COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE TECHNIQUES FOR ESTIMATING INCURRED BUT NOT REPORTED(IBNR) RESERVES

OLUBAYI BRIDGET MASITSA, 146649

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Bachelor in Business Science in Actuarial Science at Strathmore University

Strathmore Institute of Mathematical Sciences
Strathmore University
Nairobi, Kenya

January 2025

DECLARATION

I declare that this work has not been previously submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the Research Project contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the Research Project itself.

..…………….. [*Name of Candidate*]

……………….. [*Signature*]

……………... [*Date*]

This Research Project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the Supervisor.

..…………….. [*Name of Supervisor*]

……………….. [*Signature*]

……………... [*Date*]

Strathmore Institute of Mathematical Sciences

Strathmore University

ABSTRACT

The rising incidence of insurance companies breaching regulations has heightened concerns about their stability and affected millions of customers through unpaid and delayed claims. Accurate estimation of Incurred But Not Reported (IBNR) reserves is essential for maintaining the financial health of insurance companies. This study aims to evaluate, compare, and rank various IBNR reserve estimation techniques to identify the most reliable methods, considering both regulatory requirements and market conditions. The research will employ a quasi-experimental design, focusing on general insurance companies operating in Kenya. Secondary data, spanning from 2013 to 2023, will be collected from reliable sources including IRA annual reports and insurance company websites. The study will also review industry reports and publications on reserving practices. The analysis will assess the performance of different IBNR reserving techniques, such as the Basic Chain Ladder, Bornhuetter-Ferguson, and Mack Model, to determine which methods provide the most accurate and reliable reserves. The findings will contribute to minimizing under-reserving and over-reserving, thereby enhancing insurers' solvency and profitability.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

IRA- Insurance Regulatory Authority

IBNR-Incurred But Not Reported

IBNER-Incurred But Not Enough Reported

BCL-Basic Chain Ladder

BF-Bornhuetter Ferguson

UPR-Unearned Premium Reserve

OCR-Outstanding Claim Reserve

CHER-Claims Handling Expenses Reserve

DAC-Deferred Acquisition Cost

AURR-Additional Unexpired Risk Reserve

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

In the general insurance industry, setting aside reserves is critical for actuarial experts. These reserves ensure there are sufficient funds to pay future claims. If the reserves set aside are underestimated, the company may struggle to meet its future liabilities. Conversely, if reserve there are excessive reserves, the company's growth capacity and dividends to shareholders can be reduced. The emerging issue and need for proper and effective Incurred But Not Reported (IBNR) techniques in the insurance industry are thus becoming increasingly critical. Insurance companies rely on accurate IBNR estimations to ensure they have sufficient reserves to cover claims that have been incurred but have not yet been reported by the policyholder to the insurer. Inaccurate IBNR estimates can lead to regulatory penalties, damage to reputation, and loss of consumer trust. Implementation of the Solvency II directive in the European Union has heightened the importance of precise IBNR, as it requires insurers to hold enough capital to withstand a range of adverse scenarios (Bohnert, Born, & Gatzert, 2020). The failure to employ effective IBNR techniques can also have adverse effects on an insurer's financial performance. Inaccurate IBNR estimates can lead to either over-reserving or under-reserving.

Over-reserving ties up capital unnecessarily, reducing the funds available for investment and growth opportunities, ultimately impacting the company's profitability. Conversely, under-reserving can lead to sudden financial shortfalls when claims materialize, causing severe liquidity issues and potentially leading to insolvency (Kader, Adams, & Andersson, 2020). Furthermore, the mismanagement of IBNR reserves can erode stakeholder confidence (Bermúdez, Pérez, & Ayuso, 2021). In addition to financial and regulatory impacts, inadequate IBNR techniques can have operational consequences. Poor reserving practices can strain the relationship between different departments within an insurance company, such as actuarial, underwriting, and claims. Discrepancies in reserve estimates can lead to conflicts and inefficiencies, disrupting the smooth functioning of the organization. Effective communication and collaboration among departments are essential for accurate IBNR estimation and overall operational efficiency (Siddiqui & Niehaus, 2021). It is therefore essential to compare ,analyze and rank these techniques in order to determine the suitability of each method.

Implementing robust IBNR techniques that are transparent and well-understood across the organization can foster better internal collaboration and enhance the company's operational effectiveness. Examples of the negative effects stemming from inadequate IBNR techniques are evident in various high-profile cases. For instance, the collapse of certain insurance companies in the past can be traced back to insufficient reserving practices. Companies like Equitable Life in the UK faced significant financial distress partly due to underestimating their IBNR reserves, leading to insolvency and substantial losses for policyholders and investors (Hendry, 2020). Kenyan companies like Resolution insurance have also collapsed due to insufficient loss reserves and financial difficulties These examples underscore the potentially catastrophic consequences of failing to implement effective IBNR techniques, highlighting the critical need for accurate and reliable reserving practices.

In Kenya, insurers disclose two types of liabilities: premium liabilities and claims liabilities. Premium liabilities include Unearned Premium Reserve (UPR- a portion of the premium that has been paid by a policyholder but has not yet been earned by the insurance company) and Additional Unexpired Risk Reserve (AURR- loss component provision) and Deferred Acquisition Cost(DAC- cost incurred by an insurance company when acquiring new policies). Claims liabilities include claims outstanding, Incurred But Not Reported (IBNR) claims and Claim handling expenses. This study focuses on IBNR reserves, which are funds set aside for claims that have been incurred but have not yet been reported. Unlike known outstanding claims, IBNR claims need to be estimated. These reserves are crucial because they relate to losses that have already happened but have not been reported to the insurer and therefore have not yet been paid. Accurate IBNR estimation is vital for maintaining the financial stability of insurance companies, especially in Kenya, where recent collapses highlight the importance of precise reserving practices. This research aims to identify and carry out a comparative analysis the most reliable methods for IBNR estimation, considering regulatory demands and market conditions. It is fundamental to understand that IBNR reserve estimation is an actuarial practice that is essential for ensuring an insurer's solvency. This research implicitly supposes that different reserving techniques might be suitable for different claims characteristics often associated with different general insurance business lines.

1.2 Problem statement

The increasing number of insurance companies breaching regulations has raised significant concerns about their stability and has impacted millions of customers through unpaid and delayed claims. As of January 2024, the Insurance Regulatory Authority-Kenya (IRA) imposed fines totaling 94.85 million shillings on 202 insurers for various breaches, including failure to pay claims (IRA, 2024). During the fourth quarter of 2023, the IRA recorded 440 complaints, with 77.5% pertaining to general insurance and 22.5% against long-term insurers (IRA, 2023). Recently, Kenya has seen the collapse of major insurance companies. Resolution Insurance, for instance, failed due to insufficient loss reserves and financial difficulties. Placed under statutory management by the IRA in April 2022, it could not meet capital adequacy requirements and defaulted on its obligations. Additionally, Xplico Insurance was placed under statutory management in December 2023. In September 2023, the Consumer Federation of Kenya (Cofek) reported that at least 20 insurers continued to collect premiums despite lacking the capacity to pay claims, risking consumer losses exceeding 100 million shillings (Cofek, 2023

Accurate IBNR estimation is essential to prevent the financial instability that can lead to the collapse of insurance companies (Badescu et al., 2019; Zaroudi et al., 2021). The analysis and ranking of IBNR reserving techniques can optimize the accuracy of these reserve calculations. These will reduce the extent to which insurer’s under-reserve or over-reserve, which significantly impacts an insurer's solvency, profitability and capacity to pay out its future liabilities. Therefore, this research aims to evaluate, compare, and rank different IBNR reserve estimation techniques to identify the most reliable methods, considering regulatory requirements and market conditions.

1.4 Research objective

(i) To evaluate and compare various estimation techniques for Incurred But Not Reported (IBNR) claims to determine their suitability in predicting ultimate claims reserves.

(ii) To analyze the methods for IBNR reserve estimation in order of suitability across different classes of business

1.3 Research questions

(i) How do various estimation techniques for Incurred But Not Reported (IBNR) claims vary in terms of their effectiveness in predicting ultimate claims reserves given a particular claim experience?

(ii) How do these techniques compare across different insurance contexts, such as different types of insurance classes?

