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The Health Actuarial (B) Task Force met Nov. 29, 2021. The following Task Force members participated: Eric A. Cioppa, Chair, represented by Marti Hooper (ME); Andrew N. Mais, Co-Vice Chair, represented by Paul Lombardo (CT); Jonathan T. Pike, Co-Vice Chair, represented by Jaakob Sundberg (UT); Jim L. Ridling represented by Jennifer Li (AL); Ricardo Lara represented by Lan Brown (CA); Michael Conway represented by Eric Unger (CO); Colin M. Hayashida represented by Kathleen Nakasone (HI); Dean L. Cameron represented by Weston Trexler (ID); Vicki Schmidt represented by Nicole Boyd (KS); Anita G. Fox represented by Kevin Dyke (MI); Chloria Lindley-Myers represented by William Leung (MO); Eric Dunning represented by Michael Muldoon (NE); Marlene Caride represented by Seong-min Eom (NJ); Russell Toal (NM); Judith L. French represented by Laura Miller (OH); Glen Mulready represented by Andrew Schallhorn (OK); Jessica K. Altman represented by Shannen Logue (PA); Carter Lawrence represented by Brian Hoffmeister (TN); Cassie Brown represented by R. Michael Markham (TX); Scott A. White represented by David Shea (VA); Mike Kreidler represented by Lichiou Lee (WA); Mark Afable represented by Rebecca Rebholz (WI); and Allan L. McVey represented by Joylynn Fix (WV).

1. **Adopted its Sept. 14 Minutes**

The Task Force met Sept. 14 and took the following action: 1) adopted its April 23 and April 6 minutes and the May 17 and March 29 minutes of the Long-Term Care Actuarial (B) Working Group; 2) disbanded the Health Care Reform Actuarial (B) Working Group and the State Rate Review (B) Subgroup; 3) adopted its 2022 proposed charges; and 4) discussed its proposal to revise instructions for the Health Annual Statement of Actuarial Opinion (SAO).

Mr. Lombardo made a motion, seconded by Mr. Leung, to adopt the Task Force’s Sept. 14 minutes (Attachment One). The motion passed unanimously.

2. **Heard an Update from the Federal CCIIO**

Megan Mason (Federal Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight—CCIIO) presented an update (Attachment Two) on a system connection between the System for Electronic Rates & Forms Filing (SERFF) and the Health Insurance Oversight System (HIOS) Unified Rate Review (URR) module.

3. **Heard an Update on SOA Health Care Trend Research**

Dale Hall (Society of Actuaries—SOA) gave an update (Attachment Three) on SOA health care trend research.

4. **Heard an Update from the Academy Health Practice Council**

Barb Klever (American Academy of Actuaries—Academy) gave an update (Attachment Four) on Academy Health Practice Council activities.

5. **Heard an Update from the Academy and the SOA Research Institute on an LTCI Mortality and Lapse Study**

Warren Jones (Academy – Retired) and Bruce Stahl (Reinsurance Group of America—RGA) gave an update (Attachment Five) on a long-term care insurance (LTCI) mortality and lapse study.

6. **Discussed a Proposal to Revise Instructions for the Health Annual Statement SAO**

Ms. Hooper said the Task Force submitted a proposal for changes to instructions for the Health Annual SAO related to the definition of “actuarial assets” to the Blanks (E) Working Group in May. She said the Actuarial Standards Board (ASB) received comments while exposing Actuarial Standard of Practice (ASOP) No. 28 that indicated some actuaries believe the NAIC Health Annual Statement instructions regarding SAOs are not in concert with the proposed ASOP. She said the Annual Statement instructions specifically address the treatment of actuarial liabilities but not actuarial assets. She said to avoid future confusion on the matter, the Task Force intends to update the wording for the 2022 instructions to clarify that both actuarial liabilities and assets should be considered in the opinion. She said the proposal was submitted past the deadline for inclusion in the 2021 Annual Statement instructions, but the Task Force views this as a clarification and not a change in practice; actuaries
should be considering actuarial assets when making SAOs. She said the Task Force sent a letter to the Working Group in June requesting that this clarification be included as guidance for completion of 2021 Health Annual Statement SAOs. She said the Task Force will schedule a meeting to discuss the proposal as it stands and any additional items that should be included in the 2022 Health Annual Statement instructions.


Ms. Hooper said the Task Force was asked by the Senior Issues (B) Task Force for input on the impact on Medicare supplement insurance plans by the addition of dental, hearing, and vision benefits to Medicare Part B. Brian R. Webb (NAIC) said at this time, only hearing benefits are being considered for coverage under Medicare Part B by federal legislators. Ms. Hooper said Maine recently added hearing aid coverage for adults as a mandated benefit in its federal Affordable Care Act (ACA) major medical insurance plans. She said this benefit was not added to Medicare supplement plans, as was erroneously reported by various sources. She said the possibility of the availability of non-prescription hearing aids could reduce the pricing impact of the addition of hearing benefits to Medicare Part B. She said the Task Force will be available to provide input in the event that hearing coverage is added.

Mr. Sundberg said the financial impact on Medicare supplement plans of the addition of hearing benefits does not concern him, but the addition of vision and dental benefits is of financial significance, and the Task Force should examine the potential impacts of these additions.

8. Heard an Update on STLD Insurance Plans in Idaho

Mr. Trexler gave a presentation (Attachment Six) on short-term limited-duration (STLD) insurance plan experience in the Idaho market.

