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CIRCULAR LETTER TO ALL MEMBER COMPANIES

Re: Workers Compensation Insurance
Item B-1365-2000 Update to Retrospective
Rating Plan Parameters
The Bureau has adopted and the North Carolina Commissioner of Insurance has approved a proposal to update the Expected Loss Ranges and the State And Hazard Group Severity Relativities of the Retrospective Rating Plan.

The attached Filing Memorandum describes the changes which have been approved to become effective July 1, 2000, applicable to new and renewal business only.

Very truly yours,

Jerry G. Hamrick
Workers Compensation Manager


Enclosure
C-00-7

## FILING MEMORANDUM

## TEM R-1365-2000 UPDATE TO RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS

## (To be effective 12:01 a.m. on July 1, 2000 applicable to new and renewal business only.)

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this filing is to update the Expected Loss Ranges and State and Hazard Group Severity Relativities of the Retrospective Rating Plan.

## BACKGROUND

 the formula: $\mathbf{R}=(\mathbf{B}+\mathbf{c} \mathbf{L}) \mathbf{t}$, where
$\mathrm{R}=$
$B=\quad$ Retrospective Premium, subject to minimum and maximum amounts
$\mathrm{c}=\quad$ Basic Premium
$\mathrm{L}=\quad$ Loss Conversion Factor, generally reflecting loss adjustment expense
$t=$
Actual incurred loss during the effective policy period

Tax Multiplier

[^0]The Table of Insurance Charges contains the excess ratios needed to quantify the insurance charge and savings described above. The ratio of actual losses to expected losses, the entry ratio, is used to look up the values in the Table. The charges depend not only on the maximum and minimum subject losses, but also on the size of the insured. The variation in the loss ratios, hence the charges, of the larger employers who expect many losses should be much lower than the variation for smaller employers.

As inflation increases claim size, there is an apparent growth in the size of the insured employers, but no real change in loss ratio distributions. To correct for the impact of loss size inflation, NCCI is proposing that the Table of Expected Loss Ranges be updated for the trend in average size of loss since the last time such an update was made (Item R-1350, "1998 Table of Insurance Charges"). The current Table of Expected Loss Ranges already included an estimate of actual trend to $10 / 94$ and an assumption of no trend after 10/94. To calculate the new size ranges we trended the current size ranges using an estimated actual severity trend from $10 / 94$ to $10 / 96$ of $5.0 \%$ and estimated future severity trend from $10 / 96$ to $7 / 1 / 2001$ of $1.0 \%$ per year.

## State and Hazard Group Relativities

The variation in the loss ratios of employers in the lower hazard groups should be smaller than the variation for employers in the higher hazard groups. The State and Hazard Group Relativity Factors adjust for this difference by placing lower hazard group employers in a higher Expected Loss Size Range and higher hazard group employers in a lower Expected Loss Size Range than would otherwise be the case. This adjustment affects the selection of the column of the Table of Insurance

Charges, which then impacts the basic premium portion of the retrospective policy premium. The State and Hazard Group Relativities should be updated regularly due to changes in the circumstances (changes in state statutory benefit levels, inflation, etc.) underlying each state's severity.

## ITEM R-1365-2000 UPDATE TO RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS

## PROPOSAL

It is proposed that the Table of Expected Loss Ranges be updated for the trend in average size of loss since the last time such an update was made. The proposed ranges can be found in Exhibit III.

It is further proposed that the State and Hazard Group Relativities of the Retrospective Rating Plan be updated for each state. Exhibit I provides a description of the development of the relativities. As explained in the exhibit, individual state severities, as well as countrywide severities are used in the calculation of the relativities. The proposed relativities can be found in Exhibit II

It is proposed that these changes are to be effective 12:01 a.m., on July 1, 2000, for use by companies affiliated with NCCI for Large Accounts License, Service, and Maintenance, applicable to new and renewal business only.

## IMPACT

The proposed Expected Loss Ranges are necessary to maintain the aggregate expected balance between the retrospectively rated premium and the guaranteed cost premium. If these ranges were not updated, there would be a natural slippage caused by inflation because risks would have an apparent growth as seen by increasing expected losses, but no real change in their loss ratio distributions.

Retrospective rating should produce premium that is equitably distributed to all insured employers, but on average close to the guaranteed cost in the approved rate. The object of the update to the State and Hazard Group Relativities of the Retrospective Rating Plan is to maintain the aggregate expected balance, but the impact will vary slightly for individual insured employers. Thus, insurance charges and premiums will be higher for some insureds and lower for others, depending on their state and hazard group assignments. For most of the insured employers electing retrospective rating, the impact on final premium from these changes will be quite small.

The improved equitability from this change will result in slightly lower average insurance charges for some states, and slightly higher for others. However, this statewide impact will be negligible. The program is designed to be revenue neutral countrywide.

## IMPLEMENTATION

The attached exhibits outline the changes necessary in the Retrospective Rating Plan Manual for Workers Compensation and Employers Liability Insurance.