1.5 Justification of the study

The justification of this study on the comparative analysis of the methods used for IBNR (Incurred But Not Reported) reserve estimation in Kenya is profound across policy, practice, and theory. From a policy perspective, the findings will provide regulatory bodies with empirical data to inform the development of more robust frameworks and guidelines for insurance companies. Enhanced regulations based on these findings can ensure that insurers maintain adequate reserves, thereby safeguarding policyholders and promoting stability in the insurance sector. This can also help in aligning Kenya's insurance industry with international standards, fostering investor confidence, and encouraging more foreign investment.

In terms of practice, the study's significance lies in its potential to directly influence the operational efficiency and financial health of insurance firms in Kenya. By identifying the most suitable IBNR estimation methods, insurers can adopt more accurate and reliable techniques, leading to better risk management and financial planning. This can result in more competitive pricing of insurance products, improved solvency, and enhanced trust from customers. Additionally, the insights from the study can aid actuaries and financial analysts in refining their approaches to reserve estimation, thus improving the overall decision-making process within insurance firms.

From a theoretical standpoint, this study will contribute to the existing body of knowledge on IBNR reserve estimation by providing context-specific insights relevant to the Kenyan market. It will fill the gap in literature concerning the applicability and effectiveness of various IBNR estimation methods in emerging markets. Furthermore, the study's findings can serve as a basis for future research, encouraging scholars to explore the unique challenges and dynamics of the insurance industry in developing countries. By advancing theoretical understanding, the study can also support the development of new models and methodologies tailored to the specific needs and conditions of markets similar to Kenya.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Over the years, loss reserving has been crucial for maintaining the financial health and regulatory compliance of general insurance companies. Insurers use both stochastic and deterministic models to mitigate risk and prevent default. Accurate loss reserve estimates are essential for assessing an insurance company's financial condition (Wiser, 1997). Insurers must evaluate their financial position accurately to ensure they can meet their obligations to policyholders (Brown & Miller, 1988). Optimal techniques can lead to more precise reserves (The Actuary & IBNR, 2020). The Mack method, introduced in 1993, provided a statistical foundation for comparing and evaluating different actuarial models for IBNR reserves. However, statistical methods may not always reflect practical realities (Schnieper, 1991), necessitating the inclusion of all relevant information. Salzmann (1964) detailed eight methods for estimating loss reserves, which actuaries have refined over time. These methods involve simple projections of future loss development from historical data.

Blum and Otto (1998) focus on determining loss reserves, emphasizing the insurer's liability for all claims incurred by a given date. They categorize these claims into paid and unpaid losses, with the primary goal of estimating unpaid losses. They also discuss the concept of the best estimate, defined as a point within a range of reasonable estimates that is superior to all other reasonable estimates. The Faculty of Actuaries (2014) categorizes methods for estimating claims reserves into stochastic and deterministic methods. The Bornhuetter-Ferguson method, which combines the loss ratio method for future claims with the chain ladder method for past claims, is a deterministic approach. Other methods include the Average-Cost-Per-Claim and the chain ladder method, both in its basic and inflation-adjusted forms. Stochastic methods include simulation, analytical, and Bayesian approaches. Analytical techniques encompass the Mack model, over-dispersed Poisson model, negative binomial model, normal approximation to the negative binomial, and log-normal model.

2.2 IBNR Estimation Methods

The concept of Incurred But Not Reported (IBNR) reserves is crucial in the insurance industry for ensuring that companies set aside adequate funds to cover claims that have been incurred but have not yet been reported to the insurer. The estimation of IBNR reserves is vital for the financial stability and regulatory compliance of insurance companies. Various techniques are employed to estimate IBNR reserves, each with its own advantages and limitations. The comparison of these techniques helps in understanding their applicability and effectiveness in different scenarios within the insurance industry. One widely used method for estimating IBNR reserves is the Chain Ladder technique. This method utilizes historical claims data to predict future claims. It is particularly effective in stable environments where past trends are indicative of future occurrences. The Chain Ladder method relies on development factors that track the growth of claims over time, adjusting for the maturation of claims as they move through the reporting process. However, its accuracy diminishes in the presence of significant changes in claims processing or external factors affecting claim frequency and severity (Nagasawa & Shimizu, 2020). Despite its limitations, the Chain Ladder technique remains popular due to its simplicity and straightforward implementation.

Another technique employed is the Bornhuetter-Ferguson method, which combines the Chain Ladder approach with a priori estimates of ultimate losses. This method addresses some of the weaknesses of the Chain Ladder by incorporating expert judgment and external information, making it more robust in situations where historical data may not be entirely reliable. The Bornhuetter-Ferguson method is particularly useful in new lines of business or when there are significant changes in the business environment. It balances the influence of historical data and expert judgment, thus providing a more stable estimate of IBNR reserves (Lee & Whitaker, 2021). However, its dependence on subjective inputs can introduce bias, which needs to be managed carefully.

The Cape Cod method, also known as the Expected Loss Ratio method, is another technique used in IBNR estimation. This method assumes a constant loss ratio and uses it to predict future claims based on earned premiums. The Cape Cod method is advantageous in that it smooths out fluctuations in historical data, making it less sensitive to outliers. It is particularly effective in mature lines of business with stable loss ratios. However, its reliance on the assumption of a constant loss ratio can be problematic in volatile environments where loss ratios can vary significantly (Goovaerts & Kaas, 2020). The simplicity of the Cape Cod method makes it appealing, but it requires careful consideration of its assumptions to ensure accuracy. The Mack method, also known as the stochastic Chain Ladder, extends the traditional Chain Ladder approach by providing confidence intervals for the estimated reserves. This method accounts for the inherent uncertainty in the estimation process and offers a range of possible outcomes, thus providing a more comprehensive view of the reserve requirements. The Mack method is beneficial for regulatory reporting and capital management as it quantifies the risk associated with reserve estimates (Kuang, 2022). However, its complexity can be a barrier to implementation, requiring sophisticated statistical tools and expertise.

A more advanced technique is the Generalized Linear Models (GLM), which extends traditional actuarial methods by incorporating various predictors and accounting for different distributions of claim data. GLMs provide a flexible framework for modeling IBNR reserves, allowing for the inclusion of factors such as policyholder characteristics, economic conditions, and other relevant variables. This flexibility makes GLMs particularly powerful in complex environments where multiple factors influence claims development (Kaasanen, 2021). However, the complexity and data requirements of GLMs can be challenging, necessitating robust data management and analytical capabilities. Machine learning techniques are increasingly being explored for IBNR estimation, leveraging large datasets and advanced algorithms to improve accuracy and predictive power. Techniques such as neural networks, decision trees, and ensemble methods can uncover complex patterns in claims data that traditional methods may miss. These methods are particularly useful in environments with high variability and non-linear relationships between variables (Zhou et al., 2023). However, the black-box nature of some machine learning models can be a drawback, making it difficult to interpret and justify the results to stakeholders and regulators.

Comparing these techniques highlights the trade-offs between simplicity, robustness, and predictive accuracy. Traditional methods like Chain Ladder and Cape Cod are simple and easy to implement but may lack the flexibility to adapt to changing environments. Methods like Bornhuetter-Ferguson and Mack offer more robustness and incorporate uncertainty but require careful management of inputs and assumptions. Advanced techniques like GLMs and machine learning provide greater predictive power and flexibility but come with increased complexity and data requirements. The choice of technique often depends on the specific context and requirements of the insurer, including the availability of data, the stability of the business environment, and regulatory considerations (Behn & Groll, 2021).

Ultimately, the effectiveness of IBNR estimation techniques lies in their ability to accurately predict future claims and provide a reliable basis for reserve setting. Regular evaluation and refinement of these techniques are essential to ensure they remain relevant and effective in the face of changing conditions. Insurers must balance the need for accuracy with the practical constraints of data availability and computational resources. By understanding the strengths and limitations of each technique, insurers can make informed decisions about which methods to use and how to implement them effectively (Sammut, 2022).

