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The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those held by the authors individually and do not represent the views and opinions of their employers or the Institute and Faculty of Actuaries.

Although we have used our best efforts, no warranty is given about the accuracy of the information and no liability can be accepted for anybody relying on the accuracy of the information or following the recommendations in this paper.
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1. Background – Risk Pooling

- PPO – a brief recap
- Is there appetite for PPO risk transfer?
- Possible risk transfer solutions
- Why pool risks?
PPO – a brief recap

• Different **risks** from typical motor/liability insurance:
  – Mortality
  – Care-workers’ earnings

• Longer **duration** than GI, resulting in different:
  – Investment
  – Administration

• No **matching** assets
Is there appetite for PPO risk transfer?

2014 GIRO PPO Working Party Qualitative Survey results.

- **Cost** quoted as the key hurdle in constructing a transaction.
Reinsurance availability

Changes in Reinsurance offerings due to PPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Number of Reinsurers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No longer write Motor RI business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly reduced XoL Motor writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No longer write uncapped XoL Motor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalisation clauses apply to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All PPO business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50% PPO business</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of reinsurers surveyed</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2015 PPO Working Party Qualitative Survey*
So Why Pool Risks?

• **CAPITALISATION** (lump sum in lieu of future payments) - so no exit, **long tail risk reverts to the insurer**

• Risk is long term, substantial, un-hedgeable – suggests alternatives need to be explored

• Risk pooling – is there a case for grouping of separate firms’ PPOs? How will it help?
2. Pooling PPOs – a Simple Model

- Model outline
- Diversification benefit
- Model sensitivities
- Interpretation of Results
Model Outline – Overall

A simulation model is built in R to quantify financial benefits of pooling.

For simplicity, the following is modelled:

• Settled PPOs only
• FGU losses (ie no RI)
• Assume investment in risk-free assets
• Ultimate time horizon

Charts/ figures are meant for illustrative purposes only.
1. Claimant details

- Age
- Sex
- Mortality impairment
- Annual PPO amount

2. Simulate unindexed cashflows

- Individual mortality mis-estimation
- Systemic medical improvement
- Population mortality improvement
- Individuals’ deaths

3. Simulate indexed, discounted cashflows

- RPI
- ASHE-RPI differential
- Risk free yield curve

4. Aggregate discounted liabilities

Model Outline – Structure
Diversification Benefits

- Some diversification benefits from 10 to 50 claimants
- Very little diversification above 50 claimants
- Diversification limited by systemic drivers:
  - Medical improvements
  - Population mortality improvements
  - ASHE indexation
  - Discounting

1-in-200 Scenarios to Ultimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of claimants</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>200%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>99.5th-Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>99.5th-Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>99.5th-Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>99.5th-Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sensitivity: Mortality and ASHE

## Sensitivity results - 10 claimants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mortality impairment load</td>
<td>Average 4.7x</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Population mortality improvement long-term rate</td>
<td>1.5% pa</td>
<td>2.5% pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ASHE-RPI differential</td>
<td>0.5% pa</td>
<td>1.5% pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Discount rate</td>
<td>Gilt</td>
<td>Gilt + 1% pa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation of Results

• Pooling PPOs have some diversification benefits, but not significant
  – Little benefit for over 50 claimants
  – Small compared to uncertainty of other assumptions

• Key sensitivities include:
  – ASHE
  – Mortality impairment load
  – Discount rate/ investment return
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3. Investment Strategy – Alternative Assets

- Infrastructure Assets: Background
- Infrastructure Assets: Some Examples
- ALM Illustration
Infrastructure Assets: Introduction

- New Infrastructure asset class under Solvency II
- Mostly long term and biased towards annuities
- Possible categories
  - Infrastructure debt
  - Real estate backed debt
Infrastructure Assets: Some Examples

