Principle-Based Reserve Projections Questions... Answered!

American Academy of Actuaries PBA Projections Practice Note Work Group

Ben Slutsker, FSA, MAAA Kevin Piotrowski, FSA, MAAA Dylan Strother, FSA, MAAA



Objective. Independent. Effective.™

© 2020 American Academy of Actuaries. All rights reserved. May not be reproduced without express permission.

SOCIETY OF ACTUARIES Antitrust Notice for Meetings

Active participation in the Society of Actuaries is an important aspect of membership. However, any Society activity that arguably could be perceived as a restraint of trade exposes the SOA and its members to antitrust risk. Accordingly, meeting participants should refrain from any discussion which may provide the basis for an inference that they agreed to take any action relating to prices, services, production, allocation of markets or any other matter having a market effect. These discussions should be avoided both at official SOA meetings and informal gatherings and activities. In addition, meeting participants should be sensitive to other matters that may raise particular antitrust concern: membership restrictions, codes of ethics or other forms of self-regulation, product standardization or certification. The following are guidelines that should be followed at all SOA meetings, informal gatherings and activities:

- DON'T discuss your own, your firm's, or others' prices or fees for service, or anything that might affect prices or fees, such as costs, discounts, terms of sale, or profit margins.
- DON'T stay at a meeting where any such price talk occurs.
- DON'T make public announcements or statements about your own or your firm's prices or fees, or those of competitors, at any SOA meeting or activity.
- DON'T talk about what other entities or their members or employees plan to do in particular geographic or product markets or with particular customers.
- DON'T speak or act on behalf of the SOA or any of its committees unless specifically authorized to do so.
- **DO** alert SOA staff or legal counsel about any concerns regarding proposed statements to be made by the association on behalf of a committee or section.
- **DO** consult with your own legal counsel or the SOA before raising any matter or making any statement that you think may involve competitively sensitive information.
- DO be alert to improper activities, and don't participate if you think something is improper.



Objective. Independent. Effective.™ © 2020 American Academy of Actuaries. All rights reserved. May not be reproduced without express permission.

If you have specific questions, seek guidance from your own legal counsel or from the SOA's Executive Director or legal counsel.

Presentation Disclaimer

Presentations are intended for educational purposes only and do not replace independent professional judgment. Statements of fact and opinions expressed are those of the participants individually and, unless expressly stated to the contrary, are not the opinion or position of the Society of Actuaries, its cosponsors or its committees. The Society of Actuaries does not endorse or approve, and assumes no responsibility for, the content, accuracy or completeness of the information presented. Attendees should note that the sessions are audio-recorded and may be published in various media, including print, audio and video formats without further notice.



PBA Projections Practice Note Overview

Ben Slutsker, FSA, MAAA



PBA Projections

Principle-Based Approach (PBA) Projections refers to projecting future principle-based reserves and/or capital at future valuation dates.

This is distinct from point-in-time valuation, which refers to calculating principle-based reserves and/or capital at the current valuation date. Principle-based projections, in contrast, forecasts this calculation at future periods.



Academy PBA Projections Practice Note

- Joint effort from Academy PBR Governance Work Group and Life Valuation and Life Product Committees
 - Released in December 2019
 - Centralized repository for PBA projection and nested modeling industry resources
 - Builds on VM-20 practice note with focus on projections
- **Practice note on common methods / techniques for projecting PBA reserves**
 - Asset complexities: spreads, defaults, starting assets
 - Mortality grading, credibility, improvement
 - Simplifications
 - Visuals for projections and nested modeling

Practice note scope

6

- Focuses on VM-20
- Also applicable to VM-21 and RBC C3 Phase II



PBA Projections Practice Note Contents

Overview

- Visual and Definitions
- Overview Q&A

High-Level Subject Areas

- General PBA Projections
- Analysis and Reporting
- Governance and Validation
- Pricing
- Model Efficiency and Reserve Estimation

Specific Topics

- Mortality
- Policyholder Behavior and Non-Guaranteed Elements
- Reinsurance
- Economic Scenario Generation
- Assets



Beginnings of PBA Projections Practice Note

- As companies implemented VM-20 point-in-time reserves, there appeared to still be significant ambiguity around projections
- Various industry articles/presentations on certain aspects of PBA projections, but no single centralized repository
- Therefore, the Academy decided to develop a practice note that could be a go-to reference for such questions
- Serves as a complement to the Academy VM-20 Practice Note, which is a great resource for understanding VM-20 requirements and point-in-time valuations



Nested Modeling Framework





How Do Actuaries Use Nested Models?

