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Disclaimer

This document represents the personal views of the speaker who does not accept any liability for reliance on it and makes no warranty as to its content or accuracy.

This document supports the research effort of the Actuarial Profession's working party and is not written advice directed at the particular facts and circumstances of any given situation and/or data.

The materials contained in this presentation pack and any oral representation of it by the working party are outside the scope of the TAS.

Third Party Working Party

- Third iteration of the Actuarial Profession’s Third Party Working Party, which investigates third party motor claims (injury and property damage)
- Scope this year focussed on private car comprehensive business, with a more granular analysis of geography
- At £8.5bn earned premium for 2011, greater volumes of data than ever before:
  - Data from new contributors representing an extra £2.1bn in earned premium for 2011
  - Significant increase in number of contributors since last year, including new FSA and FSC (Gibraltar) regulated companies
  - Analysis of geography now supported by data at postcode sector level
  - Data collected, processed and analysed in aggregate by Towers Watson
Third Party Working Party

- Initial results presented at June Reserving Seminar and Pricing Seminar:
  - Market statistics and accident year trends, with commentary from the Working Party
  - Analysis of regional experience
- Further potential results to be presented at GIRO:
  - Analysis of individual bodily injury claims data
  - Ancillary analysis from publicly available sources
  - Data questionnaire
  - Implications for the PPO working party results
- Data is provided as at 31 December 2011
- But the focus of today’s workshop will be Small Bodily Injury Claims
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Data
Market statistics

- Third party injury (TPI) claims have been “capped” at £50,000 (1999 money, indexed at 7% pa) to remove the distorting effect of very large claims.
- Inflation rates quoted in the charts give the latest position of the relevant accident year divided by the equivalent position of the previous year (for example, the 2011 accident year position after 12 months of development divided by the 2010 accident year position after 12 months of development).
- Because not every contributor provided every data item, not every chart and statistic in this analysis is based upon data from the full set of contributors. This can result in minor inconsistencies between charts.
- Data has been checked for consistency but has not been independently audited.
**Data**

**Market statistics**

- The collection of contributing insurers has changed materially over the years. For example relative to last year’s study it includes four new insurers.
- Each year it is common for a number of insurers to make relatively subtle changes to their definitions of claim statistics. In the aggregate, these lead to distortions when comparing the market studies between different years.
- Not all contributors are able to supply data to support every claim statistic in each study. There are generally improvements (but not always) in the availability of data from year to year, and as such, the results of the most recent study will be based upon data from an increased proportion of the contributor companies (and not just new contributors). Again, this introduces a material distortion into any analysis which attempts to compare the results across different studies.
- It is reasonably common for insurers to restate the claims statistics of prior accident years (and prior periods of development), particularly in the case where portfolios (including movements on prior year liabilities) have been acquired or disposed of by the contributor(s) in question. Other reasons for such changes can be changes in the availability of granular data pertaining to (potentially large) segments of portfolios (such as in the case where data is provided by bordereaux rather than being integrated in insurer administration systems) or in some cases changes in the re-mapping of data to classes.
- For this reason, we would recommend that if the user of the research wishes to understand how trends have evolved over time, then they should focus on looking at trends by accident year within the latest study, rather than attempting to compare the results across studies.
- Likewise we do not consider statistically valid any back engineering of individual contributors’ contributions.

---

**Data**

**State of Health of Market Statistics**

**Questionnaire**

- Following the initial data collection exercise, it became apparent that the breadth of data available from contributors was less than desired.
- The Working Party issued a data questionnaire asking contributors to assess the availability of 13 desired data items, and if unavailable, whether there were plans to capture this data.
- Contributors were asked to comment on claims handling systems and actuarial systems separately.
- The results from the 10 respondents are shown on the Appendix but summarised here.

**Results**

- Claims Handling Systems capture the majority of the additional data items, with the exception of PPOs.
- Actuarial Systems are not generally extracting these additional data items.
- Actuarial Systems need to be enhanced to monitor changing claims environment (e.g. MoJ process) and to be able to provide enhanced support to the business.
- Whilst some data items are not currently available (classified as red), some companies have developed ad-hoc or manual data feeds to monitor this data.
Data
Claim Management Companies

- CMC analysis is based upon data extracts on 3 dates June 2010, June 2011 and March 2012, i.e., census data. From this transactional data has been inferred by interpolation between census points.

- If the status of a CMC has changed prior to the first census then interpolation cannot be used:
  - Eg if at first census in 2010 we know that CMC 12345 cancelled its authorisation on 01/03/2009 we cannot tell its date of first authorisation.

- However the CMC registration number (which follows a sequential pattern) has been used to infer a start date.
  - Eg if we know that CMC 12344 was first authorised on 01/02/2008 and CMC 12346 first authorised on 03/02/2008 we can reasonably assume CMC 12345 was authorised on 02/02/2008.

Data
CRU

- CRU data records claimant counts (not claim counts)
- It is recorded for the purposing of recovering DWP benefits, and we understand (from the CRU) that average costs do not include any NHS recoveries.
- It is, however, obligatory for each TPI claimant to be counted
Data
Police statistics

• The Road Traffic Act 1991, defines the duty of the public to report a personal injury road accident on a public road involving at least one motor vehicle (unless details such as insurance documents, name, etc. are exchanged between drivers).

• Stats19 is a set of data collected by a Police Officer when a road accident involving an injury or death occurring on a public road is reported (within 30 days of occurrence).

• Non-motor vehicles such as pedal cycles and ridden horses are reported regardless of motor vehicle or pedestrian involvement. Thus, Stats19 road accidents are defined wider than under the Road Traffic Act.

• Casualties per road accident as measured by Stats19 can be viewed as a proxy for the ratio of claimants per injury claim.

• The Department for Transport acknowledged in their 2008 report that a considerable proportion of non-fatal casualties are not reported to the police.

• In addition consistency in time in the data collection can not be guaranteed.

*Road Traffic Act 1988, s 170 amended by the Road Traffic Act 1991, Sch 4
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Scene Setting
High Level Market Claims Data

- The chart shows that the frequency of reported bodily injury claims has started to increase again in 2011 having, to some extent, plateaued during 2010.
- Was 2010 an anomalous year?
- Has 2011 resumed the previous trend or is it the “final fling” before referral fees are banned?

Scene Setting
High Level Market Claims Data

- The frequency of reported TPD claims continues to decrease.
- Increase in the gradient could be due to increase in petrol prices.
Scene Setting
Types of Injury

Examples of types of injury falling into various claim band sizes - bodily injury claims up to £100k

• The following are broad guidelines only. The assessment of any injury depends on the actual circumstances of an individual incident / claimant. The figures below are per claimant, include general damages and solicitor costs, but exclude any special damages.

• Up to £1k:
  – Minor soft tissue and whiplash injuries, fully resolved within a few weeks.
  – Low level travel anxiety.

• Over £1k & up to £10k:
  – Moderate soft tissue and whiplash injuries, complete recovery to nuisance levels within a few years.
  – Simple fractures – i.e. tibia or fibula with complete recovery (dependant on healing time / age etc).
  – Damage to teeth – loss of one to several front teeth.

• Over £10k & up to £20k:
  – Moderate psychiatric damage, depending on length and extent, but generally improved within several years.
  – Serious fractures – eg. one or both forearms where there is significant permanent residual disability.
  – Scarring.
  – Minor / moderate hand injuries.