## EXHIBIT I

## DEVELOPMENT OF STATE AND HAZARD GROUP RELATIVITIES

Step 1. Individual state severities are calculated for each hazard group.

Step 2 . The severities are weighted with the countrywide severities by hazard group using a credibility that varies by state. For this purpose, we regard 155,000 claims as fully credible, and use the square root rule to compute partial credibilities.

Step 3. Credibility weighted severities for each state and hazard group are produced. A new countrywide average severity is calculated by taking the weighted average of the formula state severities using claim counts as weights.

Step 4. The relativities are calculated by dividing the countrywide severity by the individual state and hazard group severities.


Note: The underlying data source for the above calculations is the Unit Statistical Plan (USP), excluding medical only claims. The USP data for each state is adjusted accordingly, as reflected in the data underlying the Excess Loss Factor (ELF) calculation.

ITEM R-1365-2000 UPDATE TO RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS

## EXHIBIT II

## NORTH CAROLINA

RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN

## Hazard Group Differentials

EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000

|  | Hazard | Hazard | Hazard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hazard | Group | Group | Group |
| Group | II | III | IV |
| I |  |  |  |
| 1.13 | 1.00 | 0.62 | 0.43 |


| 95 | 402 | - | 626 | 65 | 33631 | - | 36323 | 35 | 419451 | - | 470946 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 94 | 627 | - | 927 | 64 | 36324 | - | 39232 | 34 | 470947 | - | 528766 |
| 93 | 928 | - | 1224 | 63 | 39233 | - | 42371 | 33 | 528767 | - | 602953 |
| 92 | 1225 | - | 1618 | 62 | 42372 | - | 45763 | 32 | 602954 | - | 693056 |
| 91 | 1619 | : | 2106 | 61 | 45764 | : | 49426 | 31 | 693057 | - | 796625 |
| 90 | 2107 | : | 2542 | 60 | 49427 | - | 53394 | 30 | 796626 | - | 915671 |
| 89 | 2543 | - | 3069 | 59 | 53395 | - | 57731 | 29 | 915672 | - | 1088470 |
| 88 | 3070 | - | 3563 | 58 | 57732 | - | 62333 | 28 | 1088471 | - | 1301574 |
| 87 | 3564 | $\cdot$ | 4135 | 57 | 62334 | - | 67161 | 27 | 1301575 | - | 1556401 |
| 86 | 4136 | - | 4797 | 56 | 67162 | - | 72363 | 26 | 1556402 | $\cdot$ | 1918720 |
| 85 | 4798 | : | 5424 | 55 | 72364 | - | 77967 | 25 | 1918721 | - | 2441627 |
| 84 | 5425 | $\cdot$ | 6133 | 54 | 77968 | - | 84304 | 24 | 2441628 | - | 3107041 |
| 83 | 6134 | : | 6926 | 53 | 84305 | : | 91180 | ${ }^{23}$ | 3107042 | - | 3970253 |
| 82 | 6927 | - | 7706 | 52 | 91181 | - | 98620 | 22 | 3970254 | - | 5080315 |
| 81 | 7707 | - | 8574 | 51 | 98621 | - | 106663 | 21 | 5080316 | $\cdot$ | 6500743 |
| 80 | 8575 | : | 9537 | 50 | 106664 | - | 115100 | 20 | 6500744 | - | 8318316 |
| 79 | 9538 | - | 10611 | 49 | 115101 | - | 124185 | 19 | 8318317 | - | 10644071 |
| 78 | 10612 | - | 11710 | 48 | 124186 | - | 134052 | 18 | 10644072 | - | 14600542 |
| 77 | 11711 | $:$ | 12892 | 47 | 134053 | : | 145841 | 17 | 14600543 | $\cdot$ | 21594085 |
| 76 | 12893 | : | 14195 | 46 | 145842 | : | 158667 | 16 | 21594086 | : | 31937480 |
| 75 | 14196 | $:$ | 15598 | 45 | 158668 | : | 172621 | 15 | 31937481 | : | 47235279 |
| 74 | 15599 | $:$ | 17078 | 44 | 172622 | : | 188637 | 14 | 47235280 | : | 69860602 |
| 73 | 17079 | - | 18696 | 43 | 188638 | - | 206410 | 13 | 69860603 | - | 103323273 |
| 72 | 18697 | $:$ | 20470 | 42 | 206411 | $:$ | 225858 | 12 | 103323274 | : | 161740386 |
| 71 | 20471 | $:$ | 22346 | 41 | 225859 | : | 248980 | 11 | 161740387 | $:$ | 255938066 |
| 70 | 22347 | - | 24374 | 40 | 248981 | - | 275148 | 10 | 255938067 | - | 404996525 |
| 69 | 24375 | $:$ | 26585 | 39 | 275149 | : | 304065 | 9 | 404996526 | $:$ | \& over |
| 68 | 26586 | - | 28825 | 38 | 304066 | - | 336022 |  |  |  |  |
| 67 | 28826 | - | 31135 | 37 | 336023 | $\cdot$ | 373583 |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    $R$ is not known until after the policy has expired and the actual losses are fully developed

