

7.0] INSURANCES

BUYING AN INSURANCE MEANS CHANGING THE ORIGINAL LOTTERY L , WITH OUTCOMES ≤ 0 , TO A DETERMINISTIC LOTTERY WHERE THE ONLY OUTCOME IS THE PAID PREMIUM

$$L^{\text{INSURED}} = (-\text{PREMIUM}, 100\%)$$

FOR EXAMPLE, $L = (-100000, 0,2\%; -20000, 0,8\%; 0, 99\%)$

BECOMES AFTER INSURANCE CONTRACT $L^{\text{INS.}} = (-\text{PREMIUM}, 100\%)$

AND THE INSURANCE COMPANY WILL TAKE ON ITSELF THE RISK

$$L^{\text{FOR INSURANCE COMPANY}} = (-100000 + \text{PREMIUM}, 0,2\%; -20000 + \text{PREMIUM}, 0,8\%; +\text{PREMIUM}, 99\%)$$

HOWEVER IN THIS WAY THE CUSTOMER WILL NOT DO ALL ITS BEST TO AVOID THE DAMAGE. TO FORCE HIM TO COLLABORATE, THE INSURANCE COMPANY ASKS HIM TO SHARE THE RISK THROUGH THESE CONTRACTS:

PROPORTIONAL INSURANCE: A FRACTION K OF LOSS IS PAID BY CUSTOMER

$$L^{\text{PROP. INS.}} = (-\text{PREMIUM} - 100000k, 0,2\%; -\text{PREMIUM} - 20000k, 0,8\%; -\text{PREMIUM}, 99\%)$$

$k \in (0,1)$

STOP-LOSS INSURANCE: CUSTOMER PAYS ALL LOSSES UP TO r (CALLED DEDUCTIBLE)

SUPPOSING $r = 30000$

$$L^{\text{STOP LOSS}} = (-\text{PREMIUM} - 30000, 0,2\%; -\text{PREMIUM} - 20000, 0,2\%; -\text{PREMIUM}, 99\%)$$

LIMITED COVERAGE INSURANCE: CUSTOMER PAYS ALL LOSSES EXCEEDING A LIMIT. SUPPOSING LIMIT = 40000

$$L^{\text{LIMIT. COV.}} = (-\text{PREMIUM} - 60000, 0,2\%; -\text{PREMIUM}, 0,2\%; -\text{PREMIUM}, 99\%)$$

7.1

INSURANCES

L IS A LOTTERY (POSITIVE) WHICH DEALS WITH SOME PREMIUM FEATURES A LOSS

- 1) NON NEGATIVE LOADING $\pi_L \geq E(L)$
- 2) ADDITIVITY $\pi_{L+L'} = \pi_L + \pi_{L'}$ FOR L AND L' INDEPENDENT
- 3) SCALE INVARIANCE $\pi_{\alpha L} = \alpha \pi_L \quad \forall \alpha > 0$
- 4) CONSISTENCY $\pi_{L+c} = \pi_L + c \quad \forall c > 0$
- 5) NO RIBOFF $L \leq C_{MAX} \Rightarrow \pi_L \leq C_{MAX}$

EXAMPLE A: PURE PREMIUM

$$\pi_L = E(L)$$

THE FIVE FEATURES ARE SATISFIED

- 1) OK
- 2) $\pi_{L+L'} = E(L+L') = E(L) + E(L') = \pi_L + \pi_{L'}$ OK
- 3) $\pi_{\alpha L} = E(\alpha L) = \alpha E(L) = \alpha \pi_L$ OK
- 4) $\pi_{L+c} = E(L+c) = E(L) + c = \pi_L + c$ OK

5) $L \leq C_{MAX} \Rightarrow$ OUTCOMES $\leq C_{MAX}$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_L = E(L) &= \sum_{j=1}^n x_j p_j \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n C_{MAX} p_j = C_{MAX} \sum_{j=1}^n p_j = \\ &= C_{MAX} \end{aligned}$$

THIS MEANS $\pi_L \leq C_{MAX}$ OK

EXAMPLE B: LOADED PREMIUM

$$\pi_L = (1+b)E(L) + d \quad b, d \geq 0$$

b ARE THE VARIABLE COSTS, d THE FIXED COSTS

- 1) $\pi_L = (1+b)E(L) + d = E(L) + (bE(L) + d) > E(L)$ OK
- 2) $\pi_{L+L'} = (1+b)E(L+L') + d = (1+b)E(L) + (1+b)E(L') + d = \pi_L + \pi_{L'}$

$$\pi_L + \pi_{L'} = (1+b)E(L) + d + (1+b)E(L') + d = (1+b)E(L) + (1+b)E(L') + 2d$$