Having no further business, the Health Actuarial (B) Task Force adjourned.
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The Health Actuarial (B) Task Force met Sept. 14, 2021. The following Task Force members participated: Eric A. Cioppa, Chair, represented by Marti Hooper (ME); Andrew N. Mais, Co-Vice Chair, represented by Paul Lombardo (CT); Jonathan T. Pike, Co-Vice Chair, represented by Jaak Sundberg (UT); Jim L. Ridling represented by Jennifer Li (AL); Ricardo Lara represented by Lan Brown (CA); Michael Conway represented by Eric Unger (CO); Colin M. Hayashida represented by Kathleen Nakasone (HI); Dean L. Cameron represented by Weston Trexler (ID); Dana Popish Severinghaus represented by Eric Anderson (IL); Amy L. Beard represented by Stephen Chamblee (IN); Anita G. Fox represented by Kevin Dyke (MI); Chlora Lindley-Myers represented by William Leung (MO); Eric Dunning represented by Michael Muldoon (NE); Marlene Caride represented by Seong-min Eom (NJ); Russell Toal (NM); Glen Mulready represented by Andrew Schallhorn (OK); Jessica K. Altman represented by Tracie Gray (PA); Carter Lawrence (TN); Doug Slape represented by Barbara Snyder (TX); Scott A. White represented by David Shea (VA); and Mike Kreidler represented by Lichiou Lee (WA).

1. **Adopted its April 23 and April 6 Minutes, and the May 17 and March 29 Minutes of the Long-Term Care Actuarial (B) Working Group**

Mr. Toal made a motion, seconded by Mr. Leung, to adopt the Task Force’s April 23 (Attachment One-A) and April 6 (Attachment One-B) minutes, and the May 17 (Attachment One-C) and March 29 (Attachment One-D) minutes of the Long-Term Care Actuarial (B) Working Group. The motion passed unanimously.

2. **Adopted a Motion to Disband the Health Care Reform Actuarial (B) Working Group and the State Rate Review (B) Subgroup**

Mr. Shea said the functions of the Health Care Reform Actuarial (B) Working Group and the State Rate Review (B) Subgroup can be performed at the Task Force level. He made a motion, seconded by Mr. Dyke, to disband both the Working Group and the Subgroup. The motion passed unanimously.

3. **Adopted its Proposed 2022 Charges**

Ms. Eom made a motion, seconded by Mr. Shea, to adopt its proposed 2022 Charges (Attachment One-E). The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Discussed its Proposal to Revise Instructions for the Health Annual Statement SAO**

Mr. Sundberg said the Task Force needs to revisit its proposal to revise the language in Section 4, Section 5, Section 7 and Section 9 of the instructions for the health Statement of Actuarial Opinion (SAO) to ensure that all items—actuarial assets and liabilities—within the scope of the SAO are treated consistently, and provide a final recommendation to the Blanks (E) Working Group. Ms. Hooper said the Task Force will begin work on this.

Having no further business, the Health Actuarial (B) Task Force adjourned.
The Health Actuarial (B) Task Force met April 23, 2021. The following Task Force members participated: Eric A. Cioppa, Chair, represented by Marti Hooper (ME); Andrew N. Mais, Co-Vice Chair, represented by Paul Lombardo (CT); Jonathan T. Pike, Co-Vice Chair, represented by Jaak Sundberg (UT); Lori K. Wing-Heier represented by Sarah Bailey (AK); Jim L. Ridling represented by Jennifer Li (AL); Ricardo Lara represented by Perry Kupferman (CA); Michael Conway represented by Eric Unger (CO); Colin M. Hayashida represented by Kathleen Nakasone (HI); Dean L. Cameron represented by Weston Trexler (ID); Dana Popish Severinghaus represented by Eric Anderson (IL); Anita G. Fox represented by Kevin Dyke (MI); Grace Arnold represented by Julia Lyng (MN); Chlora Lindley-Myers represented by William Leung (MO); Eric Dunning represented by Michael Muldoon (NE); Marlene Caride represented by Seong-min Eom (NJ); Russell Toal (NM); Judith L. French represented by Laura Miller (OH); Glen Mulready represented by Andrew Schallhorn (OK); Jessica K. Altman represented by Tracie Gray (PA); Doug Slape represented by Barbara Snyder (TX); Scott A. White represented by David Shea (VA); Mike Kreidler represented by Lichiou Lee (WA); Mark Afable represented by Brian Brown (WI); and James A. Dodrill represented by Joylynn Fix (WV).

1. Exposed a Proposal to Revise the Instructions for the Health SAO

Ms. Hooper said the Task Force received several comment letters in response to an exposure of a proposal to revise the language in Section 4, Section 5, Section 7 and Section 9 of the instructions for the health Statement of Actuarial Opinion (SAO) to ensure that all items—actuarial assets and liabilities—within the scope of the SAO are treated consistently.

Mr. Leung gave a summary of comments from Missouri (Attachment One-A1).

Ms. Lee gave a summary of comments from Washington (Attachment One-A2). Annette James (NovaRest Actuarial Consulting) suggested that “actuarial asset” and “actuarial liability” be defined as:

“Actuarial asset” means an actuarial item presented as an asset in the annual statement and included in the scope of the Statement of Actuarial Opinion.