• Over £20k & up to £50k:
  – Severe soft tissue injury, permanent damage, significant disability.
  – Serious hand, foot, leg injuries.

• Over £50k & up to £100k:
  – Minor to moderate head injuries – eg. brain damage, concentration and memory affected, ability to work is reduced, small risk of dependence on others.
  – Severe post traumatic stress disorder.
  – Facial injuries – eg. significant scarring, disfigurement and psychological reaction.
  – Amputation (loss of 1 arm or 1 leg or 1 foot or 1 hand).
Scene Setting
Legislation and the Market

- Motor environment is evolving fast: but with tailwinds as well as headwinds
  - Gender Directive
  - Solvency II
  - Low investment returns
  - Fuel prices and the cost of motoring
  - Market premium increases unwinding (1)
  - But still CORs above 100%
  - PPOs and review of Ogden discount rate
  - MoJ - extension of process, review of fees
  - LASPO Act (banning of referral fees)
  - Whiplash consultation, increase to SCT
  - OFT enquiry on credit hire / repair
  - Simmons v Castle - general damages up 10%

FSA returns for 2011 show a net COR of 106% and a loss ratio of 78% for 2011 (2)

- Our study covers the cost of third party claims which cover 70% of Motor Insurance claims costs – the OFT figures cite TPI – 50%, other TPD = 20% (3).

- Focus of working party (Third Party) is therefore on the most analytically problematic and the most material areas of cost and provides information to help actuaries, consumers, regulators and companies make informed decisions

Sources
1. Confused.com/Towers Watson Insurance Price Index shows Private Comp rates dropped by 7.1% in 12 months to end June 2012
2. Deloitte Analysis of AM Best data

Scene Setting
Vehicle Mileage & Petrol Price

Relationship between Petrol Price and Vehicle Usage (since 1994)

Vehicle mileage source: http://www.dft.gov.uk/statistics/series/traffic
Petrol price source: http://www.speedlimit.org.uk/petrolprices.html
Scene Setting
CRU Data

Number of motor cases registered to the Compensation Recovery Unit has increased in each year correlating broadly with TPWP TPI data

- The number registered in the 2011-12 financial year was 5% higher than in the previous year, the lowest recent level of year-on-year growth, but follows a 17% increase last year and sits in the context of a long term 10% trend
- This is based on registration so may reflect an element of speeding up in 2010.

Scene Setting
Police Statistics

- Police statistics show a decreasing number of injuries against market TPI frequency increases
- This data supports a view that TPI frequency inflation is more related to claiming behaviour than any change in the underlying risk
Scene Setting
CMC Data

Key
- TPWP estimate of count of CMCs.
- TPWP data extraction periods.
- Count of CMCs from MoJ annual report.

### Key
- TPWP estimate of count of CMCs.
- TPWP data extraction periods.
- Count of CMCs from MoJ annual report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CMC £m</th>
<th>Turnover £m</th>
<th>YoY % inc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Claim Management Companies: slightly fewer but more activity (+52% in 2010; +21% in 2011)

Scene Setting
Weather

• TPD and TPI are impacted by seasonality and by unusual weather

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= snow / ice  = unusual rain  = flooding  = storm
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Summary of Published Findings (June 2012)

Claim frequency

![Graph showing Reported Claim Frequency (inc nils) for Private Car Comp - TPD]

While TPD frequency decreased by 11%
Summary of Published Findings (June 2012)

Claim frequency

Private Car Comp - TPI
Reported Claim Frequency (inc nils)

- TPI frequency increased by 5%
- 2010 is deteriorating

Inflation Rates
10-11: 4.7%  09-10: 0.7%  08-09: 9.5%  07-08: 4.8%  06-07: 8.5%

Summary of Published Findings (June 2012)

Ratio of TPI to TPD claim numbers

Private Car Comp
Reported Claim Numbers (inc nils) - TPI/TPD Ratio

The market TPI / TPD ratio increased by 18% in 2011

Inflation Rates
10-11: 17.7%  09-10: 6.9%  08-09: 10.9%  07-08: 12.4%  06-07: 7.5%
Summary of Published Findings (June 2012)
Conclusions for 2011

- A dramatic 11% drop in TPD frequency; the highest level of average cost inflation on TPD since 2006
- Slowing down in TPD settlement and increase in case estimate strength / size
- Huge increase in the percentage of accidents with TPI
- Despite an 11% drop in TP accidents, TPI frequency is still up by 5% with TPI/TPD inflation at 18%
- Both TPI/TPD frequency inflation and views on incurred severity inflation are consistent with 2010 being anomalous with 2011 showing a catch up with 2 years inflation in one. Capped TPI inflation appears to have taken off again to previous levels after a (6-9%) increase relative to 2010, potentially resuming its annualised trended rate of 6% with a speeding up in settlement and payment, potentially due to MOJ
- Any increases or decreases in TPD frequency flow through to TPI inflation. Norming to zero TPD frequency inflation (-11% in 2011), the data supports a trended view of TPI burn cost inflation in excess of 15% unless one believes that the lower settlement cost inflation will continue.
- These key alternative hypotheses will be investigated further with new data which splits the capped TPI claims into size bands for GIRO
- However for the moment, the most plausible hypothesis would appear to be that 2010 was a benign anomaly and 2011 has had both its own natural inflation and the “missing inflation” from 2010.
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Questions and Hypotheses (to be answered later)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Our Prejudices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. What is small TPI inflation?</td>
<td>&gt; 15% on burn cost norming for TPD distortions driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by small (MOJ type) claims with single and multiple claimants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 2011 – catch up or new trend?</td>
<td>Catch Up with 2010 experience driven by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Anomalous weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. fewer accidents due to lower vehicle mileage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. MOJ changes disrupting CMCs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No further adverse development on i, ii; but potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for this on iii with “back-farming”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What do we know about multi-claimant claims?</td>
<td>c. 1.5 claimants per claim with 5% pa inflation: claimant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per claim inflation ~ freq inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. How weak/strong are case estimates?</td>
<td>Case estimates were identified as weak in our 09/10 work; they have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strengthened but are still a concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. What’s changed post MOJ?</td>
<td>Simple whiplash claims settling faster and same cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

• This presentation summarises the data trends for the TPWP analysis of capped bodily injury claims in a series of 5 indexed layers
• The layers are given in 2010 money, indexed at 7% pa for other accident years
  – 0 to £1k
  – £1k to £10k
  – £10k to £20k
  – £20k to 50k
  – £50k to £100k
• Large TPI claims will be covered at the Reserving Plenary

Introduction

Graph terminology

• When presenting results of a layered analysis, there is a choice in how to partition the claim amounts:
  – Type 1: In which claims that exhaust the width of a particular layer contribute an amount equal to the layer’s width
  – Type 2: In which claims that exhaust the width of a particular layer are removed from that layer, and the full claim amounts “from ground up” (“FGU”) are allocated to the next layer up
Introduction
Graph terminology

• Using the Type 1 definition, a claim of £15,000 from accident year 2010 contributes:
  – £1k to Layer 1 (£0 – £1k)
  – £9k to Layer 2 (£1k – £10k)
  – £5k to Layer 3 (£10k – £20k)
  – £0 to all other layers
• The chart shows the projected total TPI burning cost split by layer using Type 1 definition.
• In this presentation, any charts which use this definition will be accompanied with a version of this graphic. Shading represents the portion(s) of the claim that is relevant to the given statistic.

