach by analysing aggregate losses
- A homogeneous statistical portfolio can be used to derive a credible loss development pattern
- Attributes used on the reinsurance side for segmenting the portfolios
 - Line of business
 - Type of business
 - Duration of risk
 - Market
 - Cession Basis
- Examples
 - Engineering Single Risk Fac (Duration-wise)
 - Property NatCat Non Proportional
 - Property Proportional
 - Marine Cargo Proportional



Portfolio Segmentation

- Casualty vs Property: Casualty has a longer development tail
- Treaty vs Facultative: Show different development patterns
- Excess of loss vs Proportional
 - Different patterns
 - Attritional vs Large Loss
 - XOL: ACRs may be added, reinsurer's claims department, further split by working, high & cat
 - Proportional: Cedent's case reserves



1

Institute of Actuaries of India

Reserving Triangle: IBNR Calculation

Contract Yr			27	39		63		87	99	111	123	135	147	159	171	183	195	207
1995	96.7	479.9	760.7	766.7	767.8	767.8	767.8	767.8	770.4	770.4	770.4	770.4	770.4	770.4	770.4	770.4	770.4	770.4
1996	196.3	880.6	1,171.2	1,187.6	1,201.1	1,201.1	1,201.1	1,201.1	1,201.1	1,201.1	1,200.1	1,200.1	1,200.1	1,200.1	1,200.1	1,200.1	1,200.1	1,200.1
1997	201.3	936.9	1,381.0	1,527.0	1,527.7	1,527.6	1,527.6	1,527.6	1,527.6	1,524.2	1,524.2	1,524.2	1,524.2	1,524.2	1,524.2	1,524.2	1,524.2	1,524.2
1998	255.8	1,122.2	1,418.2	1,415.8	1,426.9	1,439.6	1,446.9	1,446.9	1,446.9	1,446.9	1,448.6	1,448.6	1,448.6	1,448.6	1,448.6	1,448.6	1,448.6	
1999	180.0	1,035.4	2,107.6	2,186.7	2,187.7	2,187.7	2,187.7	2,186.6	2,186.6	2,186.5	2,186.5	2,186.5	2,185.4	2,185.4	2,185.4	2,185.4		
2000	954.8	5,006.0	7,173.8	7,903.7	7,698.5	7,604.2	7,589.5	6,792.0	6,786.9	6,785.0	6,785.0	6,785.0	6,791.6	6,791.6	6,791.6			
2001	323.0	8,129.8	11,849.4	12,015.9	11,956.3	11,935.1	11,939.1	11,892.0	11,884.3	11,884.3	11,884.3	11,891.6	11,891.6	11,891.6				
2002	73.2	16,904.2	22,071.8	22,507.5	22,598.1	22,630.6	22,589.9	22,589.9	22,579.7	22,579.7	22,486.8	22,486.8	22,486.8					
2003	147.7	18,751.9	23,855.0	24,326.7	24,622.2	24,750.3	24,718.4	24,718.1	24,718.1	24,838.8	24,838.8	24,838.8						
2004	233.9	17,073.8	21,362.2	21,729.0	21,756.3	21,861.5	21,799.8	21,884.3	21,644.2	21,644.2	21,657.2							
2005	1,550.8	14,922.5	24,037.9	25,789.0	26,573.7	26,614.8	26,789.1	26,623.2	26,623.2	26,623.3								
2006	523.7	9,185.3	15,951.5	15,781.9	16,004.7	16,569.7	16,611.3	16,531.5	16,566.5									
2007	0.0	3,102.3	4,878.1	4,966.7	5,031.2	5,078.7	5,078.7	5,078.2										
2008	142.9	2,148.7	3,997.3	4,478.3	4,492.7	4,512.5	4,514.9											
2009	0.0	1 383 7	1 600 8	1,714.7	1,717.0	1,716.7					12							
2010	0.0	773.7	1,255.4	1,201.1	1,507.5						2							
2011	163.5	2,509.6	5,635.5	6,052.4														
2012	295.5	5,751.4	9,315.1															
2013	13.3	5,506.6																
2014	0.0																	
											·							