“Actuarial liability” means an actuarial item presented as a liability in the annual statement and included in the scope of the Statement of Actuarial Opinion.

The Task Force agreed to include these definitions in the revisions to the proposal.

Barbara Klever (Blue Cross Blue Shield Association—BCBSA) gave a summary of comments from the BCBSA (Attachment One-A3). The Task Force agreed to the suggested change to Section 7.C.

Marc Lambright (Oliver Wyman) gave a summary of comments from the American Academy of Actuaries (Academy) (Attachment One-A4).

James Braue (UnitedHealth Group—UHG) gave a summary of comments from the UHG (Attachment One-A5).

The Task Force agreed to expose the proposal with the revisions discussed during the meeting (Attachment One-A6) for a public comment period ending May 7.

Having no further business, the Health Actuarial (B) Task Force adjourned.
From: Leung, William  
To: King, Eric  
Cc: Rehagen, John  
Subject: Comments re: Health Statement of Actuarial Opinion Instructions Change Proposal  
Date: Monday, April 12, 2021 12:11:06 PM  
Attachments: Health Actuarial Opinion Instructions Blanks Revision WL.pdf

Mr King,

Missouri has the following comments regarding the Health Statement of Actuarial Opinion Instructions Change Proposal, together with suggested changes in the attached redlined proposal:

1. The original requirement in Section 7C that the amounts carried in the balance sheet on account of the items identified above ... are at least as great as the minimum aggregate amounts required by any state, refers to the reserve and liabilities identified. The inclusion of actuarial assets in Sections 4 and 5 makes the opinion expressed on minimum aggregated amounts confusing. If not clarifying, one may think that a minimum amount of actuarial asset is required. A simple way to address the issue is to continue the prescribed language in the opinion with the understanding that actuarial assets are simply actuarial liabilities of negative value and the opinion is about the reasonableness and adequacy of actuarial liabilities or reserves reported. This change will make the original proposed revisions to Section 7D and Section 9 unnecessary.

2. Another simplification in Section 9 is simply refer to “the reserves or assets included in the of the opinion for a certain item or items in question” as “the amounts for a certain item or items in question.”
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Possible Edits to Actuarial Opinion section to more consistently reflect actuarial assets
4/9/2021

Section 1C.

The Actuarial Memorandum and underlying actuarial work papers supporting the Actuarial Opinion will be available for regulatory examination for seven years.

The Actuarial Memorandum contains significant proprietary information. It is expected that the Memorandum will be held confidential and is not intended for public inspection. The Memorandum must be available by May 1 of the year following the year-end for which the opinion was rendered or within two weeks after a request from an individual state commissioner.

The Actuarial Memorandum should conform to the documentation and disclosure requirements of the Standards of Practice as promulgated from time to time by the Actuarial Standards Board. The Actuarial Memorandum should contain both narrative and technical components. The narrative component should provide sufficient detail to clearly explain to company management, the regulator, or other authority the findings, recommendations and conclusions, as well as their significance. The technical component should provide sufficient documentation and disclosure for another actuary practicing in the same field to evaluate the work. This technical component must show the analysis from the basic data, (e.g., claim lags) to the conclusions.

The Memorandum must also include:

- An exhibit which ties to the Annual Statement and compares the actuary’s conclusions to the carried amounts;
- Documentation of the required reconciliation from the data used for analysis to the Underwriting and Investment Exhibit, Part 2B;
- Any other follow-up studies documenting the prior year’s claim liability and claim reserve run-off as considered necessary by the actuary; and
- Documentation of the assumptions used for contract reserves, other actuarial liabilities, actuarial assets, and related items and any material changes to those assumptions from the assumptions used in the previous memorandum. Such documentation should address any studies which support the adequacy of any margin in such reserves.

Section 4.

The IDENTIFICATION section should specifically indicate the appointed actuary’s relationship to the company, qualifications for acting as appointed actuary, date of appointment, and should specify that the appointment was made by the Board of Directors, or its equivalent or by a committee of the Board.

A person who is not a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries but is recognized by the Academy as qualified must attach, each year, a copy of the approval letter from the Academy. This section should contain only one of the following:

For a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries who is an employee of the organization, the opening paragraph of the opinion should contain all the following sentences if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

“I, (name and title of actuary), am an employee of (named organization) and a member of the American Academy of Actuaries. I was appointed by [named organization] and its (name of Board of Directors, or its equivalent, or
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committee of the Board) to render an opinion with regard to loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, actuarial assets, and related items on [date of appointment] in accordance with the requirements of the annual statement instructions. I meet the Academy qualification standards for rendering the opinion."

For a consultant who is a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries, the opening paragraph of the opinion should contain all the following sentences if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

"I, (name and title of consultant), am associated with the firm of (name of firm). I am a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and have been retained by the (name of organization) to render an opinion with regard to loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, actuarial assets, and related items. I was appointed on [date of appointment] in accordance with the requirements of the annual statement instructions. I meet the Academy qualification standards for rendering the opinion."

For an employee other than a member of the American Academy of Actuaries, the opening paragraph of the opinion should contain both the following sentences if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

"I, (name and title), am an employee of (name of organization) and am recognized by the American Academy of Actuaries as qualified to perform actuarial valuations for organizations of this kind. I was appointed by (named organization) with regard to such valuations on loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, actuarial assets, and related items. I was appointed on [date of appointment] in accordance with the requirements of the annual statement instructions."