2.3 Empirical Review

In the study by Badescu et al. (2019), the researchers address the challenge of accurately predicting Incurred but Not Reported (IBNR) loss reserves for Property & Casualty (P&C) insurers. They highlight the temporal dependence(the timing and frequency of claims are not independent of one another but are influenced by past claims and other factors over time.) in the claim arrival process, which is often overlooked in existing loss reserving models, leading to potentially inaccurate reserve predictions. To counter this issue, they propose a marked Cox process, the marked Cox process counters temporal dependence by explicitly modeling the claim arrival process in a way that accounts for the effects of past claims on future claim occurrences. This leads to more accurate reserve predictions by better capturing the underlying dynamics of claim arrivals over time, emphasizing its efficiency through an expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm. This method, according to the study, surpasses the commonly used moment estimation techniques in terms of estimator efficiency and computational feasibility. The model's effectiveness is demonstrated through simulations and real insurance claim data, showing realistic predictive distributions in out-of-sample tests. Despite these strengths, the model's reliance on specific data sets for validation may limit its generalizability across different insurance contexts.

Denisov and Smirnova (2016) explore the utility of the Random forest method for assessing IBNR reserves in non-life insurance companies. Utilizing data from two real companies' direct hull insurance from 2009 to 2014, they compare the Random forest method's IBNR valuations with traditional methods such as chain ladder and Bornhuetter-Ferguson. Their findings suggest that the Random forest method can serve as a viable alternative for IBNR assessment, offering a robust statistical approach. However, while the Random forest method shows promise, its complexity and the need for extensive computational resources may pose challenges for widespread adoption, particularly in smaller insurance firms lacking advanced analytical capabilities.

Ostoj (2018) revisits the widely used chain ladder method for estimating IBNR reserves, noting its simplicity and broad acceptance. The study introduces modifications within the framework of credibility theory, as detailed by Gisler and Wutrich (2008), which distinguishes between individual and collective information from different parts of an insurance portfolio. Ostoj's simulation analysis compares the predictive quality of the classical chain ladder method with its Bayesian counterpart, revealing insights into their respective strengths and limitations. While the Bayesian approach potentially enhances prediction accuracy by incorporating more nuanced data, its increased complexity and computational demands may deter its practical implementation in favor of the simpler chain ladder method.

Zaroudi et al. (2021) address the growing concerns in actuarial sciences regarding IBNR claims reserve estimation. They propose a copula-based dependency model to capture the relationship between "time between successive occurrences" and "delay time" variables. Using a maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) method, they validate their model through simulations and apply it to forecast claims for a major automobile insurer. Their results are compared with traditional Chain Ladder model forecasts, showing the copula-based model's potential for more accurate predictions. Nevertheless, the study's reliance on specific data and the complexity of copula models could limit their practicality for broader applications without significant customization.

Yulita and Effendie (2022) investigate the estimation of claims reserves, emphasizing the critical role of accurate reserve information for insurance companies' financial stability. They critique the Reserving by Detailed Conditioning (RDC) method for its instability due to numerous combinations of background variables. To address this, they propose integrating RDC with a Gamma Generalized Linear Model (GLM) and utilizing the Bootstrapping Individual Claims Histories (BICH) method. Their results indicate that this combined approach yields the lowest Mean Square Error of Prediction (MSEP) compared to other methods. However, the complexity and data requirements of this approach may limit its applicability, particularly for insurers with less sophisticated data infrastructures.

Addini et al. (2021) emphasize the necessity for insurance companies to establish claims reserves, specifically differentiating between Reported but Not Settled (RBNS) and Incurred but Not Reported (IBNR) reserves. They critique the traditional Chain Ladder (CL) method for its inability to separately estimate RBNS and IBNR reserves. Introducing the Double Chain Ladder (DCL) method, which applies the CL algorithm to both claims amount and number of claims run-off triangles, they demonstrate its capability to provide separate estimates. Their numerical analysis shows significant differences between CL and DCL reserves, particularly when the run-off triangle contains many zero values. However, the added complexity of the DCL method and its dependency on specific data structures may challenge its broader implementation.

2.4 Summary of Literature review and Research Gaps

The reviewed literature collectively highlights advancements and critiques in IBNR reserving methods, emphasizing the need for accurate and computationally feasible models. The estimation of Incurred but Not Reported (IBNR) reserves remains an area with notable research gaps. A primary issue is the balance between model accuracy and practical implementation. Many advanced models, while offering improved prediction accuracy, require significant computational resources and sophisticated data inputs, which may not be feasible for all insurers. This discrepancy often leads to the underutilization of potentially more accurate methods in favor of simpler, albeit less precise, techniques. Additionally, there is a gap in models that can effectively handle diverse and large datasets without compromising on computational efficiency. Most current models are validated on specific datasets, raising concerns about their generalizability across different types of insurance portfolios and market conditions.

In the Kenyan context, these research gaps are particularly pertinent. The insurance sector in Kenya, while growing, faces challenges related to data quality and availability. Many insurers may lack the advanced data analytics infrastructure necessary to implement complex reserving models. This limitation underscores the need for models that are both robust and adaptable to varying data conditions. Furthermore, the Kenyan market is characterized by unique claim patterns and certain regulatory requirements like use of a methodology in line with IRA prescribed methodologies, which are often not adequately addressed by models developed in different contexts. To bridge these gaps, future research should focus on developing models that are not only accurate but also computationally feasible for a broader range of insurers hence the need for this study.

Table 2.1 Summary of IBNR Estimation Methods

Technique	Main Rationale for the Technique	Key Strengths and Suitability	Weaknesses
Chain Ladder	Uses historical claims data to forecast future claims based on past trends.	Simple, easy to implement, effective instable environments where past trends are a good predictor of future outcomes.	Accuracy declines with significant changes in claims processing or external factors.
Bornhuetter-Ferguson	Combines historical data with a priori estimates of ultimate losses.	More robust when historical data is unreliable, suitable for new lines of business or substantial shifts in businessenvironment.	Relies on expert judgment, which can introduce subjectivity.
Cape Cod (Expected Loss Ratio)	Assumes a constant loss ratio to predict future claims based on earned premiums.	Smooths out fluctuations in historical data, especially effective in mature lines of business with stable loss ratios.	May not capture changes in the underlying loss process if loss ratios vary significantly.
Mack (Stochastic Chain Ladder)	Extends Chain Ladder by providing confidence intervals	Useful for regulatory reporting and capital management, as it quantifies the risk	More complex to implement compared to the traditional

	for the estimated reserves.	associated with reserve estimates.	Chain Ladder method.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will outline the structured methodology that will be employed to conduct a comprehensive comparative analysis of Incurred But Not Reported (IBNR) reserving techniques in the Kenyan insurance industry. The methodology will cover the research design, the identification and selection of the study population, detailed data collection procedures, and the analytical methods that will be applied to derive meaningful insights. This approach is intended to ensure that the study's findings are robust, replicable, and relevant to the practical needs of general insurance companies operating in Kenya.

3.2 Research Design

The study will adopt a quasi-experimental design, which will be chosen for its suitability in investigating real-world scenarios where random assignment is neither practical nor ethical. Unlike true experimental designs, quasi-experiments allow for the examination of causal relationships in settings where control groups cannot be easily established. This design will be particularly relevant for financial and actuarial studies, where historical data and established practices form the backbone of the analysis (Dunning, 2018; Cook & Campbell, 2019). By utilizing a quasi-experimental approach, the study will aim to compare different IBNR reserving techniques. This approach will allow the study to capture the complexities inherent in the application of these techniques while maintaining a high level of rigor and control, which is essential for producing valid and generalizable results (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2020). The quasi-experimental design will thus provide a robust framework for evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of different reserving techniques, which will be critical for enhancing financial stability and regulatory compliance within the Kenyan insurance sector.

3.3 Study Population

The study population will consist of general insurance companies operating in Kenya. These companies will be selected because of their direct involvement in IBNR calculations, making them the most relevant sources of data for this study. The insurance industry in Kenya is heavily regulated, with firms required by the Insurance Regulatory Authority (IRA) to maintain accurate reserves. This regulatory framework will ensure that the data collected will be both comprehensive and standardized, reflecting the true state of IBNR reserving practices in the country. The study will focus on companies that have been operational for at least a decade, ensuring that they have sufficient historical data to support the analysis of long-term reserving practices. The selection criteria will include company size, market share, and the diversity of products offered, as these factors may influence the choice and effectiveness of IBNR techniques. By focusing on a diverse range of general insurers, the study will aim to provide a representative and holistic view of IBNR reserving practices across the sector.

3.4 Data Collection

The data collection process will involve the systematic gathering of run-off triangles from reliable sources, covering a ten-year period from 2013 to 2023, specifically targeting the Motor Private and Fire Industrial insurance categories. The primary sources of data will include annual reports from the Insurance Regulatory Authority (IRA), as well as financial statements, actuarial reports, and other relevant publications from general insurance companies that underwrite these specific lines of business. These documents will be accessed through the official websites of the insurance companies and the IRA.

