# GIRO Convention

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the future

#### 23-26 September 2008 Hilton Sorrento Palace

The Case of the Credulous Actuary: Rediscovering the Importance of Judgment

> Mark Graham Alex Glencross

#### The Case of the Credulous Actuary: Rediscovering the Importance of Judgment

#### Outline

- Introduction
- Analyses and results
- Mark Graham Alex Glencross
- Recommendations and issues Mark Graham
- Discussion





## **Prior hypothesis**

Long held beliefs that:

- [Actuaries] consistently give too much credibility to data
- Necessary consequence is tendency to over-fit and, hence, underestimation of uncertainty

The Actuarial Profession

## Methodology (1)

- Pick a "true" distribution, e.g. LogNormal (μ,σ)
- Sample a sequence of 100 data points from that distribution
- Calculate the sample mean, sample standard deviation and corresponding 99.5<sup>th</sup> %ile as each data point is added to the sequence, e.g. after 10 data points, after 100 data points
- Repeat through 10,000 simulations



# Methodology (2)

- End up with 10,000 simulations of 100 sequential data points from the same distribution
- Determine distribution of sample means, standard deviations and 99.5<sup>th</sup> %iles at each data point in the sequence
- Provides real insight into how much information is really contained in the data



# Recent example (or something like it)

 Eleven years of equity returns

Would you define a

distribution with these

- Mean: 5.3%
- StDev: 15.0%

parameters?

1999 17.8% 2000 -10.2% 2001 -16.2% 2002 -24.5% 2003 13.6% 2004 7.5% 2005 16.7% 2006 10.7% 2007 3.8%

Year

1997

1998

Return

24.7%

14.6%

The Actuarial Profession						
	The	Actu	arial i	Profe	ssion	

# Basic Model: methodology

- First define our 'true' distribution
  - Equity-type asset returns
  - Mean return: 10%, Standard Deviation: 16%
  - 0.5<sup>th</sup> Percentile: -49%
- Repeatedly sample ten years of observations
- Look at errors between 'true' values and those implied by each approximation
  - Mean, Standard Deviation, 0.5<sup>th</sup> Percentile







































#### Frequency / Severity Example Distribution of Parameter Errors (Frequency)

- No need for StDev
  - Square root of mean
- Estimate of mean is unbiased and unskewed
- Not so for estimate of 99.5<sup>th</sup> percentile
  - Biased: average error is -0.4
  - Not particularly skewed















- Mean is still unbiased and unskewed
- StDev is unbiased and skewed
  - Skewness = 0.6
- 99.5<sup>th</sup> percentile is biased and skewed
  - 'True' value = 603
  - Average error = -33.4
  - Skewness = 2.1





The Actuarial Pro









Removes need for extra dimension of simulations

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the fu



#### Frequency / Severity Example Distribution of Parameter Errors (Aggregate Claims)

- Mean unbiased, but slightly skewed
  - Skewness = 0.4
- StDev marginally biased, and more skewed
  - Average error = -7
  - Skewness = 1.7
- 99.5<sup>th</sup> percentile is biased and skewed
  - Average error = -25
  - Skewness = 3.6





## Frequency / Severity Example Return on Capital

- Suppose premium received = 600
- 'True' statistics
  - mean aggregate claims = 500
  - 99.5<sup>th</sup> percentile aggregate claims = 1575
  - mean profit = 100
  - Capital = 1075
- 'True' mean Return on Capital = 9.3%

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the fi





#### Frequency / Severity Example Distribution of Parameter Errors Return on Capital

- Average error = 6.0%
- Skewness = 93

The Actuarial Profession

#### Issues

- Understates problem
- Why over rely on data vs. judgment?
- Poorly understood
- How to respond?

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the fi

#### Understates problem

- Investigation assumed known distribution
  - Actual distribution unknown and unknowable
  - Much modelling based on best fit *distribution*, rather than best fit *parameters* for a given distribution
- Investigation assumed stationary distribution
  - Certainly non-stationary, in practice





# Poorly understood

- · Little or no actuarial literature
- FRC Discussion Paper "Promoting Actuarial Quality" makes no mention of understanding the credibility of data as a driver of actuarial quality
- 10 sigma events
- EC/CEIOPS expectations of data in Solvency II



## How to respond? (1)

- Invest time in understanding underlying exposures
- Invest time in understanding the limitations of your data
- Use judgment, informed by data, to parameterise
- Use emerging data to test parameters
- Test over varying time periods, due to non-stationarity
- Do not expect every parameter to pass every test (1:20 fail at 95% confidence interval)



# How to respond? (2) Your parameters will be wrong but... ... judgment can ensure consistency between related exposures (different asset classes, different business types) ... ... and parameters can be adjusted to reflect changes in the underlying exposure much earlier than would be the case if you wait for the data to emerge

The Actuarial Profession making financial sense of the futur