For a consultant other than a member of the American Academy of Actuaries, the opening paragraph of the opinion should contain all the following sentences if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

"I, (name and title of consultant), am associated with the firm of (name of firm). I am recognized by the American Academy of Actuaries as qualified to perform actuarial valuations for organizations of this kind and have been retained by the (name of organization) with regard to such valuations on loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, actuarial assets, and related items. I was appointed on [date of appointment] in accordance with the requirements of the annual statement instructions."

Section 5.

The SCOPE section should contain only the following statement (including all specified lines even if the value is zero) if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

"I have examined the assumptions and methods used in determining loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, actuarial assets, and related items listed below, as shown in the annual statement of the organization as prepared for filing with state regulatory officials, as of December 31, 20__.

A. Claims unpaid (Page 3, Line 1);
B. Accrued medical incentive pool and bonus payments (Page 3, Line 2);
C. Unpaid claims adjustment expenses (Page 3, Line 3);
D. Aggregate health policy reserves (Page 3, Line 4) including unearned premium reserves, premium deficiency reserves and additional policy reserves from the Underwriting and Investment Exhibit, Part 2D;
E. Aggregate life policy reserves (Page 3, Line 5);
F. Property/casualty unearned premium reserves (Page 3, Line 6);
G. Aggregate health claim reserves (Page 3, Line 7);
H. Any other loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, or related items presented as liabilities in the annual statement; and
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I. Specified actuarial items presented as assets in the annual statement.

Items H and I are not intended to include the liabilities and assets associated with benefits provided to employees of the organization, or the organization’s directors or trustees, except to the extent that such benefits are provided through insurance or annuity contracts of a type that the organization is authorized to issue in the ordinary course of its business. For example, liabilities for employee pensions generally would not be within the scope of the Actuarial Opinion. However, if the organization is licensed to issue life insurance, then liabilities arising from life insurance policies or certificates issued by the organization to its employees would be within the scope of the Actuarial Opinion just as would the comparable liabilities arising from policies or contracts issued to unrelated parties.

If there are any items included in items H or I, they should be listed using appropriate annual statement captions and line references. The phrase “Not Applicable” should be placed under the item description for either item H or I if there is nothing to be listed. Any listings under items H and I do not constitute either “additional wording” or “revised wording” for purposes of the Table of Key Indicators.

If for either item H or item I there is more than one line item to be listed, the line items under the general H or I heading should be numbered sequentially.

The amounts of any assets listed under item I should be the gross amount of the asset (Page 2, Column 1 of the Annual Statement), not the net admitted amount (Page 2, Column 3).

For items A through G listed in the SCOPE section and each sub-line for items H and I, the item label should be followed by the amount of that item as reported in the annual statement. These stated amounts do not constitute either “additional wording” or “revised wording” for purposes of the Table of Key Indicators. Where the phrase “Not Applicable” is used in item H or item I, it means that there are no such items to be included in the Opinion, so there should be no value shown as a stated amount.

For example:

I. Specified actuarial items presented as assets in the annual statement, as follows:

1. Accrued retrospective premiums (Page 2, line 15.3, column 1)

Section 6.

The RELIANCE section should contain only one of the following if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

- If the appointed actuary has examined the asset and liability records, the reliance section should include only the following statement:
  
  “My examination included such review of the actuarial assumptions and actuarial methods and of the underlying basic asset and liability records and such tests of the actuarial calculations as I considered necessary. I also reconciled the underlying basic liability records to the Underwriting and Investment Exhibit, Part 2B of the company’s current annual statement.”

- If the appointed actuary has not examined the underlying records, but has relied upon data (e.g., asset or liability records) prepared by the company, the reliance section should include only the following statement:
  
  “In forming my opinion on [specify types of reserves] I relied upon data prepared by [name and title of company officer certifying liability records or other data] as certified in the attached statements. I evaluated that data for reasonableness and consistency. I also reconciled that data to the Underwriting and Investment Exhibit, Part 2B of the company’s current annual statement. In other respects, my examination included review of the actuarial assumptions and actuarial methods used and tests of the calculations I considered necessary.”

Attached to the appointed actuary’s opinion should be a statement by each person relied upon and a precise identification of the items subject to reliance. In addition, the persons on whom the appointed actuary relies shall
each provide a certification that precisely identifies the items on which the person is providing information and a statement as to the accuracy, completeness or reasonableness, as applicable, of the items. This certification shall include the signature, title, company, address and telephone number of the person rendering the certification, as well as the date on which it is signed.

Section 7.

The OPINION section should include only the following statement if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

“In my opinion, the amounts carried in the balance sheet on account of the items identified above:

A. Are in accordance with accepted actuarial standards consistently applied and are fairly stated in accordance with sound actuarial principles;

B. Are based on actuarial assumptions relevant to contract provisions and appropriate to the purpose for which the statement was prepared;

C. Meet the requirements of the Insurance Laws and regulations of the state of [state of domicile] and:

(Use of one of the following phrases, as appropriate, is considered prescribed wording. Replacing “[list states]” with an actual list of states in parentheses is also considered prescribed wording.)

are at least as great as the minimum aggregate amounts required by any state in which the statement is filed; or

are at least as great as the minimum aggregate amounts required by any state with the exception of the following states [list states]. For each listed state a separate statement of actuarial opinion was submitted to that state that complies with the requirements of that state;

D. Make a good and sufficient provision for all unpaid claims and other actuarial liabilities of the organization under the terms of its contracts and agreements when such liabilities are considered in combination with any actuarial assets included in the scope of this opinion;

E. Are computed on the basis of assumptions and methods consistent with those used in computing the corresponding items in the annual statement of the preceding year-end; and

F. Include appropriate provision for all actuarial items that ought to be established.

The Underwriting and Investment Exhibit, Part 2B was reviewed for reasonableness and consistency with the applicable Actuarial Standards of Practice.