	Age-to-Age Far.or																
Contract Yr	3 - 15	15 - 27	27 - 39	39 - 51	51 - 63	63 - 75	75 - 87	87 - 99	99 - 111	111 - 123	123 - 135	135 - 147	147 - 159	159 - 171	171 - 183	183 - 195	195 - 207
1995	4.961	1.585	1.008	1.001	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.003	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
1996	4.487	1.330	1.014	1.011	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
1997	4.655	1.474	1.106	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
1998	4.387	1.264	0.998	1.008	1.009	1.005	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	
1999	5.754	2.035	1.038	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000		
2000	5.243	1.433	1.102	0.974	0.988	869.0	0.895	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.000	1.000			
2001	25.168	1.458	1.014	0.995	0.998	1.000	0.996	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.000	1.000				
2002	230.864	1.306	1.020	1.004	1.001	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.996	1.000	1.000					
2003	127.000	1.272	1.020	1.012	1.005	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.005	1.000	1.000						
2004	72.991	1.251	1.017	1.001	1.005	0.997	1.004	0.989	1.000	1.001							
2005	9.622	1.611	1.073	1.020	1.002	1.007	0.994	1.000	1.000								
2006	17.541	1.737	0.989	1.014	1.035	1.003	0.995	1.002									
2007		1.572	1.018	1.013	1.009	1.000	1.000										
2008	15.038	1.860	1 1 20	1.003	1.004	1.001											
2009	_	1 000	1.009	1.001	1.000												
2010		1.622	1.020	1.021													
2011	15.346	2.210	1.074														
2012	19.460	1.620															
2013	415.519																
2014																	

1

Reserving Triangle: IBNR Calculation



							Age	e-to-Age l	Factor								
Contract Yr	3 - 15	15 - 27	27 - 39	39 - 51	51 - 63	63 - 75	75 - 87	87 - 99	99 - 111	111 - 123	123 - 135	135 - 147	147 - 159	159 - 171	171 - 183	183 - 195	195 - 207
1995	4.961	1.585	1.008	1.001	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.003	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
1996	4.487	1.330	1.014	1.011	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
1997	4.655	1.474	1.106	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
1998	4.387	1.264	0.998	1.008	1.009	1.005	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	
1999	5.754	2.035	1.038	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000		
2000	5.243	1.433	1.102	0.974	0.988	0.998	0.895	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.000	1.000			
2001	25.168	1.458	1.014	0.995	0.998	1.000	0.996	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.000	1.000				
2002	230.864	1.306	1.020	1.004	1.001	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.996	1.000	1.000					
2003	127.000	1.272	1.020	1.012	1.005	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.005	1.000	1.000						
2004	72.991	1.251	1.017	1.001	1.005	0.997	1.004	0.989	1.000	1.001							
2005	9.622	1.611	1.073	1.030	1.002	1.007	0.994	1.000	1.000								
2006	17.541	1.737	0.989	1.014	1.035	1.003	0.995	1.002									
2007		1.572	1.018	1.013	1.009	1.000	1.000										
2008	15.038	1.860	1.120	1.003	1.004	1.001											
2009		1.228	1.009	1.001	1.000												
2010		1.622	1.020	1.021													
2011	15.346	2.246	1.074														
2012	19.460	1.620															
2013	415.519																
2014																	



Development Factor Selection																	
Selection for Volume V	Veighted Lat	est n Averag	ge	3 Selection for Sector Average Shift 0													
_	3 - 15	15 - 27	27 - 39	39 - 51	51 - 63	63 - 75	75 - 87	87 - 99	99 - 111	111 - 123	123 - 135	135 - 147	147 - 159	159 - 171	171 - 183	183 - 195	195 - 207
W Avg 10 ex h/l	26.971	1.459	1.034	1.008	1.003	1.000	0.997	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Vols W all	19.601	1.452	1.033	1.009	1.007	1.003	0.995	0.999	1.001	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Vols W Latest 10	21.329	1.481	1.031	1.011	1.006	1.001	0.993	0.998	1.001	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Vols W Latest 3	29.148	1.794	1.053	1.006	1.006	1.002	0.995	0.997	1.002	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Sect W Avg 3/0 ex h/l	19.460	1.622	1.020	1.003	1.004	1.001	0.995	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Last Rev Sel DF	5.912	1.586	1.039	1.008	1.004	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Surrogate DF																	
User Selection		1.650		1.010	1.005	1.001											
Final Selection	5.912	1.650	1.039	1.010	1.005	1.001	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Theoretical development of a single underwriting year





