

June 9, 2011

Additional Information

Criteria:

Rating Natural Catastrophe Bonds

Analytical Contact

Emmanuel Modu, Oldwick
+1 (908) 439-2200 Ext. 5356
Emmanuel.Modu@ambest.com

Gauging the Basis Risk Of Catastrophe Bonds

A catastrophe bond is a structured debt instrument that transfers risks associated with low-frequency/high-severity events to investors. The insurance industry increasingly is employing catastrophe bonds as an alternative to traditional reinsurance and retrocession contracts. Depending on the risk appetite of investors, specific layers of risks are bundled together and through traditional securitization methods transferred to the capital markets. Since their first appearance in the capital markets in 1997, publicly disclosed catastrophe bonds with ratings increased in annual issue volume from \$643 million in 1997 to a peak of \$7.33 billion in 2007. The annual issue volume then decreased to \$2.73 billion in 2008 and stood at about \$4.28 billion in 2010. Catastrophe bonds' total risk capital outstanding has increased from \$4.0 billion at year end 2004 to approximately \$12.0 billion at year end 2010.

Catastrophe Bond Triggers

Catastrophe bonds can be defined by the following four types of triggers underlying the bond structure:

- Indemnity trigger – payouts are based on the actual losses of the sponsor.
- Pure parametric trigger – payouts are triggered by actual reported physical events (e.g., wind speed of hurricane, magnitude of earthquake, location of earthquake, etc.).
- Industry loss index trigger – payouts are triggered by an estimate of industry losses, e.g., Property Claim Services (PCS) loss information from a catastrophic event.
- Modeled loss trigger – payouts are determined by inputting events' parameters into a predetermined and fixed model to calculate losses.

Hurricane Katrina and other recent catastrophic events have made investors more cautious about the types of triggers they will accept in catastrophe bonds. Investors have been shying away from indemnity catastrophe bonds and gravitating toward nonindemnity bonds (industry loss index, parametric and modeled loss catastrophe bonds). For rating agencies, nonindemnity catastrophe bonds come with "basis risk" that must be considered in the Financial Strength Ratings (FSRs) of the companies sponsoring the bond issues. Basis risk, in the context of catastrophe bonds, generally reflects the possibility that a catastrophe bond may not be partially or fully triggered (for covered perils) even when the sponsor of the catastrophe bond has suffered a loss. This methodology discusses some of the factors that A.M. Best considers in estimating how much basis risk is inherent in catastrophe bonds and also helps A.M. Best determine how much reinsurance credit will be given to the insurance/reinsurance companies that sponsor nonindemnity catastrophe bonds.

Key Considerations

A.M. Best's assessment of the basis risk in catastrophe bonds relies primarily on data and information obtained from the three leading peril modelers (AIR Worldwide Corp., EQECAT Inc. and Risk Management Solutions Inc.) and the insurance/reinsurance sponsors of the catastrophe bonds. A.M. Best accepts modeled losses from the peril modelers that reflect the most conservative trends in peril activities. A list of some of the items reviewed, evaluated or monitored to gauge basis risk of a catastrophe bond is as follows:

This criteria report can be found at
www.ambest.com/ratings/methodology



- Independent Peril Modeler – The level of involvement of independent peril modeling organizations. While some reinsurers bring great expertise in peril modeling, A.M. Best still values greatly the amount of objective analysis performed by independent peril modeling organizations.

- Transaction Documents – A.M. Best’s review of the documents provided by the transaction’s sponsor and service providers.

- The specific peril included in the transactions (e.g., U.S. earthquake, U.S. hurricane, European windstorm, Japanese earthquake, Japanese typhoon, etc.) – A.M. Best expects that the extreme high-severity perils such as earthquakes may give rise to higher basis risk.

- Derivation of Index Share Factors – the derivation of share factors (by state, by line, etc.) used to scale the industry losses to the losses of the sponsor. Company losses will be a fraction of industry losses, and the factors probably will vary according to the severity of the catastrophe.

- Index Used – the specific parameters/models used. If it is Property Claim Services¹ (PCS), for example, how will it be simulated? Historically, how adept have the peril modelers been in modeling the index?