Actuarial methods, considerations, and analyses used in forming my opinion conform to the relevant Standards of Practice as promulgated from time to time by the Actuarial Standards Board, which standards form the basis of this statement of opinion.”

Section 9.

If the appointed actuary is able to form an opinion that is not qualified, adverse or inconclusive as those terms are defined below, he or she should issue a statement of unqualified opinion. If the opinion is adverse, qualified or inconclusive, the appointed actuary should issue an adverse, qualified or inconclusive opinion explicitly stating the reason(s) for such opinion. In all circumstances the category of opinion should be explicitly identified in the TABLE of KEY INDICATORS section of the Actuarial Opinion.
An adverse opinion is an actuarial opinion in which the appointed actuary determines that the reserves and liabilities, when considered in combination with any assets included in the scope of the opinion, are not good and sufficient. (An adverse opinion does not meet item D of Section 7.)

When, in the actuary’s opinion, the reserve amounts for a certain item (or items) are in question because they cannot be reasonably estimated or the actuary is otherwise unable to render an opinion on those items, the actuary should issue a qualified opinion. Such a qualified opinion should state whether the stated reserve amounts make a good and sufficient provision for the liabilities associated with the specified reserves, when considered in combination with any assets included in the scope of the opinion, except for the item (or items) to which the qualification relates. The actuary is not required to issue a qualified opinion if the actuary reasonably believes that the item or items in question are not likely to be material. (A qualified opinion does not meet one or more of the items A, B, C or F of Section 7.)

The actuary’s ability to give an opinion is dependent upon data, analyses, assumptions and related information that are sufficient to support a conclusion. If the actuary cannot reach a conclusion due to deficiencies or limitations in the data, analyses, assumptions or related information, then the actuary should issue an inconclusive opinion. An inconclusive opinion shall include a description of the reasons a conclusion could not be reached.

https://naiconline.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/NAICSupportStaffHub/Member%20Meetings/Summer%202021/TF/HealthActuarial/Conference%20Calls/4-23%20HATF/Exposure%20Comments/WA%20Comments.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=576C8l
April 16, 2021

Eric A. Cioppa
Health Actuarial (B) Task Force
National Association of Insurance Commissioners
444 North Capitol St., NW Ste 700
Washington, D.C. 20001-1512

Submitted via email to Eric King at eking@naic.org

RE: Health Statement of Actuarial Opinion Instructions Exposure Draft

Dear Superintendent Cioppa:

The Blue Cross Blue Shield Association (BCBSA) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed revisions to the Health Statement of Actuarial Opinion Instructions.

BCBSA is a national federation of 35 independent, community-based and locally operated Blue Cross and Blue Shield companies (Plans) that collectively provide health care coverage for one in three Americans. For more than 90 years, Blue Cross and Blue Shield companies have offered quality health care coverage in all markets across America – serving those who purchase coverage on their own as well as those who obtain coverage through an employer, Medicare and Medicaid.

BCBSA agrees that revisions should be made to align the instructions with Actuarial Standard of Practice (ASOP) 28 by including actuarial assets in the scope. We have the following comments to clarify some of the revisions.

Under Section 5, we suggest that the insertion “actuarial assets” should be replaced with “actuarial assets included and identified in the scope of the actuarial opinion” to clarify that the opinion only covers assets specifically identified in the scope.

Under Section 7.C., insert at the beginning of 7.C the words “The loss reserves and actuarial liabilities” and then continue with “meet the requirements……” to clarify that minimum aggregate amounts required by states are typically specific to loss reserves and actuarial liabilities rather than the combination of loss reserves, actuarial liabilities and actuarial assets.

Under Section 9, we suggest that the word “actuarial” be inserted before the word “assets” in the revisions shown in the second and third paragraphs.
We appreciate your consideration of our comments. If you have any questions or want additional information, please contact Barb Klever at barbara.klever@bcbsa.com.

Sincerely,

Barbara Klever, FSA, MAAA
Senior Actuary, Policy
April 19, 2021

Eric King
Health Actuary
Health Actuarial (B) Task Force
National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC)

Re: Request for comments on proposal to modify the definition of “actuarial assets” as used in the instructions for the Health Statement of Actuarial Opinion

Dear Mr. King:

I write on behalf of the American Academy of Actuaries (Academy)\(^1\) Financial Reporting and Solvency Committee of the Health Practice Council regarding the blanks proposal to modify the instructions for the Health Statement of Actuarial Opinion to address “actuarial assets,” which we have reviewed. We appreciate the opportunity to provide the following comments.

Generally, we believe the changes are appropriate as they address the inclusion of wording reflecting that actuarial assets need to be covered by the actuarial opinion. We have the following specific comments:

1. The wording modifications in Sections 4. and 5. are fairly minor (addition of words: “actuarial assets”) and sensible considering actuaries are required to opine on both actuarial assets and liabilities.