© 2011 The Actuarial Profession www.actuaries.org.uk

Introduction
Graph terminology

• Using the Type 2 definition, a claim of £15,000 from accident year 2010 contributes:
  – £15k to Layer 3 (£10k – £20k)
  – £0 to all other layers
• The chart shows the projected total TPI burning cost split by layer using Type 2 definition.
• In this presentation, any charts which use this definition will be accompanied with a version of this graphic. Shading represents the portion(s) of the claim that is relevant to the given statistic.

© 2011 The Actuarial Profession www.actuaries.org.uk
### Capped bodily injury

#### Projected Results (Type 1 – incl capped component of excess claims)

Projected Ultimate Capped TPI Results for Private Car Comprehensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Period</th>
<th>Earned Exposure</th>
<th>Ultimate Capped Claim Frequency</th>
<th>Ultimate Capped Claim Severity</th>
<th>Ultimate Capped Burning Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>8,526</td>
<td>6,597</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>9,879</td>
<td>5,956</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>10,619</td>
<td>6,064</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>11,843</td>
<td>6,201</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>12,487</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>13,777</td>
<td>7,432</td>
<td>102.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>14,040</td>
<td>7,474</td>
<td>104.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>14,856</td>
<td>8,366</td>
<td>124.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**

- 8.3% 3.9% 12.5%

• Alternate years have shown High/Low frequency Inflation at 8% over the period
• Severity inflation has been higher since 2008 averaging 8% (10% excluding 2010 which was benign; but 6% in the post MOJ years)
• Burn cost inflation has averaged 14% since 2008 (18% excluding 2010; but 10% in the post MOJ years), with periods of 2009 and 2011 particularly high.

### Capped bodily injury

#### Projected Results (Type 2)

Most claims are in bottom two layers; but most of cost comes from middle 3 layers.

Private Car Comprehensive Type 2 Layered Results (all layers given in 2010 money, indexed at 7% pa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Year</th>
<th>£0 - 1k</th>
<th>£1k - 10k</th>
<th>£10k - 20k</th>
<th>£20k - 50k</th>
<th>£50k - 100k</th>
<th>£&gt;100k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (finishing in layer) (claims per million policy years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>4,760</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>5,858</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>6,085</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,576</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>13,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>7,494</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td>7,710</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>14,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Cost**

- 6.9%

**Year-on-Year Change in Frequency**

- 9.9%

**Year-on-Year Change in Severity**

- 10.9%

**Year-on-Year Change in Burning Cost**

- 11.6%

**Burning Cost**

- 17.9%

**% freq freq freq freq freq freq**

- Neg cost cost cost cost cost cost

- 47.54 % 42.21 % 28.81 % 56.58 % 70.54 % 34.40 % 87.08 %
### Capped bodily injury

#### Projected Results (Type 1)

**Private Car Comprehensive Type 1 Layered Results (all layers given in 2010 money, indexed at 7% pa)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Year</th>
<th>£0 - 1k</th>
<th>£1k - 10k</th>
<th>£10k - 20k</th>
<th>£20k - 50k</th>
<th>£50k - 100k</th>
<th>£100k+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9,326</td>
<td>6,257</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>8,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9,875</td>
<td>7,143</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>9,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10,033</td>
<td>7,624</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>10,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>11,843</td>
<td>8,443</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>11,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>12,497</td>
<td>9,668</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>12,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>13,777</td>
<td>10,159</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>13,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>14,060</td>
<td>10,464</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>14,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cost</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11,179</td>
<td>3,469</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>14,856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average Cost Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£0 - 1k</th>
<th>£1k - 10k</th>
<th>£10k - 20k</th>
<th>£20k - 50k</th>
<th>£50k - 100k</th>
<th>£100k+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>23.84</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>26.55</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>26.55</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>27.77</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>33.76</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Frequency (in layer and above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£0 - 1k</th>
<th>£1k - 10k</th>
<th>£10k - 20k</th>
<th>£20k - 50k</th>
<th>£50k - 100k</th>
<th>£100k+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>83.84</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>83.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>54.38</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>54.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Frequency % Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£0 - 1k</th>
<th>£1k - 10k</th>
<th>£10k - 20k</th>
<th>£20k - 50k</th>
<th>£50k - 100k</th>
<th>£100k+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency

- **Impacted by TPD frequency – Slide 42**
- **Inflation is volatile but has been reducing overall and for Band 2, averaging 8-9% across all years, 6-7% (2008-2011)**
- **Inflation has been increasing for layers 3&4 with higher volatility, averaging 5%, or 8-9% (2008-2011)**
- **Inflation is broadly flat for layer 5 averaging 0%, or 2% (2008-2011)**
- **Frequency inflation is more volatile for layers 3 and above**
### Capped bodily injury Projected Results (Type 1)

#### Private Car Comprehensive Type 1 Layered Results (all layers given in 2010 money, indexed at 7% pa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Year</th>
<th>£0 - 1k</th>
<th>£1k - 10k</th>
<th>£10k - 20k</th>
<th>£20k - 50k</th>
<th>&lt; 100k</th>
<th>£100k - 200k</th>
<th>£200k - 500k</th>
<th>£500k - 1000k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£0 - 1k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1k - 10k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10k - 20k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20k - 50k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 100k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100k - 200k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£200k - 500k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£500k - 1000k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency % Change

#### Burning Cost % Change

#### Average Cost % Change

### Implied % Change

#### Severity

- Inflation overall is volatile overall but averages 4%, increasing in 2008, since when it has averaged 8%. The post MOJ years show average inflation at 6%.
- The increases in overall severity inflation is driven by increases in each of layers 1-3 in 2008.
- The potentially lower inflation post MOJ is driven by layers 2-3.
- Layer 5 is either volatile or has increased since 2010.

### Burn Cost

- The combination of frequency and severity, on a higher level since 2007, when it has averaged 14%. Since 2010 it has averaged 10%, but it remains to be seen if this is a new trend or an outlier.
- Although differing in detail in frequency and severity, overall patterns of inflation are not dissimilar in shape across all layers.
Capped bodily injury
Projected Results (Type 1)

2010 & Prior
• Normalising for TPD, frequency shows a more inflationary picture at c. 14% over all years; 15% (2008-11)
• Similar inflation is seen up to layer 4; but with more marked increases in inflation across layers 2-4 since 2008.

2011 is an outlier (or a new trend?) with inflation at 18%. Layer 2 is similar, but layers 3, 4 and 5 show inflation at c. 30% at marked variance to previous years. However inflation across 2010 and 2011 is not out of line with longer averages.
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**Question b: 2011 – catch-up or new trend?**

- Q1 & Q4 saw snow/ice in 2010; with Q2 being unusually dry
- 2011 did not see these more extreme weather patterns
- 30 April 2010 saw the introduction of the MOJ reforms attaching to accidents post that date
- The following charts will show that the predominant effect could be weather related through to layer 2. A potential MOJ effect may additionally be seen in Layer 3 post introduction to the end of 2010, with no particular evidence of this for Layer 2.
- Overall the predominant effect is likely to be weather with MOJ being a smaller factor. Any MOJ factor may risk late reporting/deterioration – although this risk will diminish as time passes.
- As such 2011 is largely a catch up and it is appropriate to average the frequency inflation over the two years: 2011 inflation does not appear to be setting a new trend

**Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer**

**Data trends**

**TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio**

- 2010 saw a drop, and 2011 a sharp rise in the proportion of third party accidents involving TPI
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates

1Q1-11Q1: 20%
09Q1-10Q1: 6%

Variation from 10 year quarterly average rainfall in England & Wales
Source: Met Office Hadley Observation centre

The Q1 differences are particularly marked.
This could be attributed to snow & ice leading to lower driving speeds + more non vehicle collisions leading to less TPI/TPD
Q2 sees differences but less marked. Differences could result from the introduction of MOJ in Q2 2010 or unusually dry weather in the same quarter.