Valuation models can be nested within more general projection models (pricing, ALM, etc.) to forecast PBR and other calculations that require their own separate cashflow projections

Examples of general earnings projection models (outer loops)

- Planning/Forecasting
- Product Pricing
- ALM/Risk Management
- Inforce Management

Examples of projected items that require their own separate cash flow models (inner loops)

- VM-20 reserves (separate inner loops for DR and SR)
- VM-21 reserves
- GAAP FIA reserves (VED and Host)
- Economic reserves/capital



Types of Nested Modeling

Nested Modeling Type	Outer Loop / Inner Loop	Example			
Deterministic on Deterministic	Deterministic Outer Loop, Deterministic Inner Loop	Term VM-20 deterministic reserves (inner loop) under pricing best estimate scenario (outer loop)			
Stochastic on Deterministic	Deterministic Outer Loop, Stochastic Inner Loop	ULSG VM-20 stochastic reserves (inner loop) under pricing best estimate scenario (outer loop)			
Deterministic on Stochastic	Stochastic Outer Loop, Deterministic Inner Loop	VUL VM-20 deterministic reserves (inner loop) under risk-based pricing stochastic scenarios (outer loop)			
Stochastic on Stochastic	Stochastic Outer Loop, Stochastic Inner Loop	ULSG VM-20 stochastic reserves (inner loop) under risk-based pricing stochast scenarios (outer loop)			
Stochastic-on-Stochastic- on-Stochastic	Stochastic Outer Loop, Stochastic Inner Loop, Stochastic calculations within the inner loop	IUL VM-20 stochastic reserves (inner loop) under risk-based pricing stochastic scenarios (outer loop), with hedge value projections (inner inner loop)			



Types of Nested Modeling

Visual example of nested modeling at a single node





Future of Nested Modeling

- VM-20 business will emerge as a larger portion of companies' inforce life insurance blocks over time
- Enhanced vendor solutions and computing technology
- Future regulatory initiatives, such as possible fixed annuity PBR and C3 Phase II frameworks



Specific topics

- Mortality
- □ Assets



PBA Mortality Projections

Kevin Piotrowski, FSA, MAAA



Presentation Disclaimer

The views expressed by the presenter are not necessarily those of Ernst & Young LLP (EY US).

This material has been prepared for general informational purposes only and is not intended to be relied upon as accounting, tax or other professional advice. Please refer to your advisors for specific advice.



NPR mortality

Projection of future mortality improvement in the form of a new CSO table

Guidance Note: The *Valuation Manual* can be updated by the NAIC to define a new valuation table. Because of the various implications to systems, form filings and related issues (such as product tax issues), lead time is needed to implement new requirements without market disruption. It is recommended that this transition be for a period of about 4.5 years—that is, that the table be adopted by July 1 of a given year, that it be permitted to be used starting Jan. 1 of the second following calendar year, that it be optional until Jan. 1 of the fifth following calendar year, and thereafter mandatory. It is further intended that the adoption of such tables would apply to all business issued since the adoption of this *Valuation Manual*. The details of how to implement any unlocking of mortality tables will need to be addressed in the future.