2. The wording added in Section 7.D: “Make a good and sufficient provision for all unpaid claims and other actuarial liabilities of the organization under the terms of its contracts and agreements, when such liabilities are considered in combination with any actuarial assets included in the scope of this opinion…” while a bit cumbersome, would essentially result in the actuary signing off on actuarial assets and liabilities held on the balance sheet considering good and sufficient concepts, so is not objectionable.

3. The revisions in Section 9. incorporate actuarial assets wording into instructions related to considerations when issuing adverse, qualified or inconclusive opinions, which is appropriate.

4. One item that is not addressed in the Instructions to the Annual Health Statement Blank, Actuarial Opinion is the definition of an “actuarial asset.” While actuaries generally can point to other guidance to determine what could reasonably be

\(^1\) The American Academy of Actuaries is a 19,500-member professional association whose mission is to serve the public and the U.S. actuarial profession. For more than 50 years, the Academy has assisted public policymakers on all levels by providing leadership, objective expertise, and actuarial advice on risk and financial security issues. The Academy also sets qualification, practice, and professionalism standards for actuaries in the United States.
considered an “actuarial asset,” it does not appear to be well defined within the NAIC instructions. The NAIC may want to consider adding some certainty to what is a reasonable approach to determining what constitutes an “actuarial asset” to be included in the Actuarial Opinion.

*****

If you have any questions or would like to discuss further, please contact Matthew Williams, the Academy’s senior health policy analyst, at williams@actuary.org.

Sincerely,

Marc Lambright, MAAA, FSA
Chairperson, Financial Reporting and Solvency Committee
American Academy of Actuaries

https://naiconline.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/NAICSupportStaffHub/Member%20Meetings/Summer%202021/TF/HealthActuarial/Conference%20Calls/4-23%20HATF/Exposure%20Comments/Academy_Health_Statement_of_Actuarial_Opinion_Comments_to_NAIC_4.19.21.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=WT04XH
April 15, 2021

Ms. Marti Hooper, Chair
Health Actuarial (B) Task Force
National Association of Insurance Commissioners
1100 Walnut Street, Suite 1500
Kansas City, MO 64106-2197

Via electronic mail to Eric King.

Re: Proposed changes to the Health Annual Statement instructions for the Actuarial Opinion.

Dear Ms. Hooper:

I am writing on behalf of UnitedHealth Group with regard to the proposed changes to the Health Annual Statement instructions for the Actuarial Opinion, as exposed for comment by your Task Force on April 6, 2021. Overall, we are supportive of the proposed changes. However, there are two aspects of the proposal that we feel deserve further comment.

First, we would like to emphasize that we believe that the proposal does not represent a change from what is currently required by the existing instructions. In particular:

- Sections 4 and 5 of the instructions refer to “loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, and related items.” We consider the term “related items” to include the actuarial assets that are within the scope of the Actuarial Opinion. Generally speaking, the assets are either claim-related, and therefore can be viewed as supplementing the actuarial liabilities for claims; or they are premium-related, and can be viewed as supplementing the actuarial liabilities for policy reserves. Accordingly, we do not feel that the existing language of Sections 4 and 5 is inconsistent with the inclusion of actuarial assets.

- In Section 7, the prescribed wording begins, “In my opinion, the amounts carried in the balance sheet on account of the items identified above: …” The “items identified above” are all of the items listed in the Scope section of the Actuarial Opinion, including the actuarial assets. Therefore, all of the subsequent statements in Section 7 must be deemed to apply to the actuarial assets, unless clearly inapplicable.
In Section 9, the language regarding qualified Actuarial Opinions certainly could be construed to apply only to actuarial liabilities. However, we believe that as a practical matter, both the Appointed Actuary and any regulatory reviewer of the Actuarial Opinion would recognize that an Actuarial Opinion might be qualified with regard to an actuarial asset, as well.

Therefore, we view the proposed changes to be a clarification of the existing requirements, rather than a change to those requirements. That said, we welcome such a clarification, especially with regard to Section 9, where the existing language is somewhat misleading.

Second, we wish to point out that the statements in the Opinion section of the Actuarial Opinion (Section 7 of the instructions) cannot readily be applied to the net of the actuarial liabilities and assets, as there was some discussion of that issue during your April 6 conference call. Perhaps the clearest case is statement C, which requires the Appointed Actuary to affirm that the amounts identified in the Scope section “are at least as great as the minimum aggregate amounts required by any state.” An amount that has been reduced by netting the actuarial assets against it is unlikely to meet a state’s minimum liability standards. With regard to how each of the statements applies to the combination of liabilities and assets, we note the following.

- Statements A and F could conceivably be applied to the net of the actuarial liabilities and actuarial assets.

- Statements B and E can be considered to apply to the liabilities and assets collectively; they relate to assumptions and methodology rather than the numerical amounts of the actuarial items.

- Statement C typically will apply only to the liabilities. That does not necessarily need to be spelled out explicitly, because there probably are no state minimum requirements applicable to actuarial assets, in which case the requirement is effectively zero. That being the case, the amount of any asset will automatically be at least as great as what’s required (i.e., will be greater than or equal to zero).

