State: Indiana Filing Company: Indiana Compensation Rating Bureau

TOI/Sub-TOI: 16.0 Workers Compensation/16.0002 Employers Liability WC

Product Name: R-1417

Project Name/Number: 2019 Update to the Retrospective Rating Plan Parameters-Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors/R-1417

Filing at a Glance

Company: Indiana Compensation Rating Bureau

Product Name: R-1417 State: Indiana

TOI: 16.0 Workers Compensation
Sub-TOI: 16.0002 Employers Liability WC

Filing Type: Rule

Date Submitted: 06/06/2019

SERFF Tr Num: INCR-131968624

SERFF Status: Closed-Filed
State Tr Num: EFT OK /

State Status:

Co Tr Num: R-1417

Co Status:

Effective Date 01/01/2020

Requested (New):

Effective Date 01/01/2020

Requested (Renewal):

Author(s): Robin Eleson

Reviewer(s): Thomas Faust (primary), Kim Green

Disposition Date: 06/07/2019

Disposition Status: Filed

Effective Date (New): Effective Date (Renewal):

State: Indiana Filing Company: Indiana Compensation Rating Bureau

TOI/Sub-TOI: 16.0 Workers Compensation/16.0002 Employers Liability WC

Product Name: R-1417

Project Name/Number: 2019 Update to the Retrospective Rating Plan Parameters-Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors/R-1417

General Information

Project Name: 2019 Update to the Retrospective Rating Plan Status of Filing in Domicile: Pending

Parameters-Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors

Project Number: R-1417 **Domicile Status Comments:**

Reference Organization: Reference Number:

Reference Title: Advisory Org. Circular: NCCI Circular CIF-2019-05

Filing Status Changed: 06/07/2019 Company Status Changed:

State Status Changed: Deemer Date:

Created By: Robin Eleson Submitted By: Robin Eleson

Corresponding Filing Tracking Number:

Filing Description:

This item proposes revisions to the following values in NCCI's Retrospective Rating Plan Manual for Workers Compensation and Employers Liability Insurance (Retrospective Rating Plan Manual):

- Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors (ELPPFs) and Excess Loss and Allocated Expense Pure Premium Factors (ELAEPPFs)
- State average cost per case values by hazard group underlying the proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs
- Each state's excess loss curve parameters, which were last updated in 2014*
- A methodology revision to introduce a new parameter for calculating the proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs that facilitates the removal of the expected loss for potential large loss events exceeding \$50 million*

Company and Contact

Filing Contact Information

Duane Schroeder, Vice President dschroeder@icrb.net

317-842-2800 [Phone] 308 [Ext] 5920 Castleway W Dr

Indianapolis, IN 46250

Filing Company Information

CoCode: State of Domicile: Indiana Indiana Compensation Rating Bureau Group Code: Company Type: Rating

5920 Castleway W Dr Organization Group Name: ICRB State ID Number: Indianapolis, IN 46250 FEIN Number: 35-0837318

(317) 842-2800 ext. 301[Phone]

Filing Fees

Yes Fee Required? \$35.00 Fee Amount: No

Fee Explanation:

Retaliatory?

Per Company: Yes

Company	Amount	Date Processed	Transaction #
Indiana Compensation Rating Bureau	\$35.00	06/06/2019	160933448

 State:
 Indiana

 Filing Company:
 Indiana Compensation Rating Bureau

TOI/Sub-TOI: 16.0 Workers Compensation/16.0002 Employers Liability WC

Product Name: R-1417

Project Name/Number: 2019 Update to the Retrospective Rating Plan Parameters-Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors/R-1417

Correspondence Summary

Dispositions

Status	Created By	Created On	Date Submitted
Filed	Thomas Faust	06/07/2019	06/07/2019

State: Indiana Filing Company: Indiana Compensation Rating Bureau

TOI/Sub-TOI: 16.0 Workers Compensation/16.0002 Employers Liability WC

Product Name: R-1417

Project Name/Number: 2019 Update to the Retrospective Rating Plan Parameters-Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors/R-1417

Disposition

Disposition Date: 06/07/2019

Effective Date (New): Effective Date (Renewal):

Status: Filed

Comment:

Rate data does NOT apply to filing.