- Index versus Company Event Losses – A.M. Best expects a table showing probability of the index or model losses falling short of company losses for a wide range of scenarios.

- Business Composition – the composition of the book of business being reinsured. Has the company been in business long enough to know the characteristics of the book of business it can acquire? If the composition of the book of business deviates from expectations, how will that change the company’s basis risk indicators?

- Factor Recalibration – this reflects the adjustment of the Index Share factor to consider the changes in modeled risk or industry exposure.

- Basis Risk Re-evaluation – A.M. Best expects that for multiyear catastrophe bonds, there will be a yearly evaluation of the basis risk, since the composition of the book of business may change over time.

Estimating Basis Risk

In reality, there are several levels of basis risk in nonindemnity catastrophe bonds, and not all of them can be modeled with absolute precision. This modeling imprecision can be illustrated by a catastrophe bond with an industry loss-based trigger. The three general sources of basis risk with such a trigger are described below, along with the factors that may make them difficult to model:

1) The Discrepancy Between the Reported Industry Loss and Actual Industry Loss – As

an example, suppose a reinsurer wants to use the reported PCS industry loss index as a trigger mechanism. This index probably would be approximated by total industry losses as modeled by the peril modelers. However, there is no assurance that modeled industry losses would equal reported PCS industry loss figures, so from the outset, there is basis risk that cannot be captured by the peril modelers.

2) The Discrepancy Between the Modeled Index Loss and Modeled Company Loss – This is the basis risk that can be measured readily by the peril modelers. Index share factors typically are designed to minimize this risk, though this risk may subsequently grow as a result of portfolio changes.

3) The Discrepancies Between Modeled Company Loss and Actual Company Loss, as well as Modeled Industry Loss and Actual Industry Loss – As an example, suppose the company loss is a derivative of the reported PCS industry loss. If the index share factors used to scale the industry loss to company loss are wrong, this produces yet another level of basis risk (sometimes called “secondary uncertainty”) that may not be captured by peril modelers.

A.M. Best’s objective in estimating basis risk is to determine how much reinsurance credit should be given to nonindemnity catastrophe bonds in the BCAR analysis, which is an important element in assigning FSRs to insurance companies. One way to accomplish this objective is to use a “scorecard” approach by assigning a score to a list of quantitative and qualitative variables that can affect the level of basis risk inherent in such catastrophe bonds. This approach tends to reveal some of the hidden drivers of basis risk. Another approach is to observe the direct impact of the nonindemnity catastrophe bond on the Probable Maximum Loss (PML), given the BCAR criteria (1-in-100 year PML for hurricane, and 1-in-250 year PML for earthquake), and give reinsurance credit based on the resulting “net” PML.

A.M. Best recognizes the merits of both of these methods of estimating basis risk, and it has devised the following four-step process that incorporates both approaches and additional considerations that can not be quantified easily:

1) Calculate a score based on a scoring table and correlate the score to a reinsurance credit table.

2) Calculate a ratio based on PML impact that directly ties to reinsurance credit.

3) Take the lesser of the results from steps 1 and 2.

4) Other considerations.

(1) Property Claim Services (PCS) is a subsidiary of Insurance Services Office Inc. PCS is the leading provider of information about property/casualty insurance, including statistical information (such as industry loss indicators), actuarial services, and a variety of insurance rating and underwriting services.

Exhibit 1

Basis Risk Scoring Table

On the scale, 1 represents the lowest risk category, and 5 represents the highest risk category.