- Statement D is the “good and sufficient” statement. In order to meet the “good and sufficient” standard, the assets and liabilities must incorporate a certain degree of conservatism or “margin,” whether implicit, explicit, or both. We believe that in practice, that standard means that the liabilities within the scope of the Actuarial Opinion, in aggregate, must include an adequate provision for a reasonable degree of adverse deviation from the anticipated experience, and that such provision must not be materially impaired by any overstatement of the aggregate assets that are within the scope of the Actuarial Opinion.

Accordingly, it does not seem that there is a uniform way that actuarial assets can be addressed by the statements in the Opinion section. If your Task Force believes that more clarity is needed, we suggest that rather than trying to revise the Opinion statements, you could include guidance in the instructions (just as guidance about the type of Actuarial Opinion is provided in Section 9 of the instructions).
In conclusion, we support the proposed changes, and we suggest that any additional clarification of Section 7 be made through additional instructions rather than through changes to the prescribed wording of the Statement of Actuarial Opinion. The bullet points above concerning statements A through F might serve as a starting point for such instructions, if desired.

We would be happy to discuss these comments with you and the Task Force.

James R. Braue  
Director, Actuarial Services  
UnitedHealth Group

c: Eric King, NAIC  
Randi Reichel, UnitedHealth Group
**NAIC BLANKS (E) WORKING GROUP**
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IDENTIFICATION OF ITEM(S) TO CHANGE

Instructions to Annual Health Statement Blank, Actuarial Opinion (Actuarial Opinion Instructions):

Modify section 1A. (Definitions), of the actuarial opinion instructions to add definitions of “actuarial asset” and “actuarial liability”.

Modify section 4 (Identification section), section 5 (Scope section), and section 7 (Opinion section) of the actuarial opinion instructions to ensure that the opinion’s prescribed wording clearly indicates that the actuary’s opinion covers actuarial assets as well as actuarial liabilities.

Modify section 9 of the actuarial opinion instructions to ensure that guidance related to the type of opinion rendered by an appointed actuary covers both actuarial assets and actuarial liabilities.

Section 1

1A. Definitions

“Insurer” means an entity authorized to write accident and health contracts under the laws of any state and which files on the Health Blank.

“Actuarial Memorandum” means a document or other presentation prepared as a formal means of conveying the appointed actuary’s professional conclusions and recommendations, of recording and communicating the methods and procedures, of assuring that the parties addressed are aware of the significance of the appointed actuary’s opinion or findings and that documents memorandum is further described in Section 1C.

“Actuarial asset” means an actuarial item presented as an asset in the annual statement and included in the scope of the Statement of Actuarial Opinion.

“Actuarial liability” means an actuarial item presented as a liability in the annual statement and included in the scope of the Statement of Actuarial Opinion.

Section 4

4. The IDENTIFICATION section should specifically indicate the appointed actuary’s relationship to the company, qualifications for acting as appointed actuary, date of appointment, and should specify that the appointment was made by the Board of Directors, or its equivalent or by a committee of the Board. A person who is not a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries but is recognized by the Academy as qualified must attach, each year, a copy of the approval letter from the Academy.

This section should contain only one of the following:

For a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries who is an employee of the organization, the opening paragraph of the opinion should contain all the following sentences if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

“I, (name and title of actuary), am an employee of (named organization) and a member of the American Academy of Actuaries. I was appointed on [date of appointment] in accordance with the requirements of the annual statement instructions. I meet the Academy qualification standards for rendering the opinion.”

For a consultant who is a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries, the opening paragraph of the opinion should contain all the following sentences if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

“I, (name and title of consultant), am associated with the firm of (name of firm). I am a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and have been retained by the (name of organization) to render an opinion with regard to loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, actuarial assets, and related items. I was appointed on [date of appointment] in accordance with the requirements of the annual statement instructions. I meet the Academy qualification standards for rendering the opinion.”

Section 5:
5. The SCOPE section should contain only the following statement (including all specified lines even if the value is zero) if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

“I have examined the assumptions and methods used in determining loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, actuarial assets, and related items listed below, as shown in the annual statement of the organization as prepared for filing with state regulatory officials, as of December 31, 20__.

Section 7:

7. The OPINION section should include only the following statement if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

“In my opinion, the amounts carried in the balance sheet on account of the items identified above:

A. Are in accordance with accepted actuarial standards consistently applied and are fairly stated in accordance with sound actuarial principles;

B. Are based on actuarial assumptions relevant to contract provisions and appropriate to the purpose for which the statement was prepared;

C. Meet the requirements of the Insurance Laws and regulations of the state of [state of domicile] and:

(Use of one of the following phrases, as appropriate, is considered prescribed wording. Replacing “[list states]” with an actual list of states in parentheses is also considered prescribed wording.)

- The loss reserves and actuarial liabilities are at least as great as the minimum aggregate amounts required by any state,

or

- The loss reserves and actuarial liabilities are at least as great as the minimum aggregate amounts required by any state with the exception of the following states [list states]. For each listed state a separate statement of actuarial opinion was submitted to that state that complies with the requirements of that state;

D. Make a good and sufficient provision for all unpaid claims and other actuarial liabilities of the organization under the terms of its contracts and agreements when such liabilities are considered in combination with any actuarial assets included in the scope of this opinion…”

Section 9:

9. If the appointed actuary is able form an opinion that is not qualified, adverse or inconclusive as those terms are defined below, he or she should issue a statement of unqualified opinion. If the opinion is adverse, qualified or inconclusive, the appointed actuary should issue an adverse, qualified or inconclusive opinion explicitly stating the reason(s) for such opinion. In all circumstances the category of opinion should be explicitly identified in the TABLE of KEY INDICATORS section of the Actuarial Opinion.