Although Q3 sees differences, they are not marked. Q3 2010 was wetter than Q3 2011, but potentially within the bounds of the "normal". Any potential MOJ effect was short-lived.
The Q4 differences are particularly marked and as in Q1 are plausibly due to snow & ice in 2010 leading to less TPI / TPD.

Variation from 10 year quarterly average rainfall in England & Wales
Source: Met Office Hadley Observation centre

The difference in Band 3 is more marked (although across fewer claims) – but puzzling …
Whilst there is the same Q1 “weather” difference (no bigger) ...
Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates
10Q2-11Q2: 20.5%  09Q2-10Q2: -0.4%

...any Q2 weather / MOJ impact is as marked here as in Q1 (more so than in layers below) ...

... but in Q3 where weather would not cause a good 2010; 2010 is much better than 2011 for this layer – it was similar for the layers below. One hypothesis is that the introduction of MOJ impacted this layer (multi-claimants?) more strongly
... With Q4 seeing both a weather and an MOJ effect. Any MOJ “under-reporting” element in this layer could be subject to late development.
Question c: What do we know about multi-claimant claims?

- MOJ individual claimant indemnity element of claim is in the range £1k to £10k.
- Multi-claimant claims would reasonably be expected to impact the £10k-£20k band.
- Recognising we have no claimant data, can we infer anything about claimant per claim rates?

Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer

Data trends

- On the hypothesis that claims terminating in this layer are predominantly multi-claimant whiplash-type claims, we would expect a strong relationship between the average cost of layers two and three.
- We see a consistent relationship albeit with small levels of inflation, potentially driven by claimants per claim inflation.
- The implied claimant per claim ratio consistent with this hypothesis is 1.4.
**Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer**

**Data trends**

- Assuming claims finishing in layers two and three are predominantly whiplash-type claims (with those in layer two being single claimant and those in layer three being multi-claimant)
- The previous slide would then give an approximation to the average claimants per claim for multi-claimant whiplash-type claims of 2.7
- Using the number of claims ultimately finishing in layers two and three as a weighting (slide 37), this implies an average number of claimants per claim for all whiplash-type claims of circa 1.4

---
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5. Conclusions
Question d: How weak/strong are case estimates?

- There were material concerns in 2010 that case estimates had weakened, with the risk that any reserving based on incurred methods could be flawed.
- Emerging evidence suggests that this risk has reduced. It is hard to conclude however that it has disappeared.

Capped bodily injury
Projected Results

- Incurred patterns have shown less redundancy and more deficiency over time, commensurate with a weakening in case estimates.
- This appears to have now stabilised for 2009 and subsequent accident years.
Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer
Data trends

Claim Settlement Rate
• Pre MOJ settlement rate was increasing
• MOJ claims initially slower but have since sped up

• This layer will include multi-claimant whiplash-type claims

Paid to Incurred Ratio
Although this band is impacted by MOJ-type claims, it is not going to be materially impacted by legal costs which will influence the bands below

Increase of paid to incurred ratio in recent accident quarters, following a decrease in prior periods. Given speeding up of settlement rates for older periods, this may imply a strengthening of case estimates, at least for older accident quarters
Settlement rates slowed post MOJ, with evidence of catching up in the 2011 accident year, as well as an operational catch up in all earlier periods.

This has been stable or reducing. Given the accelerating settlement rates for pre-MOJ accident periods, the reductions would suggest improving case estimate strengths.

Post-MOJ, the reduction in the ratios is consistent with the reduced settlement rates.
**Transactional Analysis – 50k-100k Layer**

**Data trends**

**Claim Settlement Rate**

Large increase in settlement rate for all years in recent post MOJ periods

**Paid to Incurred Ratio**

This has been broadly constant, with slight increases. These increases are less than those seen in settlement rates, and so do not point to any weakening in case estimate strength
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Capped bodily injury
Projected Results

Capped TPI Claim Numbers - Percentage of Ultimate

Patterns have been very consistent over time
Capped bodily injury
Projected Results

Capped TPI Paid Claims - Percentage of Ultimate

- Payment patterns have been speeding up since the smaller sized (faster paying) claims have grown.
- This has accelerated post MOJ with faster legal payments

Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer
Data trends

Nil Claims Proportion

... as nil settlement rates increased slightly pre MOJ but decreased post MOJ

Inflation Rates
10-11: -10.6%  09-10: -4%  08-09: -0.8%  07-08: 0.4%  06-07: 2.1%
The MOJ process appears to have sped up payments for small claims (to recap, for Stage 1, insurers have 15 days to accept/reject liability after which a fixed legal fee of £400 + VAT per claimant is payable within 10 days).

Settlement rates for small claims have been gradually increasing since the onset of the MOJ process. This increase is all the more marked as nils which would be expected to settle quickly have been reducing.
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer (excl nils)

Data trends

Frequency of Claims in Layer (excl nils)

Layer 1: 0 to 1k

Very few claims end in this layer, but strong relative increases in frequency post MOJ potentially due to:

- Increased direct capture without the legal costs that would push claims into the next layer driven by
- Increased company activity
- Claimant push as CMCs/lawyers can’t get involved <£1k
- MOJ claims that progress through Stage I successfully incurring £480 legal fees, but get marooned at Stage II by Third Party
- Faster recognition

Inflation Rates

Layer 1: 0 to 1k

Transactional Analysis – 1k-10k Layer

Data trends

Claim Settlement Rate

Settlement rates for this layer have been gradually increasing since the onset of the MOJ process, with a drop when the process was first introduced

MOJ process begins here
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The paid to incurred ratio appears to be following a new pattern post MOJ, which is evidencing on-going increases. This may be due to early fast direct settlements or to MOJ legal fees which are paid out at an early stage (total stage 1 and stage 2 legal payments = £1620).
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**Questions and Provisional Answers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Our Provisional Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. What is small TPI inflation?</td>
<td>• Burn cost inflation has increased slightly since 2008, now sitting at 15%. Greater numbers of claims between £20k &amp; £50k have been the greatest contributor to recent higher inflation. If future TPD frequencies do not drop, prospective burn cost inflation could be &gt; 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 2011 – catch up or new trend?</td>
<td>• Catch Up from 2010 experience driven by i. Anomalous weather in 2010 ii. MOJ changes disrupting CMCs? • These support 2011 being a catch-up • Relatively, 2010 should not develop adversely based on i; but ii could bring (diminishing) risk of “back-farming”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What do we know about multi-claimant claims?</td>
<td>• data supports £10k-£20k layer being dominated by multi-claimant claims, with c. 1.4 claimants / claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. How weak/strong are case estimates?</td>
<td>• Case estimates were identified as weak in our 09/10 work; they have strengthened but are still a concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. What’s changed post MOJ?</td>
<td>• Simple whiplash claims settling faster; inflation continues. Adverse operational impact on large claims now diminishing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions or comments?**

Expressions of individual views by members of The Actuarial Profession and its staff are encouraged.