Specific attention will be paid to ensuring that the data is comprehensive and accurate for these categories, which will involve cross-referencing multiple sources to verify the information collected. The data will be extracted, coded, and organized using data management software tailored to these insurance categories to facilitate subsequent analysis. The use of standardized templates will ensure consistency in data extraction across different sources, reducing the likelihood of errors and omissions and ensuring that the dataset is robust and reliable for analysis.

3.5 Data Checks

Once the run-off triangles have been collected, they will undergo a thorough data check process to ensure accuracy and consistency. This process will involve identifying and addressing any missing values, outliers, or inconsistencies within the datasets. Special attention will be given to ensuring the integrity of the data, as any errors or anomalies in the run-off triangles could significantly impact the validity of the analysis. Descriptive statistics will be used to summarize the data, providing insights into mean values, standard deviations, and distribution patterns.

3.6 Data Analysis methods

The analysis will focus on evaluating and comparing the performance of different IBNR reserving techniques, and determining which methods provide the most accurate and reliable reserves. The primary techniques to be analyzed will include the Chain-Ladder method, the Bornhuetter-Ferguson method, the Expected Claims method and the Mack model.

3.6.1 Chain-Ladder Method

The Chain-Ladder method is one of the most widely used techniques in actuarial science for projecting future claims. This method operates on the fundamental assumption that historical claims development patterns will persist into the future. By analyzing past claims data, the Chain-Ladder method estimates the amount of incurred but not reported (IBNR) claims that will emerge over time. The method involves calculating development factors, which represent the development of claims from one period to the next, and then applying these factors to project future claims development.

The specific steps involved in the Chain-Ladder method include:

- Data Segmentation: The claims data is segmented into homogeneous groups, typically by accident year or underwriting year, to ensure consistency in the development patterns.
- Cumulative Claims Calculation: Cumulative claims are calculated for each period, representing the total reported claims up to that point in time.
- Development Factor Calculation: Development factors are derived by dividing the cumulative claims of the current period by the cumulative claims of the previous period.
- Projection of Future Claims: The development factors are then applied to the most recent cumulative claims to project future claims for each period until the claims are fully developed.

The model used will be:

$$\hat{C}_{ij} = C_{ij} \cdot LDF_j$$

- $\hat{C}_{ij}$: projected cumulative claims
- C_{ij}: current cumulative claims
- LDF_j: loss development factor

3.6.3 Expected Claims Method

The Expected Claims method estimates future claims based on a combination of actuarial assumptions and historical data. This method is particularly valuable in situations where there is significant uncertainty or variability in the claims development process. It leverages actuarial expertise to establish expected loss ratios or ultimate claims amounts, which are then used to project future claims.

The model used will be:

$$I\hat{BN}R = ELR \cdot EP - PA$$

- $I\hat{BN}R$: estimated IBNR reserve
- ELR: expected loss ratio
- EP: earned premium
- PA: paid claims

3.6.4 Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method

The Bornhuetter-Ferguson method combines the strengths of the Chain-Ladder approach with the Expected Claims method, making it particularly useful in situations where historical data is limited or when claims development patterns are expected to change. Unlike the Chain-Ladder method, which relies solely on historical development factors, the Bornhuetter-Ferguson method incorporates prior estimates of ultimate claims based on actuarial judgment or external data, providing a more balanced approach to reserving.

The key steps in the Bornhuetter-Ferguson method include:

- Estimation of Expected Claims: An initial estimate of the ultimate claims is made based on historical data, industry benchmarks, or expert judgment.
- Application of Development Factors: Similar to the Chain-Ladder method, development factors are applied to the claims data to estimate the proportion of claims that have already been reported.
- Combination of Estimates: The method then combines the projected claims from the Chain-Ladder approach with the initial expected claims estimate. This combination is weighted based on the degree of development, giving more weight to the expected claims in earlier periods and to the Chain-Ladder projections in later periods.

The model used will be:

$$\hat{R} = EC \cdot (1 - (1/LDF)) + C_{ij} \cdot (1 - (1/LDF))$$

- $\hat{R}$: estimated reserve
- EC: expected claims
- LDF: loss development factor

3.6.5 Mack Model

The Mack Model is a stochastic approach that provides estimates of reserves along with their associated uncertainty, assuming a lognormal distribution for claims development. It is basically a chain ladder model with an allowance for variability of claims. The advantage of this method is its stochastic nature thereby making it possible to make more prudent estimates. The percentiles are calculated by fitting a log-normal distribution. The positive skewness of this distribution deems it appropriate for the purpose. Other positively skewed distributions will also give similar results.

$$E[C_{ij}/C_{i,j-1}] = \lambda_{j-1} * C_{i,j-1} i+j \geq 8$$

The variance of future claims is given by,

$$Var\ [C_{ij}/C_{i,j-1}] = \sigma^2_j * C_{i,j-1} i+j \geq 8$$

The parameter cr2jwill be estimated by:

$$\sigma^2_j = \frac{1}{5-j}\sum_{i=1}^{6-j} Cij\left(\frac{C_{i,j+1}}{Cij} - \lambda_j\right)$$

3.6.6 Statistical Analysis

To rigorously compare the effectiveness of the IBNR reserving techniques under study, a comprehensive suite of statistical tests will be employed. These techniques will ensure that the findings are not only statistically significant but also practically relevant, providing a robust evaluation of each method's performance in various contexts.

3.6.6.1 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

The study will begin by utilizing Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to identify any statistically significant differences in the accuracy and reliability of the reserve estimates generated by the Chain-Ladder, Bornhuetter-Ferguson, and Expected Claims methods. ANOVA is a powerful statistical tool that compares the means of multiple groups to determine whether the observed differences are greater than would be expected by chance alone.

- Implementation: The ANOVA test will be conducted by first grouping the reserve estimates according to the method used. The mean reserve estimates of each group will then be compared to assess whether the differences in accuracy, as measured by metrics such as MAE and RMSE, are statistically significant. The analysis will be conducted at a confidence level of 95%, ensuring that the results are robust and reliable.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the results of the data analysis conducted using the methodology described in the previous chapter. The focus is on evaluating reserve estimation methods applied to the collected data and deriving meaningful insights to inform recommendations.

4.2 Data Used

The following data was collected:

- Incremental Paid Claims: Presented in the form of a run-off triangle
- Earned Premiums: For each development year

The data was sourced from a local insurer, anonymized to comply with confidentiality requirements and aligned with *The Data Protection Act, No. 24 of 2019*. The loss years range from 2013 to 2022, with development periods spanning 10 years.

Below is a summary of the data used:

- Fire Industrial Line of Business:
    - Total incremental claims: KES 1.24 billion.
    - Average annual earned premium: KES 560 million.
- Motor Private Line of Business:
    - Total incremental claims: KES 3.65 billion.
    - Average annual earned premium: KES 890 million.

Below is a summary of the data used:

		Development Period									
Incremental		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Loss Year	2013	151,831,564	493,805,687	59,475,558	-	-	763,093	-	132,387	-	-
	2014	256,780,256	250,499,254	75,242,094	-	2,978,418	622,014	474,819	274,626	-	
	2015	310,913,789	397,987,353	30,652,071	-	3,382,434	1,582,433	613,175	1,292,743		
	2016	414,932,618	224,779,226	24,657,767	9,949,408	-	-	-			
	2017	456,312,885	280,977,910	6,732,761	100,787	481,577	-				
	2018	216,649,902	309,010,526	63,932,368	-	391,505					
	2019	224,227,254	82,404,246	103,035,189	26,160,977						
	2020	361,431,954	219,310,882	50,357,240							
	2021	179,351,014	51,356,648								
	2022	295,748,505									

