THE IMPACT OF THE OGDEN TABLES ON UK PERSONAL INJURY AWARDS

by Craig Pettengell

Summary:

Certain classes of insurance, including Motor, Employers Liability and Public Liability, potentially face a dramatic increase in the cost of large claims due to the widespread adoption of the Ogden tables in the assessment of UK Personal Injury Awards. This is likely to affect reserves as well as the profitability of ongoing business.

The workshop will include a presentation of the historical development of this issue, including an update of the current debate, an analysis that was performed to quantify the impact of the tables and a lead in to a discussion.

Workshop Outline:-

What are the Ogden Tables? Why are they Important? Historical Background Current Debate

Analysis: Why the Ogden Approach is Different Scope and Data Calculations Results Limitations Sensitivities

The results will include the impact on individual ground-up claims, aggregate gound-up claims and excess of loss reinsurance aggregate claim costs.

Discussion: Others' Results and Analysis Reserving Stance and Difficulties Pricing Difficulties: Reinsurance and Primary Structured Settlements Factors Affecting Yield on Index-Linked Gilts.

THE IMPACT OF THE OGDEN TABLES ON UK PERSONAL INJURY AWARDS

Presented by: Craig Pettengell Julian Ross

The attached are Appendices to the above paper, to be presented by Craig Pettengell and

Julian Ross as a workshop at GISG 1996.

Please read the example Appendix B before the session, as it will not be discussed in detail on

the day.

<u>Appendix A</u>

Data for 65 UK Motor Claims

Court Award Information (from Kemp & Kemp⁽¹⁾)

		Accident	AgeAt	Trial	Expectancy (no. years	Total	Cost Of Future Care	Cost Of Future Care	Future Loss Of Earnings	Future Loss Of Earnings
Claim Identifier	Gender	Year	Trial	Year	from trial)	Settlement	Per Annuni	Multiplier	Per Annuni	Multiplier
Brightanan	F	1981	22	1985	21	\$73,447	27,300	13	4,500	14
Brittain	F	1984	32	1989	27	950,000	19,450	14	32,611	14
Housecroft	F	1980	21	1985	27	327,917	9,400	13	5,600	10
Fitzgerald	М	1982	20	1986	28	596,553	15,684	15	11,972	15
Tuicis	F	1981	21	1985	27	411,220	12,299	13	8,500	10
Leon Sen Tang	м	1982	29	1986	30	5-10, 130	16,437	13	10,493	13
Bowden	F	1988	26	1990	30	9-19,530	43,501	14	11,000	14
Hunt	F	1985	33	1993	25	547,067	17,253	14	11,700	13.5
Wodrup	M	1987	28	1991	Normal	237,000	17,433	0	10,000	10.0
	F	1978	29	1982	23	266,000	9,251	11		10
Chapman		1980	23	1987					2,122	
Charalambous	м				Normal	395,890	7,800	13	10,644	12
Bishop	м	1984	22	1983	Normal	938,801	24,608	13	10,550	15
Duluelon	F	1982	20	1986	10	627,390	36,385	7.5	17,438	8
Hodgeson	F	1982	40	1987	Normal	417,190	11,850	14	3,000	12
ienkinson	F	1983	22	1986	Normal	296,600	5,950	. 18	5,500	16
Pritchard	м	1976	39	1986	29	362,130	6,500	14	9,000	14
Nurtle	М	1979	39	1985	36	342,260	8,381	15	5,857	13
Whiteside	F	1987	25	1991	Normal	1,906,800	62,991	18	14,794	16
Wright	M	1986	40	1993	Normal	301,861	0	0	12,424	12
Viarun	M	1981	34	1984	Normal	198,730	0	ō	8,757	14
	M	1989	58	1992	Normal	228,350	4,091	11	15,240	5
	M	1985	57	1983	Normal	104,040	673	۱۱ ة	8,207	5
	M	1988	45	1992	Normal	120,560	0	Ő	10,000	8
	M	1985	27	1989	Normal		-			
	F		20	1983	Normal	963,141	41,347	17	9,348	B
Vioora		1978				191,250	0	0	8,000	13
Brice	F	1980	45	1983	Normal	63,470	2,600	10	0	0
	м	1989	41	1993	Normal	151,550	0	0	6,500	12
•	М	1980	50	1985	Normal	90,600	Ó	0	5,900	9
lall	F	1007	46	1973	Normal	25,750	0	0	938	8
Porter	м	1974	26	1979	Normal	45,500	0	Ũ	1,000	15
ហត្ថាន	м	1977	57	1979	Normal	37,370	0	0	2,860	6
Dietrich	М	1984	25	1992	Normal	74,130	0	0	2,500	10
.oughran	м	1989	48	1003	Normal	95,750	0	0	10,391	7
	м	1985	22	1989	Normal	154,730	0	0	3,920	16
lichalski	м	1987	65	1993	Normal	216,450	11,692	6.5	3,074	6.5
	F	1989	50	1993	Normal	105,070	1,274	14	3,145	4
	ST.	1985	57	1991	Normal	91,638	0	0	8,528	4
	F	1987	29	1993	Normal	197,233	0	0	8,471	12
	M	1986	37	1994	Normal	177,170	1,000	12	9,091	11
	M	1976	39	1981	Normal	64,510	1,000	0		10
,									4,160	
	м	1986	27	1990	Normal	169,564	Ö	0	5,000	15
•	м	1982	48	1988	Normal	171,483	1,150	11	8,356	9
	F	1976	33	1986	Normal	62,990	0	٥	366	15
	м	1978	27	1984	Normal	57_160	0	0	1,0-10	15
	M	1976	25	1981	Normal	65,950	0	0	1,800	16
	М	1972	16	1975	Normal	43,250	0	0	1,250	13
J1145	м	197ú	35	1980	Nonnal	78,210	0	0	2,723	14
	м	1977	26	1982	Normal	77,500	0	0	2,375	16
ettley	М	1982	58	1983	Normal	102,920	580	10	7,015	4.5
	м	1978	47	1981	Normal	32,980	0	0	750	12
	M	1978	37	1985	Normal	98,030	0	0	2,664	14
	M	1984	38	1991	Normal	100,100	0	0	8,000	10
	M	1982	35	1985	Normal	124,500	ŏ	ŏ	3,000	15
	F	1981	43	1988	Normal	5-1,500	400	15	2,500	10
	F	1987	38	1994	Normal	54,290		0		10
							0		1,000	10
	M	1985	44	1993	Normal	124,130	519	13	4,000	
	M	1989	25	1990	Nonnal	34,370	200	16	413	14
	F	1981	37	1986	Normal	105,980	0	o	5,769	13
	F	1983	25	1984	Normal	19,130	0	0	3,074	16
avies	F	1987	м	1990	Normal	51,350	0	0	2,640	15
hillips	F	1989	21	1991	Normal	22,050	0	0	1,470	15
	F	1983	30	1987	Normal	105.800	0	0	11,843	11
	Total					16,299,045				
Count	62		37.42		Simple	262,388	6,462	6.08	6,529	11.81
			-			••••				
		Male			Average					