The views expressed in this presentation are those of the presenter.
Appendix

Have kept entire slide deck following. Comments will needed editing.
Notes to Graphs
All Layers

• Development graphs in the 0 to 1k and 1k to 10k layers are shown on a monthly origin basis except ‘reported claim frequency’ which is shown on both an annual and a quarterly origin basis
• Development graphs in the 10k to 20k and 20k to 50k layers are shown on a quarterly origin basis except ‘reported claim frequency’ which is shown on both an annual and a quarterly origin basis
• Development graphs in the 50k to 100k layer are shown on an annual origin basis except ‘reported claim frequency’ which is shown on both an annual and a quarterly origin basis
• The transactional analysis is based on transactional data provided by contributors and therefore may differ from the triangular analysis due to differences in contributors

Transactional Analysis

• 0 to 1k Layer
• All claims pass through this layer – so they show
• Those ending in the layer are few in number unusually small but have been growing post MOJ but still only contribute about 50p cost per policy
This includes nil claims but is a different dataset to the corresponding aggregate data (Slide X) with inflation about a point higher per annum over the period.

Excluding nils, inflation rates are slightly higher post MOJ, but lower pre MOJ ....
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer
Data trends

Nil Claims Proportion

... as nil settlement rates increased slightly pre MOJ but decreased post MOJ

Inflation Rates
10-11: -10.6%  09-10: -4%  08-09: -0.8%  07-08: 0.4%  06-07: 2.1%

---

Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Inflation Rates
10-11: 18.3%  09-10: 8.8%  08-09: 11.3%  07-08: 23.2%  06-07: 8.6%
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates
10Q1-11Q1: 20% 09Q1-10Q1: 6%

© 2011 The Actuarial Profession • www.actuaries.org.uk
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates
10Q2-11Q2: 14.2%   09Q2-10Q2: 7.4%

Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates
10Q3-11Q3: 13%   09Q3-10Q3: 10.9%
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Inflation Rates
1Q4-11Q4: 27.2%  09Q4-10Q4: 11.1%

Development Quarter

Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer (excl nils)
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio
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Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer (excl nils)

Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates

10Q1-11Q1: 21.8%  09Q1-10Q1: 6.3%

10Q2-11Q2: 15.9%  09Q2-10Q2: 8.5%
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer (excl nils)

Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inflation Rates
10Q3-11Q3: 14.5%  09Q3-10Q3: 11.5%
10Q4-11Q4: 27.2%  09Q4-10Q4: 12.6%
2011 has reverted to type, it is now clear that 2010 had anomalously low inflation across quarters 2 to 4 because of e.g bad weather ... MOJ whatever hypotheses to be clarified by extra charts.
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer
Data trends

Reported Claim Frequency

Development Month

Inflation Rates

09Q2-10Q2: -1.4%
10Q2-11Q2: 7.9%
09Q3-10Q3: 1%
10Q3-11Q3: 7.3%
09Q4-10Q4: 1.1%
10Q4-11Q4: 1%
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Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer
Data trends

Reported Claim Frequency

Development Month

Inflation Rates
10Q4-11Q4: 10.8%
09Q4-10Q4: 2.7%

Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer (excl nils)
Data trends

Reported Claim Frequency

Development Month

Inflation Rates
10Q4-11Q4: 10.8%
09Q4-10Q4: 2.7%
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer (excl nils)

Data trends

Reported Claim Frequency

Development Month

Inflation Rates

10Q1-11Q1: 1.9%  09Q1-10Q1: 5.5%

10Q2-11Q2: 9.4%  09Q2-10Q2: -0.5%
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer (excl nils)
Data trends

Reported Claim Frequency

Development Month

Inflation Rates
10Q3-11Q3: 8.7%  09Q3-10Q3: 1.5%

10Q4-11Q4: 10.8%  09Q4-10Q4: 4.1%

Markedly less settlement at nil
Settlement rates for small claims have been gradually increasing since the onset of the MOJ process. This increase is all the more marked as nils which would be expected to settle quickly have been reducing.
The MOJ process appears to have sped up payments for small claims.
(to recap, for Stage 1, insurers have 15 days to accept/reject liability after which a fixed legal fee of £400 + VAT per claimant is payable within 10 days)

Note: The gap between 2010 and 2011 is an indexing effect and this should be noted when comparing monthly changes.
Very few claims end in this layer, but strong relative increases in frequency post MOJ potentially due to:
- Increased direct capture without the legal costs that would push claims into the next layer driven by:
  - Increased company activity
  - Claimant push as CMCs/lawyers can’t get involved <£1k
- MOJ claims that progress through Stage I successfully incurring £480 legal fees, but get marooned at Stage II by Third Party
- Faster recognition

The average costs are not inconsistent with post MOJ legal payments of £480 ...
And have increased markedly post MOJ
Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer (excl nils)

Data trends

FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer (excl nils)

Layer 1: 0 to 1k

As is the case for settled claims although there is evidence of early direct settlements at higher cost

Inflation Rates

10-11: 10.8%  09-10: 10.1%  08-09: 4.4%  07-08: 11.4%  06-07: 6.5%

Transactional Analysis – 0-1k Layer (excl nils)

Data trends

FGU Incurred Burning Cost

Layer 1: 0 to 1k

Post 2006, this is stable until MOJ.
Post MOJ large increases driven by both frequency and severity
However the cost is under 50p per policy!
Transactional Analysis

- 1k to 10k Layer
- Most claims pass through this layer
- Those ending in the layer are typically small individual “whiplash” claims
- These claims are now the most significant of all layers contributing £x cost per policy

Transactional Analysis – 1k-10k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Inflation Rates
10-11: 19.2%  09-10: 9.7%  08-09: 13.4%  07-08: 25.5%  06-07: 8%
Transactional Analysis – 1k-10k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates
10Q1-11Q1: 21.8%  09Q1-10Q1: 6.6%
Unsurprisingly, this shows a similar story to Slide X (most claims above 0 will also be above 1k), although inflation is slightly less severe because the number of claims in 0-1k is increasing.
Similar to the lowest layer, 2010 is an anomalous year with claims frequency particularly low in Q2 – Q4, related to the introduction of MOJ, and also potentially anomalous weather patterns.

2010 Q4 has fewer claims dropping to the layer below than 2009 Q4.

Similarly in the layer below there were fewer settlements at nil here.
Transactional Analysis – 1k-10k Layer
Data trends

Reported Claim Frequency

Inflation Rates
10Q2-11Q2: 9.3%  09Q2-10Q2: -0.5%

Development Month

Inflation Rates
10Q3-11Q3: 7.7%  09Q3-10Q3: 1.4%
• 2010 Q4 showed increases in claim frequency in this layer, with fewer claims dropping to the layer below than in the previous year.

• For the layer below, the same phenomenon occurs with reduced settlement at nil.
The paid to incurred ratio appears to be following a new pattern post MOJ, which is evidencing on-going increases. This may be due to early fast direct settlements or to MOJ legal fees which are paid out at an early stage (total stage 1 and stage 2 legal payments = £1620).