Areas of judgment which influence reserving decisions



Actuaries have at their disposal several well established and commonly used Reserving techniques based on past historical claims information in order to estimate the level of reserves needed. Within these methods, actuaries have the possibility to apply specific judgment on the selection of various parameters, these include the following:

Individual claims assessment

 Judgment performed by claims managers, taking into account cedent information and the actual circumstances of the individual claims

• Adequacy of costing estimation

 Judgment is needed if and how long to follow the initial costing estimation and when to switch to a calculation as performed by reserving actuaries

· Reserving method and development pattern

 Judgment is needed on which reserving method is most suitable for the respective portfolios (e.g. Chain -Ladder or Benktander), and how to derive the most appropriate pattern (e.g. how many years of history to take into account, simple average vs weighted average)

• Paid vs. incurred development

- Applying the same method to paid development data and to incurred development data sometimes leads to contradicting answers. A judgment has to be made as to which data is more reliable
- Tail factors for long tail lines (e.g. motor liability or workers compensation)
 - Actuaries need to decide how much development is to be expected beyond the last point of reliably available data

• Allowance for trends (including inflation)

- Changes in the environment (e.g. legal, economic or social) can lead to trends in the claims development. Judgment has to be made when to explicitly allow for such a trend
- Special risks, e.g. asbestos, pollution
 - Some risks need individual models as standard actuarial methods do not work. Judgment is needed for the most suitable model

Illustration of methods





Example (contd. from previous <u>slide</u>)

The **B-F IBNR reserve estimate** is the original expected claims (80), multiplied by the remaining expected development (0.75, as pricing expected 25% of the total claims to have been reported so far). Thus the B-F IBNR reserve is $80 \times 0.75 = 60$, so that the B-F ultimate estimate is 60 + 15 =75.

The **Benktander IBNR reserve** estimate is found by taking a weighted average: 25% of the Chain Ladder IBNR (45) plus 75% of the B-F IBNR (60) to give an IBNR estimate of just over 56. The Benktander ultimate is then 56 + 15 = 71.

Primary vs Reinsurance

- i. Data: Lesser detail for reinsurance compared to primary. e.g. accident dates, sub-lines of business
- ii. Reporting & Development Lags
 - a. Primary losses develop faster
 - b. Proportional: Statements received 30-90 days after quarter end
 - c. Excess: Reinsurer receives intimation once a threshold is breached which can take a while as the loss may take long to develop
- iii. Premium estimates: RI companies need premium estimates as reserves need to be set-up against business underwritten.
- iv. Special Contracts: RI contracts with special features (e.g. multi-year, multi-line) are reserved for separately.
- v. Things to look out for in RI reserving:
 - a. Changes in underlying cedent behaviour (case reserves, settlement patterns) as the portfolio usually consists of various cedents
 - b. Attachment points, limits how are these changing over time
 - c. Large loss events
 - d. Aggregate stop loss covers



Portfolio Management – How reserving actuaries can help

- Spotting trends in portfolio segments
- Feedback to underwriting
- Data quality issues Accountants/claims book at a cedent level, Actuaries have a portfolio view
- Diagnostics









