



SOCIETY OF ACTUARIES

Article From:

The Actuary

November 1985 – Volume No. 19, Issue No. 9



The Actuary

RECEIVED
NOV 4 1985

The Newsletter of the Society of Actuaries

VOL. 19, No. 9

November, 1985

THE ACTUARY — AN AGENT'S PERSPECTIVE

By Leonard S. Frieden

I approach this task with a great deal of trepidation since the president of my company is an actuary and the two top underwriting executives of my company are actuaries. I recognize that I may be running the risk of never having another case approved standard!

I certainly understand the role of the actuary in our industry, but I believe there could be considerably more interaction between the actuary and the field. Let me give you an example. As most of you are aware, there has been an emergence of extremely low cost annual renewable term insurance and so-called Graded Premium Whole Life Insurance disguised as term insurance offered by many non-participating brokerage oriented companies during the past five or six years. In order to compete in the marketplace, our agents were forced to place their term business with these low cost companies. The premiums with these cut-rate companies were so low on an initial basis that many agents in the industry rolled the business from one company to the next company every year to keep their competition from taking the term business away from them.

In my company, we did not have a competitive term product and hence did very little term business. Through our various General Agents' Association committees, we begged, pleaded and cajoled our actuaries to give us a term product that we could sell. We did not expect to have the least expensive product on the street; we just wanted to be in the ball park.

After a few years of begging and pleading, someone amongst our frater-

(Continued on page 6)

A LOOK AT OURSELVES

By E. James Morton

One of the popularly held beliefs about actuaries is that we can predict the future. I have often been introduced with some such phrase as "He's an actuary. That means he can tell you how long you are going to live (laughter)." Well, of course, we can't do that. But we have learned in the course of our training to project current trends of experience and thus set prices based on those "predictions."

Unfortunately, we're not very good at it. Perhaps we would do better to handle projections the way that my former boss Ed Matz described the approach of economists. He felt that the economist always has in his or her mind for any time-series of data a "normal" level. So in making projections the economist merely continues the current trend line for a couple of quarters and then heads it back towards "normality."

Whatever philosophy we have used, or are using in making projections, it could stand some improvement. Let me mention a few examples.

When I started to work as an actuarial student in 1949, the portfolio interest rate of my company was substantially under 3%. In every single year since that time, new money rates have exceeded the portfolio rates. But it took over 30 years and a near-disastrous cash crisis to convince actuaries in the company (including me) that high and volatile interest rates were real, that interest sensitive products have a future, and that asset-liability matching theory actually has some practical applications. Was it more comfortable for us to assume that rates would continue to rise for a few quarters and then return to normal?

(Continued on page 2)

HOW AN UNDERWRITER SEES US

By Charles A. Will

In Lincoln National's *Reinsurance Reporter*, July 1985, Mel McFall, Second Vice President, makes the point, "Actuaries and underwriters need to work together in establishing mortality assumptions and objectives..."

The point is valid and well taken but there is a more crying need — actuaries and underwriters need to *understand* each other.

Reflecting back on over 40 years, the feeling here is that they really don't have any *in depth* perception of each other's job and function. In today's challenging atmosphere, however, they most surely should. Unfortunately, each tends to travel their own one-way street.

It has been said that the actuary draws the road map and the underwriter does the driving. However, won't the actuary prepare a better map if he drives on occasion? And, knowing how the map was drawn will make a better driver of the underwriter.

LaVerne Cain, FSA, Senior Vice President of Mass Mutual, has said, "The actuary is a bridge player, the underwriter is a poker player."

True, but would it not help each of them if they knew more about each other's game other than that both are played with a deck of cards?

Underwriters tend to look (well, almost) on actuaries as expressed a while back in *The Anatomy of Britain* by Anthony Sampson as, "... basically highly specialized mathematicians ... versed in the intricate study of probabilities, on which the success of life insurance depends."

What actuaries tend to think of underwriters, being an underwriter, I

(Continued on page 6)

How An Underwriter Sees Us

(Continued from page 1)

am not qualified to state!

Back in 1977, speaking before the Canadian Reinsurance Conference, I made the point that the actuaries' course of study is, realistically speaking, limited as regards selection of risks. To my mind, it remains so today.

In my opinion, the same charge can also be leveled at the program of the Academy of Life Underwriting as regards the role of the actuary and how he goes about drawing the road map mentioned.