- Inflation rates in this layer are similar but lower than the frequency of all claims > 1k, with the exception of 2010 which has seen a relative uplift (at 6.3% cf 2.7%).
- Any comments on TPI/TPD?
Inflation rates in this layer are lower than the aggregate data, and are broadly consistent over time at around 6%.

- The lower/higher average cost inflation seen in the aggregate data is not seen here.
- The distortion in the aggregate data comes from another layer.

- Inflation rates in this layer are quite different from the aggregate data – 3-4% lower other than 2010 which is higher.
- Settled inflation was slightly higher than incurred up to 2010 (consistent with concerns about case estimate strength in the aggregate data but much less marked), but under it in 2011.
- With the exception of the dip in 2011, inflation is again of the order of 6%.
**Transactional Analysis – 1k-10k Layer**

**Data trends**

**FGU Incurred Burning Cost**

Layer 2: 1k to 10k

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incurred Burning Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: This layer (in contrast to the previous) contributes a material burning cost. The incurred burning cost is reliant on relative case estimate strength. With the exception of 2007 and 2009, inflation is within 10% - 13% pa, driven by TBA. Need the TPI/TPD dimension on the frequency to unpick this.

**FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer 2 over FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer 1 (excl nils)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Cost of Claims Settling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Transactional Analysis

- 10k to 20k Layer
- 1/3 of Type 1 claims pass through this layer
- Those ending in the layer are typically multiple claimant “whiplash” claims (hypothesis to be tested)
- Claims ending in this layer contribute almost as much cost as (type 2) Layer 2 claims at circa £x cost per policy

Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Inflation Rates
- 10-11: 27.7%
- 09-10: 0.4%
- 08-09: 18%
- 07-08: 26.1%
- 06-07: 3.1%
Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer

Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates
1Q1-11Q1: 19.3%  09Q1-10Q1: 4.3%
Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer
Data trends

Transaction Analysis – 10k-20k Layer
Data trends
Inflation rates in this layer have been volatile over the last three years, with increases in 2011 and 2009 following a decrease in 2010. Across all periods, average inflation is in the range 5% to 7%.

Inflation Rates
10Q4-11Q4: 52.1%  09Q4-10Q4: 0.5%

• Frequencies for 2011 are high relative to 2010
• 2010 was particularly benign for quarters 2 to 4 as for layers 1 and 2 but with 2011 showing particularly high inflation for quarters 3 and 4
Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer
Data trends

**Reported Claim Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Month</th>
<th>Inflation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009Q1</td>
<td>09Q2-10Q2: -8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Reported Claim Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Month</th>
<th>Inflation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009Q1</td>
<td>09Q2-10Q2: -8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer
Data trends

Reported Claim Frequency

Inflation Rates
10Q4-11Q4: 32.5%  09Q4-10Q4: -7.1%

Transaction Analysis – 10k-20k Layer
Data trends

Claim Settlement Rate

• This layer will include multi-claimant whiplash-type claims
• Pre MOJ settlement rate was increasing
• MOJ claims initially slower but have since sped up
**Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer**

**Data trends**

**Paid to Incurred Ratio**

- Although this band is impacted by MOJ-type claims, it is not going to be materially impacted by legal costs which will influence the bands below.
- Increase of paid to incurred ratio in recent accident quarters, following a decrease in prior periods. Given speeding up of settlement rates for older periods, this may imply a strengthening of case estimates, at least for older accident quarters.

**Frequency of Claims in Layer**

Layer 3: 10k to 20k

- 2011 has seen a much more marked increase within this band than lower bands.
- It remains to be seen if this is early recognition of multi-claimant claims within the MOJ process (Note: cross check projections).
- Generally, across the period the generic inflation we see is associated with but not equal to claimant per claim inflation.
Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer
Data trends

FGU Incurred Average Cost of Claims in Layer
Layer 3: 10k to 20k

- Inflation consistent at around 7 to 8%

Inflation Rates
Layer 3: 10k to 20k
- 10-11: 7.6%
- 09-10: 7.3%
- 08-09: 7.6%
- 07-08: 7.4%
- 06-07: 6.9%

Development Month

FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer
Layer 3: 10k to 20k

- Settled inflation is higher than incurred inflation in the early years, but lower post 2010
- Given the speeding up in settlement rate for the early years, these differences are to be expected
- For the recent periods, settled inflation is lower than incurred, supporting a hypothesis of increasing case estimates
• On the hypothesis that claims terminating in this layer are predominantly multi-claimant whiplash-type claims, we would expect a strong relationship between the average cost of layers two and three.
• We see a consistent relationship albeit with small levels of inflation, potentially driven by claimants per claim inflation.
• The implied claimant per claim ratio consistent with this hypothesis is 1.4.

Assuming claims finishing in layers two and three are predominantly whiplash-type claims (with those in layer two being single claimant and those in layer three being multi-claimant):
• The previous slide would then give an approximation to the average claimants per claim for multi-claimant whiplash-type claims of 2.7.
• Using the number of claims ultimately finishing in layers two and three as a weighting (slide 30), this implies an average number of claimants per claim for all whiplash-type claims of circa 1.4.
**Transactional Analysis – 10k-20k Layer**

**Data trends**

**FGU Incurred Burning Cost**

Layer 3: 10k to 20k

- The overall burning cost is particularly high for 2011, with low inflation in 2010.
- Typical inflation is in the range of 14% to 16%, smoothing over the surge in 2009, the potential anomaly of 2010, and the "catch-up" in 2011.

**Inflation Rates**

- 10-11: 21.5%
- 09-10: 2.6%
- 08-09: 25.4%
- 07-08: 14.6%
- 06-07: 13.9%

---

**Transactional Analysis**

- 20k to 50k Layer
- Our prior hypothesis is that this layer is largely free of multi-claimant whiplash type claims.
- Claims ending in this layer contribute significant cost per policy at £x (just slightly less than layers 2 and 3).
Transactional Analysis – 20k-50k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates
10Q1-11Q1: 23.1%  09Q1-10Q1: -3.3%

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates
10Q2-11Q2: 28.1%  09Q2-10Q2: -4.8%
2010 shows unusual behaviour. The frequency trends in this layer are not dissimilar to the layers below, however are more volatile.

Settlement rates slowed post MOJ, with evidence of catching up in the 2011 accident year, as well as an operational catch up in all earlier periods.
This has been stable or reducing.
Given the accelerating settlement rates for pre-MOJ accident periods, the reductions would suggest improving case estimate strengths
Post-MOJ, the reduction in the ratios is consistent with the reduced settlement rates
Consistent inflation, not dissimilar to the 7% indexation
The inflation sits slightly below the figures seen for the layer below

Settled inflation rates are above incurred. We have already observed that case estimate strength may be increasing. Normally this would lead to settled inflation being lower than incurred inflation, however the increase in settlement rates for the older years may make this consistent. It does however fail to explain the discrepancies for the more recent years – reword.