Schedule	Schedule Item	Schedule Item Status	Public Access
Supporting Document	80 Filing Description/Cover Letter/NAIC Transmittal		Yes
Supporting Document	Third Party Filers		Yes
Supporting Document	R-1417 Filing Memorandum		Yes

State: Indiana Filing Company: Indiana Compensation Rating Bureau

TOI/Sub-TOI: 16.0 Workers Compensation/16.0002 Employers Liability WC

Product Name: R-1417

Project Name/Number: 2019 Update to the Retrospective Rating Plan Parameters-Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors/R-1417

Supporting Document Schedules

Satisfied - Item:	80 Filing Description/Cover Letter/NAIC Transmittal
Comments:	R-1417 - 2019 Update to the Retro Rating Plan Parameters-Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors, Excess Loss & Allocated Expense Pure Premium Factors, & Average Cost per Case Values
Attachment(s):	
Item Status:	
Status Date:	
Satisfied - Item:	Third Party Filers
Comments:	Per IC 27-7-2-3 through IC 27-7-2-4 the Bureau has Statutory authority to file rates, rules, plans & forms on behalf of all workers compensation insurance companies in Indiana.
Attachment(s):	
Item Status:	
Status Date:	
Satisfied - Item:	D 4447 Filip a Managan dum
	R-1417 Filing Memorandum
Comments:	
Attachment(s):	Item R-1417 - 2019 Update to the Retro Rating Plan Parameters-Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors.pdf
Item Status:	
Status Date:	

R-1417 PAGE 1

FILING MEMORANDUM

ITEM R-1417—2019 UPDATE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS-EXCESS LOSS PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, EXCESS LOSS AND ALLOCATED EXPENSE PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, AND AVERAGE COST PER CASE VALUES

PURPOSE

This item proposes revisions to the following values in NCCI's **Retrospective Rating Plan Manual for Workers Compensation and Employers Liability Insurance** (**Retrospective Rating Plan Manual**):

- Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors (ELPPFs) and Excess Loss and Allocated Expense Pure Premium Factors (ELAEPPFs)
- State average cost per case values by hazard group underlying the proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs
- Each state's excess loss curve parameters, which were last updated in 2014*
- A methodology revision to introduce a new parameter for calculating the proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs that facilitates the removal of the expected loss for potential large loss events exceeding \$50 million*

BACKGROUND

A retrospective rating plan adjusts the premium for an employer's policy on the basis of losses incurred during the term of that policy. At the simplest level, an employer's retrospective rating premium (RRP) is determined by the formula, RRP = (BP + LCF * L) * TM, where:

RRP	II	Retrospective Rating Premium, subject to minimum and maximum amounts
BP	II	Basic Premium
LCF	II	Loss Conversion Factor, generally reflecting loss adjustment expense
L	II	Actual Incurred Loss during the effective policy period
TM	II	Tax Multiplier

The RRP is not known until after the policy expires and the actual losses are fully developed. The basic premium contains provisions for the expenses of the carrier. It also includes a net aggregate loss factor, which results from the maximum and minimum limitations on the RRP. The net aggregate loss factor reflects the charge to compensate for the possibility that the RRP will exceed the maximum premium amount. It also reflects the savings resulting from the possibility that the RRP will be less than the minimum premium amount. The net aggregate loss factor accounts for the difference between the provision for the maximum and the savings from the minimum.

To determine policy size, reference the look-up table Appendix A—Table of Expected Claim Count Groups, which is based upon a calculation of the expected number of claims for the policy. To provide consistency to the derivation of the expected number of claims, the average cost per case values by hazard group that underlie the proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs are included in this filing. For an illustration of how the expected number of claims is computed, refer to line 7 of the Basic Premium Factor Calculation Example in Appendix D of NCCI's *Retrospective Rating Plan Manual*.

^{*}Does not apply in Texas.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON COMPENSATION INSURANCE, INC. (Applies in: AK, AL, AR, CO, CT, DC, GA, HI, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, ME, MO, MS, MT, NC, NE, NH, NM, NV, OK, OR, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, WV)

R-1417 PAGE 2

FILING MEMORANDUM

ITEM R-1417—2019 UPDATE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS-EXCESS LOSS PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, EXCESS LOSS AND ALLOCATED EXPENSE PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, AND AVERAGE COST PER CASE VALUES

ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs

The Retrospective Rating Plan contains an optional provision—an individual loss limitation—that limits the loss amount arising out of any one accident that will be used to calculate retrospective premium adjustments. The charge for limiting losses is determined by applying an Excess Loss Factor (ELF) or an Excess Loss and Allocated Expense Factor (ELAEF). The ELFs and ELAEFs vary by loss limitation, state, and hazard group. The variation in ELFs and ELAEFs among hazard groups reflects the varying degrees of severity exposure to occupational hazards inherent to operations associated with each classification.