Metrics	Scale*	Description	Weight																								
Shortfall	1 to 5	<p>Shortfall is defined as the amount by which the modeled index loss falls short of the modeled company loss, and it is expressed as a percentage of the total principal amount of the catastrophe bond.</p> <p>A.M. Best keys on the probability of a 50% shortfall. In the example shown in Exhibit 2, the probability of a shortfall being greater than 50% of the catastrophe bond's principal is 20% (as shown in the second column of Exhibit 2 on the ">50%" row). This probability may vary from transaction to transaction depending on the structure of the bond.</p> <p>A.M. Best will request an exhibit similar to Exhibit 2 for all parametric catastrophe bonds. Based on the ">50%" shortfall line, A.M. Best will assign the appropriate score on the following table:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>50% Shortfall</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10%</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15%</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20%</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25%</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=30%</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	50% Shortfall	Score	10%	1	15%	2	20%	3	25%	4	>=30%	5	35%												
50% Shortfall	Score																										
10%	1																										
15%	2																										
20%	3																										
25%	4																										
>=30%	5																										
Exhaustion Probability	1 to 5	<p>A.M. Best considers the exhaustion point in determining whether the catastrophe bond should merit full capital relief, if any. Imagine a situation in which the attachment probability is 5% and the exhaustion probability is nearly 0%. In this case, the full width of the bond should not be given credit, since the probability of recovering the full balance is nearly 0%, although the probability of recovering some portion of the balance is relatively high. For this reason, A.M. Best ranks the exhaustion probability in the following manner:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Wind Probability of Exhaustion</th> <th>Score</th> <th>Earthquake Probability of Exhaustion</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>>=2.0%</td> <td>1</td> <td>>=0.60%</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.50%</td> <td>2</td> <td>0.50%</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.00%</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.40%</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.50%</td> <td>4</td> <td>0.30%</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td><=0.25%</td> <td>5</td> <td><=0.20%</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Wind Probability of Exhaustion	Score	Earthquake Probability of Exhaustion	Score	>=2.0%	1	>=0.60%	1	1.50%	2	0.50%	2	1.00%	3	0.40%	3	0.50%	4	0.30%	4	<=0.25%	5	<=0.20%	5	25%
Wind Probability of Exhaustion	Score	Earthquake Probability of Exhaustion	Score																								
>=2.0%	1	>=0.60%	1																								
1.50%	2	0.50%	2																								
1.00%	3	0.40%	3																								
0.50%	4	0.30%	4																								
<=0.25%	5	<=0.20%	5																								
Peril	1 to 5	<p>Perils differ in terms of how much data are available for modeling probabilities of occurrence. In general, there are more data available for hurricanes than for earthquakes (at least of late), although scientists are constantly reviewing geological samples to detect earthquakes that occurred long ago to increase the statistical accuracy of their calculations. The peril ranking is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Florida wind. 2) U.S. wind, Europe windstorm, Japan typhoon. 3) California earthquake, Pacific Northwest earthquake, Japan earthquake. 4) New Madrid earthquake. 5) Earthquakes in other regions not traditionally known for having seismic activity and other perils that have not traditionally been modeled. 	10%																								
Independent Peril Modelers' Involvement in Basis Risk Analysis	1 to 5	<p>1) If the independent peril modeler is fully engaged to model the index and tabulate loss shortfalls and is involved in the verification of the model inputs to maintain data consistency.</p> <p>5) If basis risk analysis is done wholly by the sponsor with no input from an independent peril modeler.</p> <p>Scores from 2 to 4 will depend on the finer shades of distinction in this category as determined by A.M. Best.</p>	10%																								
Data Quality	1 to 5	<p>A.M. Best will ask each peril modeler for some generic indication on the different gradations of data quality used in modeling losses. For example, A.M. Best expects the extent to which the latitude and longitude of property locations are supplied to the model to be an indication of the level of data quality. Other indicators of data quality could be the extent to which the model has been supplied information about construction type, roof type, occupancy type, contents information, square footage, etc. Excessive use of default values in the models for primary and secondary characteristics of property is a clear-cut indication of bad data quality.</p> <p>Information supplied by the peril modelers will be used to rank data quality from 1 to 5.</p>	10%																								
Certainty of Business Composition	1 to 5	<p>1) If historical data show the type of business that is likely to be presented to the sponsor and the sponsor has a long track record. Stellar sponsor credibility is critical for this scoring category.</p> <p>5) If the sponsor has no track record (such as if it is a brand new reinsurer) and is uncertain about the type of business that is likely to be presented to it.</p> <p>Scores from 2 to 4 will depend on the finer shades of distinction in this category as determined by A.M. Best.</p>	10%																								

Source: A.M. Best Co.