Table 4.1: Incremental paid claims for the Fire Industrial line of business

		Development Period									
Cumulative		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Loss Year	2013	151,831,564	645,637,250	705,112,808	705,112,808	705,112,808	705,875,901	705,875,901	706,008,288	706,008,288	706,008,288
	2014	256,780,256	507,279,510	582,521,604	582,521,604	585,500,023	586,122,037	586,596,856	586,871,482	586,871,482	
	2015	310,913,789	708,901,143	739,553,214	739,553,214	742,935,648	744,518,081	745,131,256	746,423,999		
	2016	414,932,618	639,711,845	664,369,612	674,319,020	674,319,020	674,319,020	674,319,020			
	2017	456,312,885	737,290,795	744,023,556	744,124,343	744,605,920	744,605,920				
	2018	216,649,902	525,660,428	589,592,796	589,592,796	589,984,301					
	2019	224,227,254	306,631,501	409,666,690	435,827,667						
	2020	361,431,954	580,742,836	631,100,076							
	2021	179,351,014	230,707,662								
	2022	295,748,505									

Table 4.2: Cumulative paid claims for the Fire Industrial line of business

		Development Period									
Incremental		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Loss Year	2013	347,636,062	114,001,258	10,336,055	15,887,367	9,931,648	10,021,789	9,312,790	6,465,630	3,684,937	4,142,248
	2014	323,879,732	133,349,679	29,482,160	21,900,020	8,509,596	23,520,761	13,877,983	9,933,720	4,541,784	
	2015	383,610,631	136,399,593	34,314,907	31,712,111	24,995,836	18,229,919	6,605,272	3,914,430		
	2016	576,500,035	224,608,291	56,116,194	42,091,113	16,534,527	5,879,187	10,236,115			
	2017	552,976,952	242,947,215	36,239,801	38,215,890	14,585,930	11,612,340				
	2018	358,650,425	129,139,988	23,472,331	15,710,969	11,282,329					
	2019	407,782,924	157,349,819	31,151,994	31,092,039						
	2020	444,375,188	152,202,034	54,822,045							
	2021	582,614,600	281,421,852								
	2022	714,863,235									

Table 4.3: Incremental paid claims for the Motor Private line of business

	Cumulative	Development Period 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Loss Year	2013	347,636,062	461,637,320	471,973,375	487,860,742	497,792,390	507,814,179	517,126,969	523,592,599	527,277,536	531,419,784
	2014	323,879,732	457,229,411	486,711,571	508,611,591	517,121,187	540,641,948	554,519,931	564,453,651	568,995,435	
	2015	383,610,631	520,010,224	554,325,131	586,037,242	611,033,078	629,262,997	635,868,269	639,782,699		
	2016	576,500,035	801,108,326	857,224,520	899,315,633	915,850,160	921,729,347	931,965,462			
	2017	552,976,952	795,924,167	832,163,968	870,379,858	884,965,788	896,578,128				
	2018	358,650,425	487,790,413	511,262,744	526,973,713	538,256,042					
	2019	407,782,924	565,132,743	596,284,737	627,376,776						
	2020	444,375,188	596,577,222	651,399,267							
	2021	582,614,600	864,036,452								
	2022	714,863,235									

Table 4.4: Cumulative paid claims for the Motor Private line of business

	Premium	
Year	Fire Industrial	Motor Private
2013	625,075,686	625,075,686
2014	805,302,132	805,302,132
2015	859,986,763	859,986,763
2016	918,249,314	918,249,314
2017	974,182,838	974,182,838
2018	955,595,422	955,595,422
2019	900,517,401	900,517,401
2020	982,193,240	982,193,240
2021	1,106,762,070	1,106,762,070
2022	1,319,624,633	1,319,624,633

Table 4.5: Earned Premium

4.3 Software Used

Microsoft Excel 365 was selected for this analysis. This decision was based on the widespread use of Excel among actuaries in Kenya due to its affordability, accessibility, and robust analytical capabilities for tasks such as loss reserving. Moreover, Excel's versatility allows for comprehensive data visualization and model implementation without requiring extensive additional expertise.

4.4 Analysis

4.4.1 Chain-Ladder Method

The development factors for each business line were calculated as follows:

- **Fire Industrial Line**:
  - Development factors ranged from 1.90 in the initial years to 1.00 in later years.
- **Motor Private Line**:
  - Development factors ranged from 1.40 in the initial years to 1.00 in later years.

Using these factors, the projected cumulative claim amounts were computed. The reserve estimates derived from the projections were:

- **Fire Industrial Line**: KES 358,570,934.
- **Motor Private Line**: KES 921,866,273.

Cumulative claims and reserve estimates for each line of business are provided to illustrate claim trends and reserve allocations.

	Development Factor	
Period	Fire Industrial	Motor Private
1_2	1.8980	1.3950
2_3	1.0890	1.0589
3_4	1.0082	1.0456
4_5	1.0018	1.0221
5_6	1.0009	1.0202
6_7	1.0004	1.0154
7_8	1.0008	1.0119
8_9	1.0000	1.0076
9_10	1.0000	1.0079

Table 4.5: Development Factors

		Development Period									
Projected		1	2	3	4	5	6		8	9	10
Loss Year	2013	151,831,564	645,637,250	705,112,808	705,112,808	705,112,808	705,875,901	705,875,901	706,008,288	706,008,288	706,008,288
	2014	256,780,256	507,279,510	582,521,604	582,521,604	585,500,023	586,122,037	586,596,856	586,871,482	586,871,482	586,871,482
	2015	310,913,789	708,901,143	739,553,214	739,553,214	742,935,648	744,518,081	745,131,256	746,423,999	746,423,999	746,423,999
	2016	414,932,618	639,711,845	664,369,612	674,319,020	674,319,020	674,319,020	674,319,020	674,881,533	674,881,533	674,881,533
	2017	456,312,885	737,290,795	744,023,556	744,124,343	744,605,920	744,605,920	744,904,768	745,526,163	745,526,163	745,526,163
	2018	216,649,902	525,660,428	589,592,796	589,592,796	589,984,301	590,491,416	590,728,409	591,221,192	591,221,192	591,221,192
	2019	224,227,254	306,631,501	409,666,690	435,827,667	436,608,974	436,984,257	437,159,641	437,524,317	437,524,317	437,524,317
	2020	361,431,954	580,742,836	631,100,076	636,253,108	637,393,717	637,941,582	638,197,620	638,730,001	638,730,001	638,730,001
	2021	179,351,014	230,707,662	251,244,112	253,295,560	253,749,642	253,967,750	254,069,680	254,281,623	254,281,623	254,281,623
	2022	295,748,505	561,340,836	611,308,609	616,300,040	617,404,879	617,935,564	618,183,572	618,699,257	618,699,257	618,699,257

Table 4.6: Projected cumulative paid claims for the Fire Industrial Line of Business

		Development Period									
Projected		1	2	3	4	5	6		8	9	10
Loss Year	2013	347,636,062	461,637,320	471,973,375	487,860,742	497,792,390	507,814,179	517,126,969	523,592,599	527,277,536	531,419,784
	2014	323,879,732	457,229,411	486,711,571	508,611,591	517,121,187	540,641,948	554,519,931	564,453,651	568,995,435	573,465,416
	2015	383,610,631	520,010,224	554,325,131	586,037,242	611,033,078	629,262,997	635,868,269	639,782,699	644,620,098	649,684,179
	2016	576,500,035	801,108,326	857,224,520	899,315,633	915,850,160	921,729,347	931,965,462	943,052,767	950,183,192	957,647,751
	2017	552,976,952	795,924,167	832,163,968	870,379,858	884,965,788	896,578,128	910,385,656	921,216,233	928,181,552	935,473,268
	2018	358,650,425	487,790,413	511,262,744	526,973,713	538,256,042	549,135,630	557,592,456	564,225,962	568,492,076	572,958,102
	2019	407,782,924	565,132,743	596,284,737	627,376,776	641,259,595	654,221,159	664,296,329	672,199,258	677,281,758	682,602,427
	2020	444,375,188	596,577,222	651,399,267	681,114,556	696,186,504	710,258,287	721,196,443	729,776,294	735,294,135	741,070,544
	2021	582,614,600	864,036,452	914,921,717	956,658,274	977,827,553	997,592,051	1,012,955,220	1,025,006,035	1,032,756,108	1,040,869,354
	2022	714,863,235	997,252,047	1,055,982,711	1,104,154,136	1,128,587,256	1,151,399,010	1,169,130,844	1,183,039,632	1,191,984,598	1,201,348,729

Table 4.7: Projected cumulative paid claims for the Motor Private Line of Business

	Reserve Estimates	
Loss Year	Fire Industrial	Motor Private
2014	-	4,469,980.31
2015	-	9,901,480.23
2016	562,512.84	25,682,289.06
2017	920,242.67	38,895,140.23
2018	1,236,891.01	34,702,059.70
2019	1,696,649.54	55,225,650.69
2020	7,629,925.06	89,671,276.63
2021	23,573,961.40	176,832,901.66
2022	322,950,751.61	486,485,494.10

Table 4.8: Chain Ladder Reserve Estimates

4.4.2 Expected Claims Method

The Expected Loss Ratio (ELR) was calculated for the fully developed loss year 2013:

- **Fire Industrial Line**: 112.9%.
- **Motor Private Line**: 85.0%.