In states where loss costs are developed, NCCI files ELPPFs and ELAEPFs instead of ELFs and ELAEFs. Carriers convert these two factors into ELFs and ELAEFs. The differences between ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs are:

ELPPFs represent the expected amount of losses above a given limit (excess losses) relative to the loss
cost portion of the premium. ELPPFs do not consider the inclusion of allocated loss adjustment expense
(ALAE) as part of incurred losses. Carriers convert ELPPFs to ELFs.

ELPPF = Excess Losses / Loss Cost Premium

 ELAEPPFs, which apply when the definition of loss includes ALAE, represent the expected amount of losses and ALAE above a given limit (excess losses including ALAE) relative to the loss cost portion of the premium. These optional values are provided for loss cost states where permitted. Refer to the Exhibit Comments and Implementation Summary of this memorandum for a list of the states where ELAEPPFs are not provided. Carriers convert ELAEPPFs to ELAEFs.

ELAEPPF = Excess Losses and Allocated Loss Adjustment Expenses / Loss Cost Premium

ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs are updated regularly for two reasons:

- ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs are computed from excess ratios, which reflect the expected percentage of losses above a given loss limit. For any fixed limit, inflation will increase the percentage of losses above that limit. Therefore, ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs are regularly updated to accurately reflect the effect of inflation on those losses.
- 2. Overall excess ratios are computed as a weighted average of claim group excess ratios. Thus, excess ratios, and consequently ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs, are updated regularly for changes in the mix of losses across claim groups.

The proposed state ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs are based on the latest five years of Unit Statistical data. The latest five years of data generally underlie the latest approved NCCI experience filings.

In this filing, the excess loss curve parameters are updated for the first time since 2014. Also, a minor change in the methodology is introduced to include a parameter for calculating the proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs that scales the values appropriately for potential large loss events exceeding \$50 million. Both changes are described in more detail in Informational Exhibit 4 in this filing.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON COMPENSATION INSURANCE, INC. (Applies in: AK, AL, AR, CO, CT, DC, GA, HI, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, ME, MO, MS, MT, NC, NE, NH, NM, NV, OK, OR, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, WV)

R-1417 PAGE 3

FILING MEMORANDUM

ITEM R-1417—2019 UPDATE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS-EXCESS LOSS PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, EXCESS LOSS AND ALLOCATED EXPENSE PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, AND AVERAGE COST PER CASE VALUES

PROPOSAL

This item proposes to update the ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs that are used with an optional loss limitation in NCCI's *Retrospective Rating Plan Manual*. Exhibits 1 and 2 contain the proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs. The average cost per case values are also being updated for use in determining the expected number of claims for the countrywide Table of Aggregate Loss Factors and are included as Exhibit 3.

IMPACT

The values proposed in this item are based on the latest filed information available as of May 7, 2019.

The proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs are necessary to maintain the aggregate expected balance between the retrospectively rated premium and the guaranteed cost premium. If the ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs are not updated, there will be a natural erosion of rate adequacy over time caused by inflation acting to increase the percentage of losses over any fixed loss limit.

This proposal to adjust the ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs may increase or decrease premium for an employer that chooses to purchase an individual loss limitation, depending on which limit is purchased.

The changes to the overall proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs are generally downward for most states, particularly for loss limits of \$250,000 and higher. The impact varies across both loss limits and hazard groups for each state. A few states will observe an increase in proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs, mainly due to the refresh of the data and the proposed change in the state-specific excess loss curve parameters.

The impact due to the methodology change for handling large loss events results in a very slight increase to the ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs, because the newly introduced unlimited parameter is always greater than the average cost per case underlying the current methodology. The methodology change impact is minimal when reviewing the differences between the current and refreshed ELPPF and ELAEPPF values.

The proposed ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs also reflect an updated mix of loss weights and average costs per case by hazard group and claim group. Because retrospectively rated policies represent a small percentage of a state's premium, changes are expected to have a negligible impact on overall statewide premium levels.