Exhibit 2 Shortfall Table Example

Shortfall as a % of Limit	Conditional Probability of Exceedance (%)
<=0%	70%
>10	50
>20	45
>30	40
>40	30
>50	20
>60	15
>70	12
>80	8
>90	5

Source: A.M. Best Co.

Exhibit 3 Scoring-Based Reinsurance Credit Scale

Summed Basis Risk Score	Credit
1	90%
2	75%
3	50%
4	30%
5	10%

Source: A.M. Best Co.

Step 1 — Basis Risk Scoring Table

In Step 1, A.M. Best calculates a score based on **Exhibit 1**, the Basis Risk Scoring Table. This table describes A.M. Best’s internal scoring system for gauging basis risk. Each of the items in the scoring table is scored from 1 to 5 where 1 represents the least amount of basis risk.

While A.M. Best recognizes that it is not possible to capture all aspects of basis risk using this approach, the company believes it is useful as a relative measure of basis risk from transaction to transaction. The rest of the exhibits associated with the Basis Risk Scoring Table are described as follows:

- **Exhibit 2**, the Shortfall Table Example, shows the probability of a “shortfall” being greater than losses expressed as a percentage of the total principal amount of the catastrophe bond. A shortfall is defined as the amount by which the payout on the catastrophe bond “falls short” of the sponsor’s loss (i.e. the modeled company loss). As an example of how a shortfall is calculated for one scenario, consider one path of a hurricane that causes a certain level of industry loss. Assuming that the index is the PCS industry index, the peril modeler readily can calculate a modeled index loss by applying various scaling factors to the modeled

industry loss. In addition, the peril modeler can calculate the modeled company loss based on the company’s book of business (as is supplied to the peril modeler by the sponsoring insurance company). If the modeled index loss is less than the modeled company loss, then the shortfall is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Shortfall} = \frac{\{\text{Modeled Company Loss} - \text{Modeled Index Loss}\}}{\{\text{Bond Principal Balance}\}}$$

This shortfall can be tabulated for thousands of scenarios of hurricane paths (in some cases for hundreds of thousands of paths) to generate a distribution of shortfalls. From that distribution, confidence intervals of shortfalls can be determined. For example, **Exhibit 2** shows that the probability of having a shortfall of greater than 50% of the principal amount of the bond (on the left column of the exhibit) is 20% (as shown on the right column of the exhibit). Any insurer/reinsurer issuing a nonindemnity catastrophe bond and working with one of the top three peril modelers should be able to provide similar data to A.M. Best.

- **Exhibit 3**, the Scoring-Based Reinsurance Credit Scale, is the reinsurance credit table. A.M. Best adjusts for some of the modeling uncertainties, described earlier, that are associated with basis risk by imposing a maximum reinsurance credit of 90% (as shown on **Exhibit 3**).

- **Exhibit 4** is an example of A.M. Best’s Scoring-Based Credit Calculation.

Scoring Procedures:

The scoring mechanics for determining reinsurance credit are as follows:

- For each of the items in **Exhibit 1**, assign a number on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is the riskiest measure.
- Multiply each of the numbers by the factor weight in **Exhibit 1**.
- Sum all the products of the scales and their corresponding weights to get a total score.
- Correlate the total score to the Scoring-Based Reinsurance Credit Table (see **Exhibit 3**).

Step 2 — Calculating the Capital Effectiveness Ratio and Aggregate Capital Effectiveness Ratio

In Step 2, A.M. Best calculates a Capital Effectiveness Ratio and the Aggregate Capital Effectiveness Ratio, the components of which are supplied by the sponsor of the nonindemnity catastrophe bond and its peril modeling agency. The rest of this section describes both ratios and how they are calculated.

A.M. Best ultimately is interested in the extent to which the nonindemnity catastrophe bond being contemplated is effective in providing reinsurance protection to the sponsor. To this end, A.M. Best will need the following aggregate exceedance curves for the company:

1) The base aggregate exceedance curve before adding the effect of the nonindemnity catastrophe bond; and

2) The base aggregate exceedance curve after adding the nonindemnity catastrophe bond.