The resulting total reserves were:

- **Fire Industrial Line**: KES 5,029,120,304.
- **Motor Private Line**: KES 1,067,286,592.

A table showing the results is as follows:

	Reserve Estimates	
Loss Year	Fire Industrial	Motor Private
2014	322,698,338.83	115,647,231.94
2015	224,910,826.22	91,351,129.99
2016	362,821,987.56	(151,298,635.75)
2017	355,710,686.45	(68,358,370.42)
2018	489,338,256.51	274,161,275.90
2019	581,285,560.83	138,214,932.70
2020	478,264,091.79	183,630,683.58
2021	1,019,354,069.84	76,898,019.19
2022	1,194,736,485.90	407,040,324.94

Table 4.9: Expected Claims Method Reserve Estimates

4.4.3 Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method

Using the development factors from the Chain Ladder method and the ELRs from the Expected Claims method:

- Ultimate loss ratios and reserve estimates were calculated.
- Reserve estimates for the Fire Industrial Line totalled KES 4,731,890,000, while those for the Motor Private Line totalled KES 950,345,000.
- Tables showing the results are as follows:

A table showing the results is as follows:

	Ultimate Loss Ratios	
Loss Year	Fire Industrial	Motor Private
2014	0.4780	0.5951
2015	0.9073	0.8301
2016	0.9881	0.8790
2017	0.9961	0.9191
2018	0.9979	0.9394
2019	0.9988	0.9584
2020	0.9992	0.9732
2021	1.0000	0.9848
2022	1.0000	0.9922

Table 4.10: Ultimate Loss Ratios

	Reserve Estimates	
Loss Year	Fire Industrial	Motor Private
2014	778,008,447.12	454,314,217.40
2015	115,890,824.58	159,855,002.19
2016	13,251,867.69	101,040,585.59
2017	3,944,202.93	61,939,862.25
2018	2,258,045.52	49,205,263.32
2019	1,358,179.42	34,435,750.02
2020	864,455.62	20,935,997.68
2021	-	11,142,809.67
2022	-	5,336,571.59

Table 4.11: Bornhuetter Fergusson Reserve Estimates

4.4.4 Mack Model

The Mack Model reserves were found to align with those from the Chain Ladder method:

- Fire Industrial Line: KES 358,570,934.
- Motor Private Line: KES 921,866,273.

The model further quantified uncertainty. Tables showing the calculations are as follows:

	Mack Model	r_i,j								
		1_2	2_3	3_4	4_5	5_6	6_7	7_8	8_9	9_10
Loss Year	2013	4.2523	1.0921	1.0000	1.0000	1.0011	1.0000	1.0002	1.0000	1.0000
	2014	1.9755	1.1483	1.0000	1.0051	1.0011	1.0008	1.0005	1.0000	
	2015	2.2801	1.0432	1.0000	1.0046	1.0021	1.0008	1.0017		
	2016	1.5417	1.0385	1.0150	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000			
	2017	1.6158	1.0091	1.0001	1.0006	1.0000				
	2018	2.4263	1.1216	1.0000	1.0007					
	2019	1.3675	1.3360	1.0639						
	2020	1.6068	1.0867							
	2021	1.2863								

Table 4.12: Individual development factors from loss year i to development period for the Fire Industrial Line of Business.

	Mack Model	w_i,j * (r_i,j - f_j)^2								
		1_2	2_3	3_4	4_5	5_6	6_7	7_8	8_9	9_10
Loss year	2013	841,554,871.1170	6,221.0897	47,009.7358	2,266.0656	34.9664	113.7038	295.1605	-	-
	2014	1,542,485.1337	1,784,426.5538	38,836.6037	6,421.8594	24.0859	97.9287	78.5891	-	
	2015	45,375,138.5702	1,485,473.0379	49,305.8711	5,719.3513	1,199.0980	132.7350	604.5311		
	2016	52,678,449.8528	1,629,481.9593	30,815.8823	2,167.1016	498.1931	108.6206			
	2017	36,359,220.0277	4,704,901.3244	47,971.6762	976.4591	550.1217				
	2018	60,462,235.4543	558,922.0168	39,308.0387	751.0818					
	2019	63,111,740.3028	18,708,464.7139	1,270,713.8422						
	2020	30,659,256.3698	3,080.8475							
	2021	67,106,211.4939								

Table 4.13: Weighted actuarial claim factors for the Fire Industrial Line of Business.

	Mack Model	r_i,j								
		1_2	2_3	3_4	4_5	5_6	6_7	7_8	8_9	9_10
Loss Year	2013	1.3279	1.0224	1.0337	1.0204	1.0201	1.0183	1.0125	1.0070	1.0079
	2014	1.4117	1.0645	1.0450	1.0167	1.0455	1.0257	1.0179	1.0080	
	2015	1.3556	1.0660	1.0572	1.0427	1.0298	1.0105	1.0062		
	2016	1.3896	1.0700	1.0491	1.0184	1.0064	1.0111			
	2017	1.4393	1.0455	1.0459	1.0168	1.0131				
	2018	1.3601	1.0481	1.0307	1.0214					
	2019	1.3859	1.0551	-						
	2020	1.3425	1.0919							
	2021	1.4830								

Table 4.14: Individual development factors from loss year i to development period for the Motor Private Line of Business.

		w_i,j * (r_i,j - f_j)^2								
Mack Model		1_2	2_3	3_4	4_5	5_6	6_7	7_8	8_9	9_10
Loss Year	2013	1,564,834.9983	615,100.8292	8,425,347.1613	1,529.8245	3.2014	4,385.5232	190.0912	143.3321	-
	2014	90,337.2840	14,274.8701	10,225,087.1509	14,816.4509	330,255.5901	57,014.2066	20,078.6644	132.9562	
	2015	597,230.1526	26,187.2165	13,690,684.1710	246,857.6875	56,570.3066	15,129.6591	20,955.0900		
	2016	16,924.3874	99,697.6466	19,043,728.4069	12,597.3224	174,244.8331	17,002.4869			
	2017	1,086,155.0567	142,080.6008	17,707,017.3431	25,101.3046	44,496.4307				
	2018	438,165.4372	56,609.5665	8,730,565.6229	272.1964					
	2019	34,202.7701	8,028.6644	483,047,252.9380						
	2020	1,225,602.4062	649,743.4806							
	2021	4,512,553.4061								

Table 4.15: Weighted actuarial claim factors for the Motor Private Line of Business.

Development Period	1_2	2_3	3_4	4_5	5_6	6_7	7_8	8_9	9_10
1 /(I_j -1)	0.13	0.14	0.17	0.20	0.25	0.33	0.50	1.00	-
Process Variance	0.0583	0.0009	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-	-
Standard Error	0.24136	0.02978	0.00757	0.00095	0.00041	0.00024	0.00049	0.00000	0.00000

Table 4.16: Measures of uncertainty for the Fire Industrial Line of Business development factors.

Development Period	1_2	2_3	3_4	4_5	5_6	6_7	7_8	8_9	9_10
1 /(I_j -1)	0.13	0.14	0.17	0.20	0.25	0.33	0.50	1.00	-
Process Variance	0.0003	0.0000	0.0217	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-
Standard Error	0.01734	0.00701	0.14727	0.00394	0.00665	0.00346	0.00347	0.00050	0.00000

Table 4.17: Measures of uncertainty for the Motor Private Line of Business development factors.

4.4.5 Statistical Analysis

4.4.5.1 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) – Motor Private

- Hypothesis:
  - Null: Reserve estimates across methods are not statistically different.
  - Alternative: Reserve estimates across methods are statistically different.
- Results:
  - F-statistic: 0.0048.
  - Critical value: 3.3541.

- Conclusion: As the test statistic is less than the critical value, we failed to reject the null hypothesis at the 5% significance level and concluded that the reserve estimates between the three methods are not statistically different.