This is slightly puzzling given the previous observation on increasing case estimate strength.
Recent data is possibly unreliable.
Transactional Analysis – 20k-50k Layer
Data trends

FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer 4 over FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer 3

One hypothesis: these are multi-claimant claims

Inflation Rates
10-11: 3.7%  09-10: -0.6%  08-09: 0.5%  07-08: -0.6%  06-07: -0.2%

Inflation Rates
10-11: 26.3%  09-10: -4%  08-09: 29%  07-08: 20.8%  06-07: 10.7%

As seen on lower bands, 2010 is anomalous. Headline burning cost inflation is in excess of 20%
Transactional Analysis

- 50k to 100k Layer

Transactional Analysis – 50k-100k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Inflation Rates
10-11: 37.8%  09-10: -3.8%  08-09: 7.7%  07-08: 15.3%  06-07: 1.3%
Transactional Analysis – 50k-100k Layer
Data trends

TPI/TPD Claim Numbers Ratio

Development Quarter

Inflation Rates
10Q4-11Q4: 48%  09Q4-10Q4: 5.6%

2010 shows unusual behaviour
This layer is well beyond multi-claimant whiplash
type claims, and shows behaviour more in line with
third party accident frequencies
2011 however is to date showing high inflation
whether this persists in further development
simply due to earlier recognition across the market
remains to be seen.

Reported Claim Frequency

2010 shows unusual behaviour
The layer is well beyond multi-claimant
whiplash type claims, and shows behaviour
more in line with third party accident frequencies
2011 however is to date showing high inflation
whether this persists in further development
simply due to earlier recognition across the market
remains to be seen.
Transactional Analysis – 50k-100k Layer
Data trends

Claim Settlement Rate

Large increase in settlement rate for all years in recent post MOJ periods

Paid to Incurred Ratio

This has been broadly constant, with slight increases. These increases are less than those seen in settlement rates, and so do not point to any weakening in case estimate strength
Inflation is broadly consistent in the range 6% to 8%, but increasing slightly.
Transactional Analysis – 50k-100k Layer

Data trends

FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer
Layer 5: 50k to 100k

Settled data in this layer is very volatile, however the headline inflation measures are not inconsistent with that seen for incurred cost.

Inflation Rates
09-10: -0.5%  08-09: 7.9%  07-08: 5%  06-07: 5.5%

Transactional Analysis – 50k-100k Layer

Data trends

FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer 5 over FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer 4

Reduction in these ratios show that this layer is slightly less inflationary than the one below.

Inflation Rates
09-10: -6.4%  08-09: -0.4%  07-08: -1.9%  06-07: -1.2%
Transactional Analysis – 50k-100k Layer
Data trends

FGU Incurred Burning Cost
Layer 5: 50k to 100k

2010 and 2011 again appear anomalous. However, average inflation across all periods in the range 9% to 11%

Introduction
Graph terminology
### Introduction

Graph terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Type 2 - Burning cost contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; £5m</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2m - 5m</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1m - 2m</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£500k - 1m</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£250k - 500k</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100k - 250k</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50k - 100k</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20k - 50k</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10k - 20k</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1k - 10k</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£0 - 1k</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We note that the CRU Data continues to show frequency INCREASES not DECREASES

- Number of motor cases registered to the Compensation Recovery Unit has increased in each year
- The number registered in the 2011-12 financial year was 5% higher than in the previous year, the lowest recent level of year-on-year growth, but follows a 17% increase last year and sits in the context of a long term 10% trend
- This is based on registration so may reflect an element of speeding up in 2010.
Average CRU recoveries show DECREASE – but only for Motor

- Average recovery for motor cases settled by the Compensation Recovery Unit has decreased in 4 of the last 5 years
- The average motor recovery in the 2011-12 financial year was £51, 19% lower than in the previous year, but follows a 2% increase last year and sits in the context of a long term -10% trend
- Average recoveries in other lines of business all show increasing or flat trends (Clinical Negligence +13%, Employers Liability +17%, Public Liability 0%)

Claim Management Company update

- We have, again, extracted and analysed details of the count and location of CMCs.
- Our analysis shows that the number of authorised CMCs decreased to 2,453 a reduction of 5% in the year to March 2012. (This compares to modest growth of 3% in the previous year).
- While the growth in the number of CMCs has stopped, income continues to increase.
- The MoJ annual Claim Regulation report shows revenues in 2011 rose by 21% to £455m.
Claim Management Companies: slightly fewer but more activity (+52% in 2010; + 21% in 2011)

**Key**
- TPWP estimate of count of CMCs.
- TPWP data extraction periods.
- Count of CMCs from MoJ annual report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Nov</th>
<th>CMC £m</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>YoY % inc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>247.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>377.0</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>455.4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market statistics**

**Scene setting**

- Motor environment is evolving fast: but with tailwinds as well as headwinds
  - Gender Directive
  - Solvency II
  - Low investment returns
  - Fuel prices and the cost of motoring
  - Market premium increases unwinding (1)
  - But still CORs above 100%
  - PPOs and review of Ogden discount rate
  - MoJ - extension of process, review of fees
  - LASPO Act (banning of referral fees)
  - Whiplash consultation, increase to SCT
  - OFT enquiry on credit hire / repair
  - Simmons v Castle - general damages up 10%

FSA returns for 2011 show a net COR of 106% and a loss ratio of 78% for 2011 (2)

- Our study covers the cost of third party claims which cover 70% of Motor Insurance claims costs – the OFT figures cite TPI – 50%, other TPD = 20% (3)
- Focus of working party (Third Party) is therefore on the most analytically problematic and the most material areas of cost and provides information to help actuaries, consumers, regulators and companies make informed decisions

**Sources**

1. Confused.com/Towers Watson Insurance Price Index shows Private Comp rates dropped by 7.1% in 12 months to end June 2012
2. Deloitte Analysis of AM Best data
Legislative Developments
Ogden Discount Rate

- The current discount rate of 2.5% was set in June 2001 by reference to the yield on Index-Linked Government Stock (ILGS) over the previous three years.
  - The approach used in 2001 would now lead to a discount rate of c.1%.
- Under pressure from claimant solicitors, Lord Chancellor Kenneth Clarke agreed to review the discount rate.
- The Ministry of Justice has now issued a consultation on the methodology used to set the discount rate. This asks for views on two possible bases
  1. An approach based on recent ILGS yields, similar to that used in 2001;
  2. An approach based on a mixed portfolio of investments
- This consultation closes on 23rd October. But further new consultation has recently been announced, to be issued in Autumn 2012, on "whether the restrictions on the factors that can be taken into account in prescribing a rate" ... "are still appropriate."
- The new Lord Chancellor, Chris Grayling, will then have to consider the responses, decide on an appropriate methodology and consult further (at least with the Government Actuary and the Treasury) before making any announcement.
  - This means that the discount rate is unlikely to change before mid-2013 at the earliest
- Any reduction in discount rate would increase the cost of settling large personal injury claims.
  - It could also increase the attractiveness to claimants of lump sum awards relative to PPOs
  - A period of uncertainty before the setting of a new rate could lead to delays in settlement of large claims.
  - In insurance, this would impact Motor Liability and Commercial General Liability (EL/PL), but also MOD and NHS settlements

Legislative Developments
MoJ Process

- The Ministry of Justice wrote to interested parties in February 2012 inviting views on its plans to extend the existing MoJ process for road traffic accidents to cover claims up to £25,000.
- The then Justice Minister Jonathan Djanogly indicated to Parliament that changes would take effect in April 2013.
  - However, there has been no formal confirmation that this extension will take place or when.
- The Ministry also sought views on a possible reduction in the level of fixed recoverable costs for MoJ claims.
  - Many consider that a reduction in recoverable costs (both for MoJ claims and under the predictable costs regime) is a natural corollary of the ban on referral fees.
Legislative Developments

LASPO Act

- The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act received Royal Assent in May 2012.
- It is expected to come into force in April 2013.
- LASPO introduces many of the reforms proposed by Lord Justice Jackson in his review of civil litigation costs.
- The Act will
  - Ban referral fees for personal injury claims
  - Make success fees and After-the-Event legal expense insurance premiums unrecoverable from the liable insurer
  - Introduce Damages Based agreements (whereby claimant solicitors take a percentage of any damages awarded)
- The introduction of Qualified One-Way Costs Shifting, also proposed by Jackson, is not included in LASPO but is widely expected to be introduced by an amendment to the Civil Procedure Rules from the same time.
  - This would mean that (other than in exceptional circumstances) an unsuccessful claimant would not be liable for the defendant’s costs, negating the need for legal expense insurance.