The problem is, of course, that each is a specialist in his own right and that speciality becomes his paramount area of concentration.

Over ten years ago, Jack Moorhead, FSA, wrote me, "...shouldn't the underwriters become more active in studying the statistics that actuaries are developing...?"

Of course they should, but conversely, why is it, as retired Ken Balay of Lincoln National has put it, "The underwriting decisions appear to me as the peak of vast, complex, hidden and in many ways mysterious mental processes that are not seen and never quite fully understood by other than underwriters." Why is this so, particularly to a good number of actuaries?

Neither underwriter nor actuary would argue that they interrelate. Both basically make judgments as to facts. Certainly the underwriter does and so does the actuary as Robin B. Leckie, FSA, wrote in *The Actuary*, May 1983, "...much of what actuaries do is judgment rather than science."

My point is this: let both start to get a much better understanding, feel if you will, as to the assumptions each makes so that the challenge both face can be met — together. Not only to the how and why of their jobs but also the concepts and philosophies that are contained therein.

How?

Perhaps a starting point would be for both to take a long hard look at their educational programs.

And then, while there have been and will continue to be exceptions, how many underwriters appear on the Society's programs and how many actuaries not directly engaged in under-

An Agent's Perspective

(Continued from page 1)

nity of home office actuaries must have heard us, and, in December 1983, they provided us with a competitive YRT product that finally put us in the ball park. While I do not have the records for the entire company, let me tell you what happened in my agency in 1984. We enjoyed our best year ever, paying for over \$1,000,000 of life insurance premium for the first time in the 56-year-history of the agency. Over \$100,000 of this premium was YRT premium. We had a case for \$1,700,000, another for \$2,000,000, and hundreds of cases in the \$250,000 to \$500,000 range. Lapses on this business have been almost nonexistent, and we are already beginning to see a number of conversions to permanent insurance after the first policy anniversary. In 1985, we have seen even greater activity in the term insurance marketplace. No one is even thinking about rolling our business to another company. In addition, much of the business placed with other companies is coming back to us.

Had our actuaries only heeded our pleas several years sooner, a substantial amount of premium dollars that went elsewhere could have stayed right home in our own coffers. I certainly hope that there will be even more interaction between the field and the actuaries in future years.

Let me give you another example of the same problem. For years on end, our agents were clamoring for a competitive disability income product. Our actuaries continued to tell us that the company was losing money on the current disability income product so we could not expect to have a more competitive product. The end result was the

writing on those of the HOLUA and the IHOU?

Could be I'm off base here, but on the other hand, to paraphrase something Henry Kissinger once said, "...the critic is obliged to stress imperfections in order to challenge assumptions and to goad actions."

Editor's Note: Charles A. Will is the chairman of his own consulting firm, and has written extensively about underwriting. □

same. Our agents were forced to market products offered by more competitive companies.

Then one day a few years ago, our company decided to give us a competitive product and for the past two years, agents throughout the country have been ringing up new disability income sales records every single month.

As you can see from these examples, we are asking our actuarial brethren to heed these voices from the wilderness. Give us competitive products to sell, and we will achieve sales results beyond our wildest imaginations.

Within our national sales organizations, we provided our actuaries with a vivid demonstration of the power of the field during the past five years that we have been marketing our Variable Life products. We were the second company on the street with Variable Life in late 1980 and early 1981 after its introduction a few years before. In my agency during the years of 1982-1985, Variable Life has accounted for 60% of our new paid life insurance premium.

Our actuaries and other home office executives never dreamed that the Variable Life product would be so successful. As a result, our administrative delivery system has been a disaster for the field, and our home office people have been working night and day to assist us in properly administering the Variable Life product. Once again, all we need is a reasonably competitive product that puts us in the ball park, and we will have no trouble selling it.

Let us move into the area of substandard underwriting and the role of the actuary in underwriting decisions. While I recognize that underwriting can never be an exact science and there certainly must be some judgment calls, there still seems to be a great deal of variance in underwriting actions between companies. I think that my company has an outstanding reinsurance program, and we are able to receive favorable underwriting action in the majority of cases.

Every now and then, however, we will have the occasional substantial case that all of our reinsurance outlets will see as a heavily rated case. Lo and behold, another company will come along with a standard offer. After all these years in agency management, I still have a great deal of difficulty ex-

(Continued on page 7)