Tables showing the results are as follows:

	Reserve Estimates		
Loss Year	**Chain Ladder**	**Bornhuetter Fergusson**	**Expected Claims Method**
2014	4,469,980	454,314,217	115,647,232
2015	9,901,480	159,855,002	91,351,130
2016	25,682,289	101,040,586	- 151,298,636
2017	38,895,140	61,939,862	- 68,358,370
2018	34,702,060	49,205,263	274,161,276
2019	55,225,651	34,435,750	138,214,933
2020	89,671,277	20,935,998	183,630,684
2021	176,832,902	11,142,810	76,898,019
2022	486,485,494	5,336,572	407,040,325
Mean	**102,429,586**	**99,800,673**	**118,587,399**

Table 4.18: Mean estimates per method

	SSE		
Loss Year	**Chain Ladder**	**Bornhuetter Fergusson**	**Expected Claims Method**
2014	9,596,084,316,470,330	125,679,852,950,581,000	8,644,583,058,940
2015	8,561,450,328,405,620	3,606,522,418,848,010	741,814,355,964,799
2016	5,890,147,563,492,310	1,537,382,480,869	72,838,471,814,856,700
2017	4,036,625,779,270,110	1,433,441,013,689,300	34,948,720,748,216,600
2018	4,587,017,798,467,230	2,559,895,511,411,140	24,203,231,135,981,700
2019	2,228,211,493,947,810	4,272,573,195,492,020	385,240,074,628,350
2020	162,774,454,132,827	6,219,637,060,605,490	4,230,628,853,386,790
2021	5,535,853,404,288,980	7,860,216,783,366,490	1,738,004,399,031,560
2022	147,498,940,662,477,000	8,923,466,512,526,140	83,205,090,413,435,400

Table 4.19: Sum of Squared Errors (SSE)

4.4.5.2 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) – Fire Industrial

- Hypothesis:
    - Null: Reserve estimates across methods are not statistically different.
    - Alternative: Reserve estimates across methods are statistically different.
- Results:
    - F-statistic: 3.5337.
    - Critical value: 3.3541.
- Conclusion: As the test statistic is greater than the critical value, we rejected the null hypothesis at the 5% significance level and concluded that the reserve estimates between the three methods are statistically different.

Tables showing the results are as follows:

	Reserve Estimates		
Loss Year	Chain Ladder	Bornhuetter Fergusson	Expected Claims Method
2014	-	778,008,447	322,698,339
2015	-	115,890,825	224,910,826
2016	562,513	13,251,868	362,821,988
2017	920,243	3,944,203	355,710,686
2018	1,236,891	2,258,046	489,338,257
2019	1,696,650	1,358,179	581,285,561
2020	7,629,925	864,456	478,264,092
2021	23,573,961	-	1,019,354,070
2022	322,950,752	-	1,194,736,486
Mean	**35,857,093**	**101,730,669**	**502,912,030**

Table 4.20: Mean estimates per method

	SSE		
Loss Year	Chain Ladder	Bornhuetter Fergusson	Expected Claims Method
2014	1,587,322,405,041,490	457,351,632,890,490,000	55,739,813,067,326,900
2015	1,587,322,405,041,490	200,510,000,202,091	111,476,067,187,877,000
2016	1,542,816,435,781,320	7,828,498,317,991,760	38,403,910,621,688,600
2017	1,514,842,079,508,550	9,562,192,987,519,190	41,241,672,594,938,500
2018	1,490,293,823,466,510	9,894,802,862,885,350	4,823,703,703,554,640
2019	1,455,007,866,697,590	10,074,636,706,045,300	505,998,748,840,524
2020	1,037,567,193,496,180	10,173,993,043,853,800	6,484,606,279,750,210
2021	264,623,536,444,635	10,349,129,057,995,300	212,118,207,842,530,000
2022	80,151,009,775,127,600	10,349,129,057,995,300	404,426,476,765,697,000

Table 4.21: Sum of Squared Errors (SSE)

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

This study evaluated reserve estimation techniques for Kenya's Fire Industrial and Motor Private insurance lines, offering actionable insights into their accuracy, reliability, and contextual suitability. Below are the key findings and their implications:

5.1.1 Key Findings

Chain-Ladder Method

- Strengths: Delivered consistent estimates for the Motor Private line (e.g., KES 921 million reserve), aligning with its stable claim patterns (validated by ANOVA's non-significant differences).
- Limitations: Highly sensitive to outliers (e.g., Fire Industrial's volatile development years), making it unreliable for volatile lines without robust outlier-detection mechanisms.

Expected Claims Method

- Outcome: Produced inflated reserve estimates (e.g., Fire Industrial: KES 5.03 billion) due to reliance on a single-year ELR (2013), which exceeded 100%—a potential outlier.
- Risk: Overestimates in stable environments (e.g., Motor Private's 85.0% ELR) and underestimates in volatile contexts if ELR assumptions are not dynamically updated.

Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method

- Advantage: Balanced historical data with expert judgment, proving robust for both lines—especially Fire Industrial, where it stabilized volatile projections (KES 4.73 billion reserve).
- Utility: Mitigated Chain-Ladder's outlier sensitivity and Expected Claims' assumption bias, making it ideal for lines with erratic claim patterns.

Mack Model

- Alignment: Matched Chain-Ladder's point estimates but added critical value by quantifying uncertainty (e.g., Fire Industrial's ±20% variability via standard errors in Table 4.16).

- Regulatory Relevance: Provides a foundation for probabilistic reserving (e.g., confidence intervals) to meet solvency requirements and risk management standards.

5.1.2 Statistical Analysis

The ANOVA tests comparing reserve estimates across methods yielded critical insights:

Motor Private Line

- Result: No statistically significant differences were found between the Chain-Ladder, Expected Claims, and Bornhuetter-Ferguson methods (F-statistic: 0.0048 < Critical value: 3.3541).
- Interpretation: This consistency suggests stable claim development patterns for Motor Private, where historical trends reliably predict future outcomes. Insurers can confidently use any of the three methods for this line, as they produce statistically equivalent results.
- Practical Implication: Prioritize computational efficiency (e.g., Chain-Ladder) or simplicity (e.g., Expected Claims) for Motor Private, given the minimal variability in outcomes.

Fire Industrial Line

- Result: Significant differences were detected between methods (F-statistic: 3.5337 > Critical value: 3.3541).
- Interpretation: The variability in Fire Industrial's reserve estimates reflects unstable claim development, likely driven by outlier claims, volatile loss ratios, or inconsistent reporting delays.
- Practical Implication: Method selection is critical here. For example:
    - The Chain-Ladder method's sensitivity to outliers makes it less reliable for Fire Industrial.
    - Bornhuetter-Ferguson's hybrid approach (blending historical data with expert judgment) is better suited to dampen volatility.

Broader Implications

- Data-Driven Decision-Making: The divergent ANOVA outcomes highlight the need for insurers to tailor reserving methods to each line's unique risk profile.

- Regulatory Relevance: For lines like Fire Industrial, regulators should mandate sensitivity testing to avoid under/over-reserving.

5.1.3 Practical Implications

The study's findings highlight critical priorities for insurers and regulators:

- Probabilistic Reserving is Non-Negotiable:
    - The Mack Model's quantification of uncertainty (e.g., Fire Industrial's ±20% reserve variability in Table 4.16) underscores that point estimates alone are insufficient for solvency management. Insurers should adopt probabilistic frameworks, such as confidence intervals or risk margins, to buffer against volatility. For example:
        - Fire Industrial: High standard errors demand capital buffers of 20–25% above central estimates to hedge against adverse developments.
        - Motor Private: Lower variability (Table 4.17) allows narrower margins but necessitates periodic reassessment to address emerging risks like climate-related claims or regulatory reforms.
- Method Selection Must Align with Business Line Realities:
    - Volatile Lines (e.g., Fire Industrial): Avoid overreliance on the Chain-Ladder method. Instead, use Bornhuetter-Ferguson to blend historical data with expert judgment, dampening outlier sensitivity.
    - Stable Lines (e.g., Motor Private): Chain-Ladder remains viable.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following actionable recommendations are proposed for stakeholders in the Kenyan insurance industry:

For Insurers

- Adopt the Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method for lines with volatile claims (e.g., Fire Industrial) to balance historical data with expert judgment, reducing sensitivity to outliers.
- Integrate the Mack Model into regulatory reporting and risk management frameworks to quantify uncertainty

- Regularly revise expected loss ratios and development factors using recent data to reflect inflation, regulatory changes, and emerging risks.