Depending on the return period being targeted (e.g., 1-in-100 for hurricane, 1-in-250 for earthquake), A.M. Best will compare the PML based on the aggregate exceedance curve after adding the nonindemnity catastrophe bond with the PML based on the aggregate exceedance curve before adding the bond. Specifically, A.M. Best will calculate the Capital Effectiveness Ratio for each catastrophe bond tranche as follows:

$$\text{Capital Effectiveness Ratio} = 90\% \times \left(\frac{\text{(PML Before Adding the Bond - PML After Adding the Bond)}}{\text{(Bond Principal Balance)}} \right)$$

The 90% factor in the Capital Effectiveness Ratio above is an adjustment factor for the various sources of basis risk that are difficult to model, as discussed earlier.

The diversification effect of issuing multiple tranches of catastrophe bonds that cover the same peril (such as earthquakes and hurricanes) can be positive for basis risk. At its discretion, A.M. Best will ask for additional aggregate exceedance curves that are based on combining two or more tranches of catastrophe bonds that provide protection for the same peril. Based on these aggregate exceedance curves and the aggregate PML (APML) derived for each peril, A.M. Best will calculate Aggregate Capital Effectiveness Ratios for the cumulative balance of the catastrophe bonds for each peril as follows:

$$\text{Aggregate Capital Effectiveness Ratio} = 90\% \times \left(\frac{\text{(APML Before Adding Bonds - APML After Adding Bonds)}}{\text{(Total Principal Balance of Bonds)}} \right)$$

Step 3 – Calculating the Absolute Reinsurance Credit

In Step 3, A.M. Best calculates the Absolute Reinsurance Credit, which is the maximum reinsurance credit to ascribe to the nonindemnity catastrophe bond. The formula for the reinsurance credit of each individual catastrophe bond is as follows:

Exhibit 4 An Example of Scoring-Based Calculation (California Earthquake)

Metrics	Score	Weight	Weight x Score
Shortfall	2	35%	0.70
Exhaustion Probability	1	25%	0.25
Data Quality	2	10%	0.20
Peril Type	3	10%	0.30
Peril Modeler Involvement	1	10%	0.10
Certainty of Business Composition	2	10%	0.20

Total value of: Weight x Score = 1.75.

This translates to approximately 79% on the scoring-based reinsurance credit scale (Exhibit 3). Assuming the capital effectiveness ratio is 81%, the absolute reinsurance credit = minimum (81%, 79%) = 79%.

Source: A.M. Best Co.

$$\text{Absolute Reinsurance Credit} = \text{Minimum (Capital Effectiveness Ratio, Credit Derived from Scoring Table)}$$

If the issuer has issued or intends to issue two or more catastrophe bonds covering a particular peril, the Absolute Reinsurance Credit for the catastrophe bonds covering the peril may be calculated (at A.M. Best's discretion) as follows:

$$\text{Absolute Reinsurance Credit} = \text{Aggregate Capital Effectiveness Ratio}$$

As an example of the calculation of reinsurance credit for a single nonindemnity catastrophe bond covering earthquakes, assume that at the 99.6% confidence level (i.e. at a return period of 250 years), the PML before adding the effect of the nonindemnity catastrophe bond is \$200 million, the PML after adding the effect of the catastrophe bond is \$65 million, and the principal balance of the bond is \$150 million. The Capital Effectiveness Ratio would be 81% (81% = 90% X [\$200 million - \$65 million] / \$150 million).

Step 4 – Other Considerations

Since an insurer's or reinsurer's book of business will change from year to year, so will the basis risk associated with the multiyear nonindemnity catastrophe bond it sponsors. A.M. Best would like some indication of how the catastrophe bond sponsor intends to measure basis risk changes as its business portfolio changes. In addition, A.M. Best is interested in how the index share factors are derived by the sponsor of the catastrophe bond, as well as how the index share factors may change at extreme ends of catastrophic losses. Finally, the risk management personnel and practices of the insurer/reinsurer matter greatly to A.M. Best.