OK ONLY WHEN $d=0$

7.2

$$3) \pi_{L+d} = (1+b)E(L) + d = a(1+b)E(L) + d$$

HW

$$a\pi_L = a[(1+b)E(L) + d] = a(1+b)E(L) + a \cdot d$$

OK IF $d=0$

$$4) \pi_{L+c} = (1+b)E(L+c) + d = (1+b)E(L) + c + b'c + d =$$

HW

$$\pi_{L+c} = (1+b)E(L) + d + c \quad \text{OK ONLY WITH } b=0$$

$$5) L \leq c_{\max} \Rightarrow E(L) \leq c_{\max} \quad (1+b)E(L) + d \leq c_{\max}(1+b) + d$$

OK IF $b=0$ AND $d=0$
 IN OTHER CASES WE ARE NOT ABLE TO PROVE. A COUNTEREXAMPLE
 IS $b=1$ $d=20$ $L=(1, 50\%; 0, 50\%)$

SO THE LOADED PREMIUM

- WITH $c=0$ $b > 0$ DOES NOT SATISFY CONSISTENCY AND NO RIPOFF
- WITH $b=0$ $c > 0$ DOES NOT SATISFY ADDITIVITY, SCALE INV. AND NO RIPOFF

BUT ITS MAJOR PROBLEM IS THAT FOR

$$L = (2 \text{ 50\%; } 0 \text{ 50\%}) \quad \text{AND} \quad L = (100 \text{ 1\%; } 0 \text{ 99\%})$$

IT HAS THE SAME PREMIUM.

EXAMPLE C: VARIANCE PRINCIPLE

$$\pi_L = E(L) + b \text{VAR}(L) \quad b > 0$$

$$1) \pi_L = E(L) + b \text{VAR}(L) \geq E(L) \quad \text{OK}$$

7.3

$$2) \pi_{L+L'} = E(L+L') + b \text{VAR}(L+L') = E(L) + E(L') + b \text{VAR}(L) + b \text{VAR}(L')$$

SINCE L AND L' INDEPENDENT

$$\pi_{L+L'} = E(L) + b \text{VAR}(L) + E(L') + b \text{VAR}(L') \quad \text{OK}$$

OK SINCE L AND L' ARE INDEPENDENT

$$3) \pi_{aL} = E(aL) + b \text{VAR}(aL) = aE(L) + b a^2 \text{VAR}(L) =$$

$$a \pi_L \neq a [E(L) + b \text{VAR}(L)] = aE(L) + ab \text{VAR}(L) \quad \text{NO SINCE } b > 0$$

4) HW $\pi_{L+c} = E(L+c) + b \text{VAR}(L+c) = E(L) + c + b \text{VAR}(L) = \pi_L + c \quad \text{OK}$

5) $L \leq c_{max} \Rightarrow E(L) \leq c_{max}$ BUT WE MAY NOT SAY THE SAME ON $\text{VAR}(L)$!
WE ARE NOT ABLE TO PROVE IT. A GOOD COUNTER-EXAMPLE IS FOR $b=20 \quad L = (1, 50\%; 0, 50\%)$
DOES NOT SATISFY SCALE INVARIANCE AND RIPS OFF

EXAMPLE D: STANDARD DEVIATION PRINCIPLE

$$\pi_L = E(L) + b \sqrt{\text{VAR}(L)}$$

1) OK HW 2) HW $\pi_{L+L'} = E(L) + E(L') + b \sqrt{\text{VAR}(L) + \text{VAR}(L')}$

IN ANY CASE 2 IS NOT SATISFIED

3) HW $\pi_{aL} = aE(L) + b \sqrt{\text{VAR}(aL)} = aE(L) + b \sqrt{a^2 \text{VAR}(L)} = a(E(L) + b \text{VAR}(L)) = a \pi_L$

7.4:

$$4) \quad \pi_{L+c} = E(L+c) + \alpha \sqrt{\text{VAR}(L+c)} = E(L) + c + \alpha \sqrt{\text{VAR}(L)} = \pi_L + c$$

5) $L \leq c_{\max} \Rightarrow E(L) \leq c_{\max}$ BUT WE CANNOT SAY ANYTHING ON $\text{VAR}(L)$ NOR $\sqrt{\text{VAR}(L)}$

WE ARE NOT ABLE TO PROVE IT. A COUNTEREXAMPLE IS $b=100$ $L=(1, 50\%; 0, 50\%)$.