Anticipated experience vs. CSO table



Modeling mortality for the DR/SR

1) Nested modeling



3) 'One vector' approach

2) Distinct model runs



4) All inner-loop



Mortality improvement

Industry tables

g. Mortality improvement shall not be incorporated beyond the valuation date. However, historical mortality improvement from the date of the industry basic table (e.g., Jan. 1, 2008, for the 2008 VBT and July 1, 2015, for the 2015 VBT) to the valuation date may be incorporated using the improvement factors for the applicable industry basic table as determined by the SOA and published on the SOA website, <u>https://www.soa.org/research/topics/indiv-val-exp-study-list/</u> (Mortality Improvement Rates for AG-38 for Year-End YYYY).

Company specific tables

Beyond the valuation date



Mortality Improvement example



© 2019 American Academy of Actuaries. All rights reserved May not be reproduced without express permission.

Mortality Assumption Update Impact on Inner and Outer Loop Assumptions 7.00 The inner loop (DR) mortality is similar to the outer -2015 VBT loop (BE) mortality in early durations, but grades into 6.00 BE Mortality (pre-update) industry experience in later durations. As a result, the impact of the assumption update is reflected fully in BE Mortality (post-update) the DR mortality assumption in early durations, but the impact of the assumption update eventually 5.00 -DR Mortality (pre-update) wears off. In later durations, where the DR mortality assumption is fully based on industry experience, the Mort Rate per 1000 DR Mortality (post-update) assumption update has no impact. 4.00 3.00 BE Mortality = 85% RR 2015 VBT DR Mortality = BE Mortality + Margin, with Grading 2.00 The impact of the mortality assumption update is reflected in 1.00 the projected outer loop mortality. 0.00 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 17 18 16

Duration

Credibility/Sufficiency data period

- Improvements to mortality 'parameters' with each year of new data
 - Credibility
 - Sufficient data period

Projection			
Year	Credibility	"D"	
1	58%	34	
2	60%	35	
10	85%	50	
11	90%	50	

Projections inside vs. outside the system





New business

Accelerated underwriting and/or simplified issue



Putting it all together

- Mortality is both complex, and the most influential assumption on the liabilities
- The rigor used to determine the assumption should be driven by its purpose – complexity is not always better



PBA Asset Projections and case study

Dylan Strother, FSA, MAAA



Asset related nested modeling topics

There are additional challenges and complexities for asset modeling when performing a nested projection of reserves

Economic scenarios

Existing assets

Reinvestments

Other considerations



Economic scenarios



Key inputs for generating interest rates for inner loop economic scenarios are mean reversion parameter and a starting yield curve

American Academy of Actuaries

Existing assets

Challenges

- □ Starting assets
- Externally projected existing asset cash flows
- Asset collar requirement
- Negative assets







Prescribed spreads and default factors

Reinvestment strategy and guardrail requirements

Disinvestment



Other considerations



Common simplifications

Model efficiency / run time reduction



Asset PBR projection key takeaways

- 1
- Changes to the asset modeling approach may be required to support projections of reserves

Simplifications are common, driven by runtime concerns and model system limitations



Asset projections and overall PBR projections should be fit for purpose



Projecting PBR case study (1/2)



Analysis performed in support of the industry field test required projecting PBR reserves using a representative PBR model



Projecting PBR case study (2/2)