For Regulators

- Require insurers to report reserve ranges (e.g., ±10% of central estimates) alongside point estimates to enhance transparency.
- Partner with industry bodies to fund training on advanced techniques (e.g., stochastic reserving, machine learning) through workshops or certifications.

For Researchers

- Test neural networks or gradient-boosted trees to capture non-linear claim patterns, particularly for IBNR estimation.
- Quantify the impact of inflation, climate change, and regulatory shifts on reserves using scenario analysis or causal inference.
- Adapt global reserving standards to Kenya's context, addressing data scarcity and informal sector dynamics.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations that warrant consideration. First, its reliance on anonymized, single-insurer data restricts the applicability of findings to broader, heterogeneous market contexts. To improve generalizability, future research should aggregate data across multiple insurers and explicitly incorporate temporal shocks, such as legislative reforms or economic disruptions, into the analysis.

A second limitation lies in the calculation of the Expected Loss Ratio (ELR), which was derived solely from the fully developed loss year 2013 (Fire Industrial: 112.9%; Motor Private: 85.0%). While this approach simplifies calculations, it introduces significant risks. Relying on a single year's data may overfit to outlier conditions—for example, the Fire Industrial ELR exceeding 100% suggests claims surpassed premiums, which may not be representative of typical years. Furthermore, this method fails to account for year-to-year variability in claims experience, which can be influenced by systemic shocks, regulatory changes, or cyclical trends.

To address these limitations, future studies should calculate the ELR using a multi-year average of fully developed loss years. This approach would mitigate outlier bias, stabilize estimates, and better reflect long-term trends. Researchers should also explicitly justify any use of single-year data (e.g., due to data constraints) and test sensitivity by comparing results against multi-year benchmarks. For the Kenyan context, incorporating at least 5–7 years of mature loss data would enhance the reliability of reserve estimates and align with global actuarial standards.

By addressing these limitations, future research can provide more robust and actionable insights for the Kenyan insurance industry, ensuring greater accuracy and relevance in reserve estimation practices.

REFERENCES

Addini, F., Nurrohmah, S., & Fithriani, I. (2021). Prediction of the reported but not settled (RBNS) claims reserves and the incurred but not reported (IBNR) claims reserves using the double chain ladder method. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1725. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1725/1/012103.

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2019). Quasi-Experimentation: Design & Analysis Issues for Field Settings. Houghton Mifflin.

Dunning, T. (2018). Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach. Cambridge University Press.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2020). Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference. Houghton Mifflin.

Akinlo, O., & Asaolu, T. (2020). The Effect of Regulatory Changes on the Performance of Insurance Firms in Nigeria. *Journal of Finance and Insurance*, 12(3), 150-165.

Badescu, A., Chen, T., Lin, X., & Tang, D. (2019). A MARKED COX MODEL FOR THE NUMBER OF IBNR CLAIMS: ESTIMATION AND APPLICATION. ASTIN Bulletin. https://doi.org/10.1017/asb.2019.15.

Behn, A., & Groll, A. (2021). Advances in IBNR prediction models. *Journal of Risk and Insurance, 88*(3), 731-752.

Bermúdez, L., Pérez, J., & Ayuso, M. (2021). The Impact of Reserve Estimation Errors on Insurer Solvency: Evidence from the Spanish Market. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 94, 213-227.

Blum K.A. & Otto DJ. (1998). Best estimate loss reserving: an actuarial perspective, Casualty Actuarial Society Forum Fall 1998, 55-lOI.

Bohnert, A., Born, P., & Gatzert, N. (2020). The Solvency II Directive and Its Impact on Risk Management in Insurance. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 283(2), 711-726.

Bornhuetter, R. L., & Ferguson, R. E. (1972). The actuar y and IBNR . Proceedings ofthe Casualty Actuarial Society, 59,181-195

Boucher, J. P., & Guillén, M. (2020). Big Data and Machine Learning in Actuarial Science. *Risk Management and Insurance Review*, 23(3), 261-277.

Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Denisov, D., & Smirnova, D. (2016). Application of Random forest method to estimate the incurred but not reported claims reserve of an insurance company. International Journal of Open Information Technologies, 4, 45-51.

Goovaerts, M. J., & Kaas, R. (2020). Modern loss reserving techniques. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 91*(1), 34-45.

Hendry, C. (2020). The Collapse of Equitable Life and Its Lessons for Insurance Regulation. *Journal of Insurance Regulation*, 39(1), 45-68.

Insurance Regulatory Authority (IRA). (2024). *Annual report*. Insurance Regulatory Authority of Kenya.

Kaasanen, H. (2021). Generalized linear models in IBNR estimation. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal, 2021*(2), 155-172.

Kader, H., Adams, M., & Andersson, L. (2020). Reserving Practices and Financial Performance of Insurers: Evidence from South Africa. *African Review of Economics and Finance*, 12(1), 80-95.

Kothari, C. R. (2014). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (3rd ed.). New Age International Publishers.

Kuang, X. (2022). Stochastic approaches to IBNR reserves. *European Actuarial Journal, 12*(4), 245-263.

Lee, M., & Whitaker, S. (2021). The Bornhuetter-Ferguson method revisited. *Annals of Actuarial Science, 15*(3), 456-478.

Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2008). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Acts Press.

Nagasawa, K., & Shimizu, T. (2020). Chain Ladder technique and its applications. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Risk and Insurance, 14*(2), 119-138.

Nguyen, H., & Tran, T. (2021). Cyber Risk and the Need for Advanced Reserving Techniques in Insurance. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 88(4), 947-965.

Ostoj, K. (2018). Analysis of the IBNR reserve credibility predictors. Collegium of Economic Analysis Annals, 187-206.

Salzmann, R.E. Estimated Liabilities For Losses and Loss Adjustment Expenses. Prentice-Hall, 1964

Sammut, M. (2022). Evaluating IBNR reserve estimation methods. *International Journal of Insurance Studies, 29*(1), 99-115.

Schnieper, R. (1991). Separating true IBNR and IBNER claims CT 6, Statistical methods (2013) Core Reading. Actuarial Education Company https://intapi.sciendo.com/pdf/10.2478/icas-2019-0019

Siddiqui, S., & Niehaus, G. (2021). Internal Collaboration and Reserving Practices in Insurance Companies. *Journal of Insurance Issues*, 44(2), 157-182.

Weindorfer, R (2012) A practical guide to the use ofthe chain-ladder methodfor determining technical provisions for outstanding reported claims in non-life insurance. Working Paper Series by the University of Applied Sciences bfi Vienna, number 77. ISSN 1995-1469

Weke P.G.O., M. A. (2006). Deterministic Loss reserving in Short-Term Insurance Contracts. East African Journal of Statistic

Weke, P.G.O (2008).Deterministic and Stochastic modelling of technical reserves in short-term insurance contracts. Retrieved on 21st April 2016 from: https://profiles.uonbi.ac.ke/pweke/files/deterministic_and_stochastic_modelling_of.pd

Wiser, R.F. "Loss Reserving." In Foundations of Casualty Actuarial Science. Arlington, Va.: Casualty Actuarial Society, 1990: 143-230.

Wiser, R.F. "Loss Reserving." In Foundations of Casualty Actuarial Science. Arlington, Va.: Casualty Actuarial Society,

Yulita, T., & Effendie, A. (2022). ESTIMATION OF IBNR AND RBNS RESERVES USING RDC METHOD AND GAMMA GENERALIZED LINEAR MODEL. MEDIA STATISTIKA. https://doi.org/10.14710/medstat.15.1.24-35.

Zaroudi, S., Faridrohani, M., Behzadi, M., & Safari-Katesari, H. (2021). Copula-based Modeling for IBNR Claim Loss Reserving. Scientia Iranica. https://doi.org/10.24200/SCI.2021.54706.3878.

Zhou, Y., Wang, J., & Zhang, H. (2023). Machine learning for IBNR reserves. *Journal of Data Science, 21*(1), 45-67.

Office of the Attorney General and Department of Justice, Kenya. (2019). The Data Protection Act, No. 24 of 2019. Kenya Law Reports. Retrieved from http://kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/Acts/2019/TheDataProtectionAct__No24of2019.pdf.