Legislative Development

General Damages

- Lord Justice Jackson recommended in his report that awards of general damages should be increased by 10% to compensate claimants for the non-recoverability of success fees and ATE premiums (introduced in the LASPO Act).
- The Court of Appeal used the case of Simmons v Castle to announce that general damages awards made from 1st April 2013 would be increased by 10%, in line with Jackson’s recommendation.
- This would create a mismatch of timing, with success fees and ATE premiums still recoverable for agreements entered into before April, but general damages increased if the claim is subsequently settled after April.
- It is also likely that this would cause delays in settlement of claims before April, with claimant solicitors holding out for a higher award if the claim remains open until then.
- The ABI applied to the Court to intervene in this case and the Court agreed to listen to submissions both from the ABI and from the Association of Personal Injury Lawyers. The date for this hearing has been provisionally set for 25th September.
Legislative Developments

Other developments

- The Government is expected to issue a consultation paper shortly on options to reduce whiplash claims.
  - Possible options include raising the small claims track limit for injury claims from £1000 to £5000. This would mean that legal costs would not be recoverable for the majority of whiplash claims.
  - Another possible measure is to establish an independent panel of medical experts to diagnose whiplash injuries rather than relying on GPs.
- The Office of Fair Trading recently completed a review into credit hire and repair.
  - Its report was published in May and found that dysfunctional practices within the insurance industry added £10 to the average cost of a motor insurance policy.
  - The OFT was provisionally minded to refer the matter to the Competition Commission. It will make a final decision on whether or not to make a referral in October.

Motor Premium Rate Movements

Confused.com/Towers Watson Car Insurance Price Index

- Average prices across the UK have fallen by 2.3% in the second quarter, contributing to a 7.1% decrease in the last 12 months.
- For the third quarter out of the last four, prices for comprehensive insurance fell, having been flat in the final quarter of 2011.
- Average price is the average of the 5 cheapest quotes obtained on confused.com.

Source: Confused.com / Towers Watson Car Insurance Price Index July 2012
Police statistics

Reported Injuries (Stats 19)

Source: www.data.gov.uk

Reported Injuries per accident

Police vs Market data

Police statistics show a decreasing trend in time unlike the ratio of TPI to TPD market data.
Police statistics
Reported Injuries

Police vs Market data

TPWP data: TPI frequency
Police stats: Casualties

Slides to be updated
show a decreasing number of injuries in time unlike the market TPI frequency data

Excess of capped bodily injury
Projected Results (Type 1)

The lead up to 2007/8 accident years saw a redistribution and an up-weighting of the smaller claims
Capped bodily injury
Projected Results (Type 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Year</th>
<th>&lt; 100k</th>
<th>£0 - 1k</th>
<th>£1k - 10k</th>
<th>£10k - 20k</th>
<th>£20k - 50k</th>
<th>£50k - 100k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**
- Frequency: 1.0%
- Severity: 1.0%

**Projected Results (Type 2)**

**Frequency**
- Impacted by TPD frequency – Slide X. A clearer view comes when year on year differences are accounted for.
- Inflation is volatile but has been reducing overall and for Band 2, averaging 7-8% across all years, 6-7% (2008-2011)
- Inflation has been increasing for layers 3&4 with higher volatility, averaging 8%, or 7-10% (2008-2011)
- Inflation is broadly flat for layer 5 averaging 1%.
- Frequency inflation is more volatile for layers 3 and above

**Severity**
- Inflation has increased since 2008, averaging 5% across all years, 8% (2008-2011)
- Although they are slight increases in inflation within each layer post 2008, increases in the overall severity inflation are driven by a rebalancing across the layers with the up-weighting of layers 3&4.
- For Layer 1, inflation was particularly high in 2010, potentially driven by MOJ changes.
- For Layer 5, inflation has been higher in the last 2 years (at 11%) than the all year average of 8%.
Capped bodily injury
Projected Results (Type 2)

Private Car Comprehensive Type 2 Layered Results (all layers given in 2010 money, indexed at 7% pa) - Implied % Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Year</th>
<th>£0 - 1k</th>
<th>£1k - 10k</th>
<th>£10k - 20k</th>
<th>£20k - 50k</th>
<th>£50k - 100k</th>
<th>&lt; 100k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capped bodily injury
Projected Results (Type 2)

Burn Cost

- Burn Cost inflation is built from frequency and severity inflation. However as we have noted, frequency inflation is itself impacted by year on year movements in the number of accidents. We have not normed for this impact. If we did, inflation would be higher.
- Inflation has increased since 2007, averaging 13% across all years, 15% (2008-2011), with recent TPD led reductions in frequency inflation being more than offset by increases in severity inflation.
- Burn cost inflation is not dissimilar across layers 2 to 5, but layers 3&4 have seen the greatest increases since 2008.

2011 is an outlier (or a new trend?) with higher inflation at 18%. High inflation is universal other than in layer 2, but is particularly marked in layers 3, 4 and 5 (c. 30%). Inflation across 2010 and 2011 is not out of line with longer averages.
Capped bodily injury
Projected Results (Type 2)

Proportion of Ultimate Capped Claim Frequencies Finishing in Layer

Proportion of Ultimate Capped Burning Cost Finishing in Layer

• This distribution is relatively stable without the diluting effect of the excess claims
Summary of FOI Whiplash Data

- To be completed later

Results of Questionnaire

- Following the initial data collection exercise, it became apparent that the breadth of data available from contributors was less than desired
- The Working Party issued a data questionnaire asking contributors to assess the availability of 13 desired data items, and if unavailable, whether there were plans to capture this data.
- Contributors were asked to comment on claims handling systems and actuarial systems separately.
- The results from the 10 respondents are shown on the following slides
Conclusions

- Claims Handling Systems capture the majority of the additional data items, with the exception of PPOs
- Actuarial Systems are not generally extracting these additional data items
- Actuarial Systems need to be enhanced to monitor changing claims environment (e.g. MoJ process) and to be able to provide enhanced support to the business
- Whilst some data items are not currently available (classified as red), some companies have developed ad-hoc or manual data feeds to monitor this data
Transactional Analysis – 20k-50k Layer

Data trends

FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer 4 over FGU Average Cost of Claims Settling in Layer 3

One hypothesis: these are multi-claimant claims

Inflation Rates
10-11: 3.7%  09-10: -0.6%  08-09: 0.5%  07-08: -0.6%  06-07: -0.2%