Published by A.M. Best Company

Methodology

CHAIRMAN & PRESIDENT Arthur Snyder III

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT Larry G. Mayewski

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT Paul C. Tinnirello

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENTS Manfred Nowacki, Matthew Mosher, Rita L. Tedesco

**A.M. BEST COMPANY
WORLD HEADQUARTERS**
Ambest Road, Oldwick, N.J. 08858
Phone: +1 (908) 439-2200

NEWS BUREAU
830 National Press Building
529 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20045
Phone: +1 (202) 347-3090

**A.M. BEST EUROPE RATING SERVICES LTD.
A.M. BEST EUROPE INFORMATION SERVICES LTD.**
12 Arthur Street, 6th Floor, London, UK EC4R 9AB
Phone: +44 (0)20 7626-6264

A.M. BEST ASIA-PACIFIC LTD.
Unit 4004 Central Plaza, 18 Harbour Road, Wanchai, Hong Kong
Phone: +852 2827-3400



Copyright © 2011 by A.M. Best Company, Inc., Ambest Road, Oldwick, New Jersey 08858. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this report or document may be distributed in any electronic form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the A.M. Best Company. For additional details, see Terms of Use available at the A.M. Best Company Web site www.ambest.com.

Any and all ratings, opinions and information contained herein are provided "as is," without any expressed or implied warranty. A rating may be changed, suspended or withdrawn at any time for any reason at the sole discretion of A.M. Best.

A Best's Financial Strength Rating – Insurer is an independent opinion of an insurer's financial strength and ability to meet its ongoing insurance policy and contract obligations. It is based on a comprehensive quantitative and qualitative evaluation of a company's balance sheet strength, operating performance and business profile. The Financial Strength Rating opinion addresses the relative ability of an insurer to meet its ongoing insurance policy and contract obligations. These ratings are not a warranty of an insurer's current or future ability to meet contractual obligations. The rating is not assigned to specific insurance policies or contracts and does not address any other risk, including, but not limited to, an insurer's claims-payment policies or procedures; the ability of the insurer to dispute or deny claims payment on grounds of misrepresentation or fraud; or any specific liability contractually borne by the policy or contract holder. A Financial Strength Rating is not a recommendation to purchase, hold or terminate any insurance policy, contract or any other financial obligation issued by an insurer, nor does it address the suitability of any particular policy or contract for a specific purpose or purchaser.

A Best's Debt/Issuer Credit Rating is an opinion regarding the relative future credit risk of an entity, a credit commitment or a debt or debt-like security. It is based on a comprehensive quantitative and qualitative evaluation of a company's balance sheet strength, operating performance and business profile and, where appropriate, the specific nature and details of a rated debt security. Credit risk is the risk that an entity may not meet its contractual, financial obligations as they come due. These credit ratings do not address any other risk, including but not limited to liquidity risk, market value risk or price volatility of rated securities. The rating is not a recommendation to buy, sell or hold any securities, insurance policies, contracts or any other financial obligations, nor does it address the suitability of any particular financial obligation for a specific purpose or purchaser.

In arriving at a rating decision, A.M. Best relies on third-party audited financial data and/or other information provided to it. While this information is believed to be reliable, A.M. Best does not independently verify the accuracy or reliability of the information.

A.M. Best does not offer consulting or advisory services. A.M. Best is not an Investment Adviser and does not offer investment advice of any kind, nor does the company or its Rating Analysts offer any form of structuring or financial advice. A.M. Best does not sell securities. A.M. Best is compensated for its interactive rating services. These rating fees can vary from US\$ 5,000 to US\$ 500,000. In addition, A.M. Best may receive compensation from rated entities for non-rating related services or products offered.

A.M. Best's special reports and any associated spreadsheet data are available, free of charge, to all *BestWeek* subscribers. On those reports, nonsubscribers can access an excerpt and purchase the full report and spreadsheet data. Special reports are available through our Web site at www.ambest.com/research or by calling Customer Service at (908) 439-2200, ext. 5742. Some special reports are offered to the general public at no cost.

For press inquiries or to contact the authors, please contact James Peavy at (908) 439-2200, ext. 5644.

SR-2011-M-056