• Examples from IFoA WP paper ‘Non-traditional investments - key considerations for insurers Jan 2015’:
  – Date: July 13
  – Deal: Holyrood Student Accommodation PLC
  – Type: student accommodation, senior secured fixed-rate tranche and senior secured RPI-linked tranche of bonds, both due 2048,
  – Size: £63,000,000
  – Coupon: Fixed 5.5% & IL linked 2%
  – Fully amortising
  – Rating at issue: S&P AA, Moody’s A2

• Infrastructure loans: to date, default and the recovery rates on default much better (especially PFI/PPP) than corporate bonds.
ALM Illustration – Overview

• Simple model to illustrate impact of alternative investment strategy on VaR
  – 1-in-200 over ultimate horizon
  – Cashflow basis
  – Regulatory aspects not considered

• Liability cashflows from Baseline run for 50 claimants

• Infrastructure asset default probabilities extrapolated from 2014 S&P Global Corporate Default Study

Charts/figures are meant for illustrative purposes only
**ALM Illustration – Asset Allocation**

- Assets all invested in gilts and/or infrastructure assets
  - Simple cashflow model – insolvent if assets do not meet payments;
  - Gilts assumed to be risk-free and liquid
  - All coupons and loan amortisation reinvested in gilts
  - Up to 3 infrastructure assets are invested in the scenarios
  - Infrastructure example from 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure asset features</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Sensitivity 1</th>
<th>Sensitivity 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value as % Mean Liabilities</td>
<td>1/3rd</td>
<td>1/3rd</td>
<td>1/3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortised?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL: Fixed yield</td>
<td>50:50</td>
<td>50:50</td>
<td>50:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL yield</td>
<td>RPI + 2%</td>
<td>RPI + 2%</td>
<td>RPI + 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed yield</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect of Infrastructure Investments
Baseline Illustration

99.5% VaR as % Mean Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100% Gilts</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Infrastructure Assets</td>
<td>250%</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Effect of Infrastructure Investments
Sensitivities (3 infrastructure units case)

99.5% VaR as % Mean Liabilities

- 100% Gilts
- Baseline (3x Infra)
- Sen 1: BBB-rating
- Sen 2: RPI + 1%
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Alternative Assets: Initial Findings

- Results indicate drop in VaR for PPOs when invested in investment-grade infrastructure assets
  - Increase in default risk more than offset by higher than expected investment return than gilts
  - Some inflation matching offered by some assets
- Infrastructure assets are illiquid and sold in large blocks
  - Need fund of certain size to invest
  - Time and expertise for identifying and managing investments
- Economy of scale needed to benefit from infrastructure and other alternative assets
4. Potential Pooling Arrangements

• Operational features
• Outline structures
Pooling arrangements: operational considerations

• Criteria for entry – all PPO firms’ cases to be in Pool
• Pricing basis – objective, eg set by Pool
• Investment policy
• Profit/shortfall
  – Tracking facility for each firm of cumulative P&L
  – Regular reporting
  – Analysis of surplus (mortality, investment, expenses etc)
Pooling arrangement: general considerations

• Profit/Shortfall monitoring enables
  – Withdrawal terms
  – Wind up terms

• Rules for Deficit contribution/ apportionment

• Prevent adverse selection/cross-subsidization
Pooling – outline solutions

(A) PPO Purchasing Facility

- Selective entry
- Firms pay Facility premium who pay PPO
- Shortfall/surplus can be called/returned

(B) Captive

- Selective entry
- Owned by Insureds
- Need start up capital
- Could register in tax/capital efficient countries
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Pooling – summary

Advantages:
• Take advantage of better matching/alternative asset classes
• Benefit from diversification
• Benefit from economy of scale

Disadvantages:
• Start up costs/initial capital
• Risks of anti-selection
5. Conclusions and Next Steps

Pooling risks worth further investigation, but also more work

- Sounding out of insurer interest
- More detailed ALM
- Drawing lessons from other pooling arrangements
6. Discussion
Expressions of individual views by members of the Institute and Faculty of Actuaries and its staff are encouraged.

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