NAIC YRT Field Test

Model Analysis File

Inner Loop PBR As of: 2019 11 18

	Block Pivot Indicator	12/31/2019			12/31/2023		
	Calendar Year	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Gross Premium	Outer Loop	-	96.7	93.3	89.8	86.4	83.0
	Loop 12.31.19	101.0	98.7	96.2	93.6	90.9	88.2
	Loop 12.31.23	-	-	-	-	-	87.3
	12.31.19 Inner/Outer		102%	103%	104%	105%	106%
	12.31.23 Inner/Outer						105%
	Outer	58.1	56.3	54.4	52.6	50.8	49.0
Coverages EOY	Loop 12.31.19	58.7	57.4	56.1	54.8	53.4	52.1
	Loop 12.31.23	-	-	-		52.6	51.3
	Outer	70.4	135	198	256	307	352
CSV Per Policy	Loop 12.31.19	69.9	135	201	261	317	366
	Loop 12.31.23	-	-	-	-	256	308
Net Earned Rate	Outer	4.34%	4.69%	4.65%	4.63%	4.58%	4.51%
(Outer vs. 1.31.19)	Loop 12.31.19	2.92%	4.32%	4.29%	4.24%	4.15%	4.08%
,	Inner Less Outer		-0.4%	-0.4%	-0.4%	-0.4%	-0.4%
Net Earned Rate	Outer	4.34%	4.69%	4.65%	4.63%	4.58%	4.51%
(Outer vs. 12.31.23)	Loop 12.31.23	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.95%
	Inner Less Outer					-4.6%	-0.6%
Net Earned Rate	Loop 12.31.19	2.92%	4.32%	4.29%	4.24%	4.15%	4.08%
(1.31.19 vs. 12.31.23)	Loop 12.31.23	U.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.95%
	Innner Less Inner					-4.2%	-0.1%



Analysis tools that perform high level sensibility checks can be useful for confirming modeled results at future valuation points at a glance



Projecting PBR case study takeaways

Organization is key to obtaining accurate results

 Visualization and analytics can be useful to understand and confirm the integrity of model results at a high level

The best way to gain intuition is performing analysis





- Projections are only as good as the models and more complicated is not necessarily better
- Assumptions/models should be set/calibrated for a specific purpose
- Model output should be structured to give flexibility for adhoc analysis









Presenter bios



Biographies – Kevin Piotrowski

Kevin Piotrowski, FSA, CERA, MAAA Insurance and Actuarial Advisory Services, Ernst & Young LLP

Kevin works in the Insurance and Actuarial Advisory Services practice of Ernst & Young LLP's Financial Services Office. He is based in New York and has 9+ years of consulting experience. He serves as an advisor to large insurance companies and is focused on Financial Reporting.

Kevin focuses his time on various aspects of insurance including assumption setting, valuation, reinsurance reporting and capital management. Additionally he has been involved in large scale model validation projects as well as assisting companies to transform their actuarial systems and processes (Actuarial Transformation). Recently, Kevin has focused his efforts on Principle-Based Reserves - managing review of both AG-48 and VM-20 implementations at several companies. He has written articles around PBR implementation and is involved in the SOA's effort to provide more depth/breadth around Principle-Based Reserves.

Kevin is a Fellow of the Society of Actuaries (FSA), a Chartered Enterprise Risk Analyst (CERA) and a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries (MAAA)



Biographies – Dylan Strother

Dylan Strother, FSA, MAAA Oliver Wyman Actuarial Consulting

Dylan is a Senior Consultant with the Actuarial Practice of Oliver Wyman and is based in New York. He is an expert in statutory and GAAP valuation and financial reporting across a variety of products and has assisted clients extensively with emerging financial regulations such as PBR and LDTI, in addition to working extensively with modeling, model validation and M&A.

Especially active with Life PBR projects, Dylan was one of the team leads supporting the analysis and development of insights for the VM-20 YRT field test. He routinely volunteers for PBR related initiatives, such as the PBA Projections Practice Note Work Group. He also frequently speaks and writes articles on the subject.

Dylan is a Fellow of the Society of Actuaries and a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries



Biographies – Ben Slutsker

Ben Slutsker, FSA, MAAA New York Life Insurance Company

Ben Slutsker is a Corporate Vice President & Actuary for New York Life Insurance Company, where he works in the Office of the Chief Actuary and is responsible for actuarial regulatory oversight. In past roles, Ben has worked in Individual Life Financial Reporting, New York Life International, BOLI/COLI Pricing, and previously led the implementation of Principles-Based Reserving.

Ben currently chairs the American Academy of Actuaries Annuity Reserves Work Group and the Society of Actuaries Life Financial Modeling Exam Curriculum Committee. In addition, he is a member of the Academy Life Practice Council, Life Valuation Committee, and PBR Implementation Work Group.

Ben is a Fellow of the Society of Actuaries (FSA) and a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries (MAAA).