IMPLEMENTATION

This item is applicable to new and renewal voluntary policies only and will become effective concurrent with each state's approved loss cost/rate filing effective on and after October 1, 2019. For example, this item will be effective January 1, 2020, for approved loss cost/rate fillings that have a January 1, 2020 effective date. Similarly, this item will be effective July 1, 2020, for approved loss cost/rate filings that have a July 1, 2020 effective date.

FILING MEMORANDUM

ITEM R-1417—2019 UPDATE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS-EXCESS LOSS PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, EXCESS LOSS AND ALLOCATED EXPENSE PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, AND AVERAGE COST PER CASE VALUES

If there is no loss cost/rate filing for a state in a given year, this item will take effect on that state's regular loss cost/rate effective date. The regular loss cost/rate effective date is one year later than the date of the state's previous year's effective date.

Anticipated Effective Dates by State

The following chart shows the anticipated effective dates for each state:

State	Anticipated* Effective Date
Alabama	March 1, 2020
Alaska	January 1, 2020
Arkansas	July 1, 2020
Colorado	January 1, 2020
Connecticut	January 1, 2020
District of Columbia	November 1, 2019
Georgia	March 1, 2020
Hawaii	The effective date will be determined upon regulatory approval of the individual carrier's election to adopt this change.
Illinois	January 1, 2020
Indiana	January 1, 2020
Kansas	January 1, 2020
Kentucky	October 1, 2019
Louisiana	May 1, 2020
Maine	April 1, 2020
Maryland	January 1, 2020
Mississippi	March 1, 2020
Missouri	January 1, 2020
Montana	July 1, 2020
Nebraska	February 1, 2020
Nevada	March 1, 2020

FILING MEMORANDUM

ITEM R-1417—2019 UPDATE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS-EXCESS LOSS PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, EXCESS LOSS AND ALLOCATED EXPENSE PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, AND AVERAGE COST PER CASE VALUES

State	Anticipated* Effective Date
New Hampshire	January 1, 2020
New Mexico	January 1, 2020
North Carolina	April 1, 2020
Oklahoma	January 1, 2020
Oregon	January 1, 2020
Rhode Island	August 1, 2020
South Carolina	April 1, 2020
South Dakota	July 1, 2020
Tennessee	March 1, 2020
Texas	July 1, 2020
Utah	January 1, 2020
Vermont	April 1, 2020
West Virginia	November 1, 2019

^{*}Subject to change, depending on the approved effective date of the loss cost/rate filing if a loss cost/rate filing has been submitted for a state.

EXHIBIT COMMENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION SUMMARY

Exhibit	Exhibit Comments
1	Displays the revised state ELPPFs in NCCI's <i>Retrospective Rating Plan Manual</i> .
2	Displays the revised state ELAEPPFs in NCCI's <i>Retrospective Rating Plan Manual</i> • Applies in all states in this item except GA, IL, KY, LA, MD, OR, and SD
3	Displays the revised state average cost per case values by hazard group.
4	Displays the informational exhibit related to the refresh of the excess loss curve parameters and the methodology revision • Applies in all states in this item except TX

EXHIBIT 1 RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN MANUAL INDIANA STATE SPECIAL RATING VALUES EXCESS LOSS PURE PREMIUM FACTORS