Appendix B

Example Calculation

This example relates to the plaintiff Housecroft, who was a 16 year old in 1980 at the time of an accident from which she suffered almost complete paralysis. We show the actual award, the estimation of the multipliers for medical care and loss of earnings consistent with the Ogden tables and summarise the impact of this change on the total award.

Whilst we believe this calculation is appropriate given the facts presented in Kemp and Kemp⁽¹⁾ regarding the award, there may be other factors of which we are unaware that should be taken into account in determining the impact of the revised basis for calculating multipliers.

Actual Award

Head of claim	Award (£)				
Pain & Suffering Loss of Life Expectancy Miscellaneous Future Expense Cost of Past Care Interest Total excl. Future Care & Earnings	80,000 1,250 53,600 10,000 <u>4,867</u> 149,717				
Future Care and Earnings			Annual Amou	int	Multiplier
Cost of Future Care Loss of Future Earnings Total Award	122,200 <u>56,000</u> 327,917	=	9,400 5,600	*	13 10

Ogden effect on multipliers (all multipliers based on net real return of 2.625%)

Medical Care

Life Expectancy from Trial	27	•	as opposed to 56 years for unimpaired female age 21 at trial		
Age for Look Up in Tables		56	:	average age at death of females is 83 - 27 life expectancy	
Multiplier in Tables at :	3% 2.5%	16.5 17.5			
Ogden Multiplier at 2.625%	17.2	:	compared to award value of 13		
Future Cost of Care post Ogo	162,150 = 9400 * 17.2				

Appendix B continued

Future Loss of Earnings

Age for Look Up in Tables		21	age at trial as no impaired life assumed
Multiplier in Tables at : 3%		24.1 26.2	
Multiplier at 2.625%	2.370	25.68	
Discount for Future Employment Contingencies		1.8%	taken from the Ogden ready-reckoner ⁽²⁾ without adjustment for sex, interest rate etc.
Ogden Multiplier		25.21=	= 25.68*(1-1.8%) compared to award value of 10
Future Loss of Earnings post-Ogden			76 = 5,600 * 25.21

Summary of Ogden Impact

Element of Award	Pre-Ogden	Post-Ogden	% Increase
Costs excluding Care & Earnings	141,717	141,717	0.0%
Future Care	122,220	162,150	32.7%
Future Earnings	56,000	141,176	152.1%
Total	327,937	453,043	38.1%