194

196

2%

2%

0%

40%

4%

81%











Diagnostics



Swiss Re (m



P0 LR relative to **Diagnostics** last 3 reserving MU: Cedent Ctry: LOB: Heat Map Development 2009 **P**2011 **P**2013 2015 TOB: rounds Branch: €sαo Elsa 4 2016 CQ-22 Floors CQ-21 CQ-20 CQ-29 PO vs Latest Premlum (\$m) & Loss Ratio (%) Comparison Reported Loss Ratio Development (%) 79.0% 190% 5,000 20.0% CQ-28 72.2% CQ-27 69. BN 4,500 160% CQ-26 69.9% 25.0% 4,000 CQ-25 71.6% 71.7% 140% CQ-24 67.6% 65.8% 2,500 20.0% 120% CQ-22 62.9% 2,000 CQ-22 63.0% 100% CQ-21 62.0% 168.0N 85 2,500 15.0% CQ-20 125.2% 62.4% 21/2 90% 2,000 CQ-19 62.2% 142.9% 12 CQ-18 61.4% 142.9% // as.e 60% 10.0% 1,500 CQ-17 61.9N 242.87 \$4.2% 61.4% 40% 1,000 CQ-16 61.2% 58.5% 247 🔏 👘 \$2.5% 50 % CQ-15 60.5N 58. BN 45% \$1.9% 20% 500 CQ-14 60.2% 12.0% 79.9 57.8% CQ-12 55.1% 0% 0% 59.5N 148.2% 79.7 65.6% 2009 2010 2011 2012 2012 2014 2015 2016 12 20 24 29 22 CQ-12 33.7 54.5N 61.4% 15 30.7% CQ-11 54.5% 2 A 3 150.0% 62.2% P-caro Premium 🛛 160,2 Premium — P-caro UR — 160,2 UR 2009 --2010 --- 2011 2014 - 2015 - 2016 CQ-10 149.8% 75.0 54.2% 62.9% CQ-9 sa. ani 150.2% 76.25 55.4% 62.9% 66.5% Controls: 00-6 59.6N 152.9% 75.6% 55.2% 62.9% 64.2% Ultimate Loss Ratio Development (%) Ultimate Reported CQ-7 58.0% 162.9% 54.4% 62.0% 61.9% 190% 00 52.9N 62.9% 58.0% 155.9% 80.0% 61.2% c s 59,4% 100.7% 78.93 52.6N 62.7% 59.6% 64.2% Toggle FullScreen 160% 26-4 59.4% 361.0% 78.7% 52.9N 61.6N 61.1% 62.4% 140% CQ-2 59.2% 360.2% 78.9% 53.6% 61.2% 61.1% 62.2% CQ-2 161.0N 74.7N 53.5N 60.5% 60.2% 59.1% 62.1% RepetSe le ction 120% CQ-1 58.1% 165.2% 78.7% 52.2% 60.5N 59.6% 60.2% 64.2% cq. \$7.9% 79.0 52.9% 60.4% 58.4% 58.5% 64.2% PO 69.6% 63.2% 61.6% 59.4% 62.3% 64.5% 62.4% 65.2% Ult Prem 1,852 1,724 3,974 3,483 4,587 4,117 4,246 2,572 80% Export to PPT Ult Cost (495) (472) (1,300) (954) (1,289) (1,201) (1,189) (825) (1,073) (2,809) (3,139) (1,844) (2,769) (2,405) (2,482) (1,653) UIT Loss 60% 284 (1,557) (465) 685 529 512 575 95 -----UWYr 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 40% 20% Scale Graph: x Max of PO 05 2x P 0 20 EA. P3 FA 73 2x P0 Repet 75 25 20 EA. 75 26. 20 EA. 23 25 20 EA. 75 25 20 EA. 75 76 20 EA. 26 20 75 20 EA. 75 25

2014

2014

2%

2015

2015

2%

2016

0%

2016 Total



% Ultimate Losses

Largest Events (\$USDm)

Largest Claims (\$U3Dm)

Earthquake in Christchurch, New Zealand (hearth Earthquake and taunami off Honahu, Japan (Magnitus Earthquake - South Island of New Zealand Floods in Thailand October 2011 Cyclone Yasi over Australia - ICA CAT CODE 114

2009

2009

4%

2010

2010

21%

2011

2011

40%

2012

2012

196

2013

2013

1%

Swiss Re



Diagnostics



4%

21%

40%

196

196

2%

2%

0%

Heatmap

Reserving Heat Map Main Line of Business *



- Easy to understand & show to senior management rather than just figures
- Can focus on segments of business
- Gives an ultimate view lines of business may be slow to develop
- Gives a snapshot across years



2 Portfolio Management

Diagnostics



Example





Example

Swiss Re

Ē





Example







Legal notice

©2018 Swiss Re. All rights reserved. You are not permitted to create any modifications or derivative works of this presentation or to use it for commercial or other public purposes without the prior written permission of Swiss Re.

The information and opinions contained in the presentation are provided as at the date of the presentation and are subject to change without notice. Although the information used was taken from reliable sources, Swiss Re does not accept any responsibility for the accuracy or comprehensiveness of the details given. All liability for the accuracy and completeness thereof or for any damage or loss resulting from the use of the information contained in this presentation is expressly excluded. Under no circumstances shall Swiss Re or its Group companies be liable for any financial or consequential loss relating to this presentation.