Per							
Accident		В	С	azard Grou լ D	os E	F	G
Limitation \$10,000	A 0.516	0.569	0.594	0.636	0.667	0.712	0.727
\$10,000 \$15,000	0.460	0.509	0.542	0.587	0.621	0.712	0.727
\$20,000	0.416	0.313	0.542	0.547	0.621	0.636	0.659
	0.416	0.472	0.300	0.547 0.513	0.56 4 0.552	0.606	0.631
\$25,000					0.552 0.524		0.606
\$30,000	0.350 0.324	0.406	0.435	0.483	0.524	0.579	0.584
\$35,000	0.324	0.380 0.357	0.409 0.386	0.457 0.434	0.499	0.554 0.532	0.563
\$40,000 \$50,000	0.302	0.357	0.347	0.434	0.476	0.532	0.526
\$75,000	0.206	0.253	0.279	0.322	0.364	0.418	0.455
\$100,000	0.168	0.211	0.234	0.274	0.314	0.365	0.402
\$125,000	0.142	0.180	0.202	0.239	0.277	0.325	0.363
\$150,000	0.122	0.157	0.178	0.212	0.249	0.294	0.331
\$175,000	0.107	0.139	0.158	0.191	0.226	0.269	0.305
\$200,000	0.095	0.125	0.143	0.174	0.207	0.248	0.284
\$225,000	0.085	0.113	0.130	0.159	0.191	0.230	0.266
\$250,000	0.077	0.103	0.120	0.147	0.178	0.215	0.250
\$275,000	0.071	0.095	0.111	0.136	0.166	0.202	0.236
\$300,000	0.065	0.088	0.103	0.127	0.156	0.190	0.224
\$325,000	0.060	0.082	0.096	0.120	0.147	0.180	0.213
\$350,000	0.056	0.076	0.090	0.113	0.139	0.171	0.203
\$375,000	0.052	0.072	0.085	0.106	0.132	0.162	0.194
\$400,000	0.049	0.068	0.080	0.101	0.126	0.155	0.186
\$425,000	0.046	0.064	0.076	0.096	0.120	0.148	0.179
\$450,000	0.044	0.061	0.072	0.092	0.115	0.142	0.173
\$475,000	0.041	0.058	0.069	0.088	0.110	0.136	0.166
\$500,000	0.039	0.055	0.066	0.084	0.106	0.131	0.161
\$600,000	0.033	0.046	0.056	0.072	0.092	0.114	0.142
\$700,000	0.028	0.040	0.049	0.063	0.081	0.102	0.128
\$800,000	0.025	0.035	0.044	0.057	0.073	0.092	0.117
\$900,000	0.022	0.032	0.040	0.051	0.067	0.084	0.108
\$1,000,000	0.020	0.029	0.036	0.047	0.062	0.077	0.101
\$2,000,000	0.011	0.016	0.021	0.027	0.037	0.046	0.063
\$3,000,000	0.007	0.011	0.015	0.020	0.027	0.034	0.048
\$4,000,000	0.006	0.009	0.011	0.015	0.021	0.027	0.039
\$5,000,000	0.004	0.007	0.009	0.013	0.018	0.023	0.033
\$6,000,000	0.004	0.006	0.008	0.011	0.015	0.019	0.028
\$7,000,000	0.003	0.005	0.006	0.009	0.013	0.016	0.024
\$8,000,000	0.002	0.004	0.005	0.008	0.011	0.014	0.021
\$9,000,000	0.002	0.003	0.005	0.007	0.009	0.013	0.019
\$10,000,000	0.002	0.003	0.004	0.006	0.008	0.011	0.017

EXHIBIT 2 RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN MANUAL INDIANA STATE SPECIAL RATING VALUES EXCESS LOSS AND ALLOCATED EXPENSE PURE PREMIUM FACTORS

Per							
Accident		Hazard Groups					
Limitation	Α	В	С	D	Ε	F	G
\$10,000	0.575	0.632	0.657	0.702	0.734	0.782	0.797
\$15,000	0.514	0.574	0.602	0.650	0.687	0.739	0.759
\$20,000	0.467	0.528	0.558	0.608	0.647	0.703	0.726
\$25,000	0.428	0.490	0.520	0.571	0.613	0.671	0.697
\$30,000	0.396	0.457	0.488	0.540	0.583	0.642	0.671
\$35,000	0.368	0.429	0.460	0.511	0.556	0.616	0.647
\$40,000	0.344	0.404	0.435	0.486	0.532	0.592	0.625
\$50,000	0.305	0.363	0.392	0.443	0.490	0.550	0.585
\$75,000	0.238	0.290	0.317	0.365	0.410	0.469	0.508
\$100,000	0.196	0.242	0.268	0.311	0.355	0.411	0.451
\$125,000	0.166	0.208	0.232	0.273	0.314	0.367	0.407
\$150,000	0.144	0.183	0.205	0.243	0.283	0.333	0.372
\$175,000	0.127	0.163	0.183	0.219	0.257	0.305	0.344
\$200,000	0.113	0.146	0.166	0.200	0.236	0.282	0.320
\$225,000	0.102	0.133	0.152	0.184	0.219	0.262	0.300
\$250,000	0.093	0.122	0.140	0.170	0.204	0.245	0.282
\$275,000	0.085	0.112	0.129	0.158	0.191	0.230	0.267
\$300,000	0.078	0.104	0.121	0.148	0.179	0.217	0.253
\$325,000	0.073	0.097	0.113	0.139	0.169	0.206	0.241
\$350,000	0.068	0.091	0.106	0.131	0.160	0.195	0.230
\$375,000	0.064	0.086	0.100	0.124	0.152	0.186	0.220
\$400,000	0.060	0.081	0.095	0.118	0.145	0.178	0.212
\$425,000	0.056	0.076	0.090	0.112	0.139	0.170	0.203
\$450,000	0.053	0.072	0.086	0.107	0.133	0.163	0.196
\$475,000	0.051	0.069	0.082	0.102	0.127	0.157	0.189
\$500,000	0.048	0.066	0.078	0.098	0.122	0.151	0.183
\$600,000	0.040	0.056	0.067	0.084	0.106	0.132	0.162
\$700,000	0.035	0.048	0.058	0.074	0.094	0.117	0.146
\$800,000	0.031	0.043	0.052	0.066	0.085	0.106	0.133
\$900,000	0.027	0.038	0.047	0.060	0.077	0.097	0.123
\$1,000,000	0.025	0.035	0.043	0.055	0.071	0.089	0.114
\$2,000,000	0.013	0.019	0.024	0.031	0.042	0.053	0.071
\$3,000,000	0.009	0.013	0.017	0.023	0.031	0.039	0.054
\$4,000,000	0.007	0.010	0.013	0.018	0.024	0.031	0.044
\$5,000,000	0.005	0.008	0.011	0.014	0.020	0.026	0.037
\$6,000,000	0.004	0.007	0.009	0.012	0.017	0.022	0.031
\$7,000,000	0.004	0.006	0.008	0.010	0.014	0.019	0.027
\$8,000,000	0.003	0.005	0.006	0.009	0.013	0.016	0.024
\$9,000,000	0.003	0.004	0.006	0.008	0.011	0.014	0.021
\$10,000,000	0.002	0.004	0.005	0.007	0.010	0.013	0.019