EXAMPLE 5: PRINCIPLE OF ZERO UTILITY

$$U(w) = E(U(w + \pi_L - L))$$

WHERE w IS THE INSURER SURPLUS AND U ITS UTILITY FUNCTION

SUBCASE: EXPONENTIAL PRINCIPLE

IF $U = -e^{-bx}$ $b > 0$ IT IS THE EXPONENTIAL PRINCIPLE

$$-e^{-bw} = E(-e^{-b(w + \pi_L - L)}) = E(-e^{-bw} \cdot e^{-b\pi_L} \cdot e^{bL}) = -e^{-bw} \cdot e^{-b\pi_L} E(e^{bL})$$

\Downarrow

$$1 = e^{-\pi_L b} \cdot E(e^{bL}) \quad e^{\pi_L b} = E(e^{bL}) \quad \pi_L = \frac{1}{b} \ln E(e^{bL})$$

1) IF THE INSURER IS RISK-AVERSE $E(U(w + \pi_L - L)) \leq U(w + \pi_L - E(L))$

$$U(w) = E(U(w + \pi_L - L)) \leq U(w + \pi_L - E(L))$$

SINCE U IS INCREASING

$$w \leq w + \pi_L - E(L) \Rightarrow E(L) \leq \pi_L \quad \text{OK}$$

7.5

2) FOR EXPONENTIAL

$$\Pi_{L+L'} = \frac{1}{b} \ln E(e^{bL+bL'}) = \frac{1}{b} \ln E(e^{bL} \cdot e^{bL'}) =$$

SINCE L AND L' INDEPENDENT \Rightarrow e^{bL} AND $e^{bL'}$ INDEPENDENT

$$= \frac{1}{b} \ln E(e^{bL}) \cdot E(e^{bL'}) = \frac{1}{b} \ln E(e^{bL}) + \frac{1}{b} \ln E(e^{bL'}) =$$

$$= \Pi_L + \Pi_{L'} \quad \underline{\text{OK}}$$

IN GENERAL IT DOES NOT WORK FOR ZERO UTILITY!

3) SCALE INVARIANCE. IT DOES NOT WORK IN GENERAL NOR FOR THE PARTICULAR CASE OF EXPONENTIAL PRINCIPLE

COUNTER-EXAMPLE $V = -e^{-bx}$ $L = N(\mu, \sigma^2)$

TAKE $b=1$

$$\Pi_{\alpha L} = \ln E(e^{\alpha \cdot N(\mu, \sigma^2)}) = \ln E(e^{N(\alpha\mu, \alpha^2\sigma^2)}) =$$

BECAUSE $\alpha \cdot N$ IS STILL A NORMAL WITH $\alpha\mu$ EXP. VALUE AND $\alpha^2\sigma^2$ VARIANCE

IT IS A LOGNORMAL

$$= \ln \left(e^{\alpha\mu + \frac{\alpha^2\sigma^2}{2}} \right) = \alpha\mu + \frac{\alpha^2\sigma^2}{2}$$

$$\alpha \Pi_L = \alpha \ln E(e^{N(\mu, \sigma^2)}) = \alpha \cdot \left(\mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) \quad \underline{\text{NO}}$$

7.6

$$5) \quad L \leq C_{\max} \quad -L \geq -C_{\max}$$

$$U(w) = E(U(w + \pi_L - L)) \geq E(U(w + \pi_L - C_{\max})) = U(w + \pi_L - C_{\max})$$

\downarrow
U IS INCREASING

\downarrow since U is increasing

$$w \geq w + \pi_L - C_{\max} \Rightarrow \pi_L \leq C_{\max} \quad \text{OK}$$

4) CONSISTENCY

For π_L $U(w) = E(U(w + \pi_L - L))$

For π_{L+c} $U(w) = E(U(w + \pi_{L+c} - (L+c)))$

$$E(U(w + \pi_L - L)) = E(U(w + \pi_{L+c} - (L+c))) = \\ = E(U(w + \pi_{L+c} - c - L)) \quad \forall w$$

\Downarrow

$$w + \pi_L - L = w + \pi_{L+c} - c - L$$

\Downarrow

$$\pi_L + c = \pi_{L+c}$$