EXHIBIT 3 RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN MANUAL STATE SPECIAL RATING VALUES AVERAGE COST PER CASE

Hazard Groups В С Ε F G State Α D ΑK 12,547 15,661 17.890 24.374 30.558 38.972 48.950 AL10,256 15,233 19,943 29,052 7,457 11,214 33,587 AR 4,807 6,465 7,055 10,337 15,999 26,654 25,521 CO 17,515 5,713 8,336 9,292 13,258 23,843 27,398 CT 10,679 14,982 16,777 22,507 29,720 42,039 45,184 DC 13,870 22,913 25,393 39,893 36,597 19,347 56,634 GΑ 8,674 10,821 12,569 16,480 23,496 37,797 38,802 ΗΙ 13,144 16,966 17,410 21,235 25,770 29.140 34,149 ΙL 11,209 15,658 18,145 24,755 35,066 50,589 57,289 IN 5,166 7,429 8,123 11,195 14,655 24,530 22,174 KS 4,968 7,424 17,147 8,329 13,049 26,129 29,063 ΚY 5,268 8,183 9,179 12,580 18,197 29,356 45,197 LA 14,510 17,667 23,629 32,078 43,935 59,967 52,672 MD 8,318 11,531 13,470 18,617 24,914 34,750 34,381 ME 4,676 6,162 6,742 9,435 12,994 19,039 17,582 MO 8,477 11,598 14,218 20,251 27,412 40,910 45,088 MS 7,513 10,089 12,151 14,808 21,610 32,799 26,672 15,124 MT 5,985 10,253 11,043 16,907 28,743 35,924 NC 8,289 9,938 12,431 18,531 25,900 42,939 46,159 ΝE 6,092 9,695 10,658 14,903 20,486 32,357 31,338 NH 7,349 9,877 11,134 15,511 19,571 27,463 27,049 NM 8,455 10,624 11,479 16,688 24,583 36,462 41,183 NV 5,626 7.635 8,995 10,648 16,423 22,718 24,778 OK 8,390 14,042 14,318 19,682 26,503 41,752 54,958 OR 5,171 7,471 7,908 10,166 12,477 17,316 21,120 RI12,520 8,789 13,989 17,343 22,346 29,736 31,602 SC 9,798 13,405 15,868 23,801 31,750 46,557 53,839 SD 5,380 8,455 9,109 12,623 18,502 31,304 28,383 ΤN 4,778 7,389 8,595 11,489 18,030 26,052 28,606 TX 5,410 7,258 8,671 10,711 13,069 19,580 27,344 UT 4,521 6,301 7,258 9,566 13,776 20,277 24,071 VT 9,283 11,861 14,049 20,040 23,549 35,319 31,136

6,627

7,356

10,476

12,419

19,241

24,889

WV

4,245

EXHIBIT 3 RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN MANUAL STATE SPECIAL RATING VALUES AVERAGE COST PER CASE INCLUDING ALAE

Hazard Groups Α В С Ε F G State D ΑK 13,949 17,402 19,859 27,030 33.848 43,126 54.036 AL8,398 17,096 22,351 32,516 37,491 11,537 12,603 AR 5,361 7,204 7,848 11,475 17,722 29,465 28,124 CO 6,268 9,138 10,175 14,498 19,129 26,015 29,829 CT 11,838 16,595 18,570 24,894 32,842 46,422 49,809 DC 15,411 21,472 25,398 28,125 44,104 40,433 62,372 ΗΙ 14,730 19,008 19,498 23,773 28,833 32,590 38,149 IN 5,660 8.134 8,886 12,236 16,003 26,755 24,150 KS 5,562 8,303 9,307 14,560 19,107 29,081 32,268 ME 5,009 6,601 7,220 10,096 13,896 20,349 18,779 MO 22,515 30,432 45,357 9,460 12,930 15,829 49,856 MS 8,589 11,528 13,868 16,886 24,608 37,316 30,276 MT 6,284 10,759 11,584 15,849 17,709 37,545 30,077 NC 9,217 11,041 13,794 20,540 28,673 47,487 50,929 ΝE 6,618 10,520 11,554 16,137 22,158 34,956 33,791 NH 8,003 10,754 12,115 16,860 21,259 29,809 29,325 NM 9,292 11,670 12,597 18,290 26,914 39,876 44,938 NV 8,295 24,552 6,117 9,760 11,541 17,770 26,706 OK 9,243 15,451 15,738 21,607 29,055 45,708 59,988 RΙ 10,012 14,253 15,915 19,718 25,384 33,753 35,807 SC 17,867 11,057 15,114 26,765 35,651 52,222 60,216 ΤN 5,410 8,358 9,710 12,962 20,310 29,317 32,119 TX 5,981 8,112 9,767 12,149 14,949 22,601 31,965 UT 5,095 7,091 8,152 10,725 15,416 22,659 26,815

VT

WV

10,029

4,930

12,812

7,688

15,164

8,518

21,616

12,111

25,387

14,332

38,049

22,157

33,503

28,537

EXHIBIT 4

INFORMATIONAL EXHIBIT

The excess ratio curves underlying the proposed state ELPPFs are being refreshed in this update. The latest valuation of case-incurred loss amounts from NCCI's *Statistical Plan for Workers Compensation and Employers Liability Insurance* are compiled across 37 states and combined for five older policy periods, corresponding to policy periods within the 2005–2010 time frame. These policy periods are selected to use claim amounts evaluated as of the 6th through 10th reports. Using this data, one countrywide excess ratio curve is generated for each claim group (five curves).

Claim group—Every claim is assigned to one of the following five claim groups using its latest evaluation:

- 1. Fatal
- 2. Permanent Total
- 3. Permanent Partial and Temporary Total—Likely-to-Develop
- 4. Permanent Partial and Temporary Total—Not-Likely-to-Develop
- 5. Medical Only

Consistent with the 2014 Excess Loss Factor methodology that NCCI introduced in Item R-1408—2014 Update to the Retrospective Rating Plan Parameters—Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors and Excess Loss and Allocated Expense Pure Premium Factors, every state has five unique excess ratio curves shaped from the newly refreshed countrywide curves. The state curves are shaped using state-specific claim amounts from the five policy periods evaluated as of the 6th through 10th reports. The variability of the state's claim data for each claim group is quantified and compared to the variability observed in the countrywide claim group data (at the same maturity) to determine the adjustment applied to generate the state excess ratio curves. This helps address the differences in benefit levels and variation in claim amounts across states. A credibility-weighted procedure is applied to compute the variability observed for states having small claim volumes for any one claim group.

The current methodology is summarized and described in Item R-1408 in Informational Exhibit 3, filed in each jurisdiction in 2014. One small change in the methodology—to address large events beyond \$50M—has been introduced in this filing and is described later but does not affect the curves.

The following table summarizes a comparison of the 2014 ELPPF methodology to that being proposed in this filing that refreshes the 2014 methodology with newer data:

Component	Current Methodology (2014)	Proposed Methodology
Organization of the Data	Curves by Claim Group: Fatal Permanent Total Permanent Partial and Temporary Total—Likely-to-Develop Permanent Partial and Temporary Total—Not-Likely-to-Develop Medical Only	Same as current

EXHIBIT 4 (CONT'D)

Component	Current Methodology (2014)	Proposed Methodology
Maturity of the Data	Curves based on PYs ranging from 2000–2005 • 6th through 10th reports for all claim groups	Curves based on PYs ranging from 2005–2010 • 6th through 10th reports for all claim groups
Form of Body of Excess Ratio Curves	Mixture of two lognormal distributions fitted for each claim group	Same as current
Form of Tail of Excess Ratio Curves	A Generalized Pareto (GPD) tail is spliced on to each CW Curve by claim group	Same as current
Adjusting Countrywide Curves to the State Level	Countrywide parameters are adjusted to the state level using the state's R-value. The R-value is the state's credibility-weighted proxy CV relative to the countrywide proxy CV and is calculated by claim group.	Same as current
Stabilizing ELFs for Annual Updates/ Treatment of PT Claims	PT severities (based on the same data as the curves) are locked-in and adjusted forward each year for trend and benefit on-levels • The ratios (by state and hazard group) of expected PT claim counts to expected non-PT lost-time claim counts will remain constant	Same as current except PT severities and ratios are based on PYs ranging from 2005–2010
Handling of Catastrophic Events Beyond \$50M	Final excess ratios are adjusted to limit occurrences to \$50 million • Excess ratios at \$50M = 0	Introduces unlimited parameter to accommodate the removal of expected losses beyond \$50M • Excess ratio at \$50M = 0
Inclusion of ALAE by Claim Group and Size of Loss	 Severities are scaled by separate claim group relativities (balanced to get the correct statewide total ALAE) Countrywide shape curves including ALAE are fitted for each claim group and then CV adjusted similar to loss CW ALAE/Loss = 12.7% Weighted at state level with pure loss shape curves based on how the statewide ALAE/Loss ratio compares to the overall countrywide ALAE /Loss ratio 	Same as Current except: CW ALAE/Loss = 13.2%

METHODOLOGY REVISION

The ELPPFs and ELAEPPFs that NCCI produces and files are non-catastrophe. Events exceeding \$50 million are considered catastrophes and non-ratable. The current approach handled this in a final adjustment by initially producing unlimited excess loss provisions. Then the excess provision for losses beyond \$50

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON COMPENSATION INSURANCE, INC.

R-1417 PAGE 69

ITEM R-1417—2019 UPDATE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS-EXCESS LOSS PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, EXCESS LOSS AND ALLOCATED EXPENSE PURE PREMIUM FACTORS, AND AVERAGE COST PER CASE VALUES

EXHIBIT 4 (CONT'D)

million is removed and the excess ratios at the remaining loss limits are adjusted and rescaled. This process ensures that the excess ratio at the \$50M loss limit is zero and that the excess ratio at zero dollars is 1.0.

In this filing, NCCI is proposing a slightly different approach to calculating the excess ratios to accomplish the same outcome. Let $E[\min(X;x)]$ be defined as the limited expected value (LEV) of a random variable loss amount (X) limited at x. Given this notation, the generalized form of the excess ratio calculation at a limit of \$100,000 is as follows:

Excess Ratio @
$$$100,000 = 1 - \frac{E[min(X;100,000)]}{Average Cost per Case}$$

Under the current methodology, the average cost per case varies by state, claim group, and hazard group, and it can be thought of as conceptually analogous to a limited expected value at \$50M (because the ELPPFs are non-catastrophe).

Under the proposed methodology in this filing, NCCI introduces the new unlimited parameter (UP), which is used in determining the numerator (LEV) in the formula above. UP is determined by setting E[min(X;\$50,000,000)] equal to the average cost per case. This results in an excess ratio of zero at \$50,000,000 and facilitates the removal of the expected loss for potential large loss events exceeding \$50 million. The calculation change does not impact the methodology used to create the loss curve parameters that underlie the excess ratio calculations.

In summary, the excess loss calculation has an added parameter (i.e., the unlimited parameter) that allows for calculating excess ratios using limited expected values rather than calculating excess ratios from an unlimited distribution, which then needs to be adjusted. Because the UP is used only in intermediate calculations of the ELPPFs, it will not be included in the **Retrospective Rating Plan Manual** and is not needed for use in any other components of the **Retrospective Rating Plan**. The UP will be provided as an informational value in the **Excess Loss Factor Calculations** NCCI produces by state.