An adverse opinion is an actuarial opinion in which the appointed actuary determines that the reserves and liabilities, when considered in combination with any actuarial assets included in the scope of the opinion, are not good and sufficient. (An adverse opinion does not meet item D of Section 7.)

When, in the actuary’s opinion, the reserves or actuarial assets included in the scope of the opinion for a certain item or items are in question because they cannot be reasonably estimated or the actuary is unable to render an opinion on those items, the actuary should issue a qualified opinion. Such a qualified opinion should state whether the stated reserve amount makes a good and sufficient provision for the liabilities associated with the specified reserves, when considered in combination with any actuarial assets included in the scope of the opinion, except for the item or items to which the qualification relates. The actuary is not required to issue a qualified opinion if the actuary reasonably believes that the item or items in question are not likely to be material. (A qualified opinion does not meet one or more of the items A, B, C or F of Section 7.)
The actuary’s ability to give an opinion is dependent upon data, analyses, assumptions and related information that are sufficient to support a conclusion. If the actuary cannot reach a conclusion due to deficiencies or limitations in the data, analyses, assumptions or related information, then the actuary should issue an inconclusive opinion. An inconclusive opinion shall include a description of the reasons a conclusion could not be reached.
The Health Actuarial (B) Task Force met April 6, 2021. The following Task Force members participated: Eric A. Cioppa, Chair, represented by Marti Hooper (ME); Andrew N. Mais, Co-Vice Chair, represented by Paul Lombardo (CT); Jonathan T. Pike, Co-Vice Chair, represented by Jaakob Sundberg (UT); Lori K. Wing-Heier represented by Sarah Bailey (AK); Jim L. Ridling represented by Jennifer Li (AL); Ricardo Lara represented by Perry Kupferman (CA); Michael Conway represented by Eric Unger (CO); Dean L. Cameron represented by Weston Trexler (ID); Dana Popish Seiveringhaus represented by Eric Anderson (IL); Anita G. Fox represented by Kevin Dyke (MI); Grace Arnold represented by Julia Lyng (MN); Chlora Lindley-Myers represented by William Leung (MO); Mike Causey represented by David Yetter (NC); Bruce R. Ramge represented by Michael Muldoon (NE); Marlene Caride represented by Seong-min Eom (NJ); Judith L. French represented by Laura Miller (OH); Glen Mulready represented by Andrew Schallhorn (OK); Jessica K. Altman represented by Jim Laverty (PA); Doug Slape represented by Barbara Snyder (TX); Scott A. White represented by David Shea (VA); Mike Kreidler represented by Amy Peach (WA); Mark Afable represented by Brian Brown (WI); and James A. Dodrill represented by Joylynn Fix (WV).

1. Exposed a Proposal to Revise the Instructions for the Health SAO

Annette James (NovaRest Actuarial Consulting) presented a proposal (Attachment One-B1) to revise the language in Section 4, Section 5, Section 7 and Section 9 of the instructions for the health Statement of Actuarial Opinion (SAO) to ensure that all items (actuarial assets and liabilities) within the scope of the SAO are treated consistently.

Ms. Hooper said the Task Force will expose the proposal for a 10-day public comment period ending April 16.

Having no further business, the Health Actuarial (B) Task Force adjourned.
### Blanks Agenda Item Submission Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACT PERSON:</th>
<th>Eric King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE:</td>
<td>816-708-7982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL ADDRESS:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eking@naic.org">eking@naic.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON BEHALF OF:</td>
<td>ASOP 28 Task Force, ASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME:</td>
<td>Annette James, Chair, ASOP 28 Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFILIATION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOR NAIC USE ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Changes to Existing Reporting</th>
<th>New Reporting Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVIEWED FOR ACCOUNTING PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES IMPACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Modifies Required Disclosure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISPOSITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rejected For Public Comment</th>
<th>Referred To Another NAIC Group</th>
<th>Received For Public Comment</th>
<th>Adopted Date</th>
<th>Rejected Date</th>
<th>Deferred Date</th>
<th>Other (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BLANK(S) TO WHICH PROPOSAL APPLIES**

- [X] ANNUAL STATEMENT
- [X] INSTRUCTIONS
- [ ] CROSSCHECKS
- [ ] QUARTERLY STATEMENT
- [ ] BLANK
- [ ] Life, Accident & Health/Fraternal
- [ ] Property/Casualty
- [X] Health
- [ ] Separate Accounts
- [ ] Protected Cell
- [ ] Health (Life Supplement)

Anticipated Effective Date: Annual 2021

**IDENTIFICATION OF ITEM(S) TO CHANGE**

See the following page for details of proposed changes.

**REASON, JUSTIFICATION FOR AND/OR BENEFIT OF CHANGE**
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IDENTIFICATION OF ITEM(S) TO CHANGE

Instructions to Annual Health Statement Blank, Actuarial Opinion (Actuarial Opinion Instructions):

Modify sections 4 (Identification section), section 5 (Scope section), and section 7 (Opinion section) of the actuarial opinion instructions to ensure that the opinion’s prescribed wording clearly indicates that the actuary’s opinion covers actuarial assets as well as actuarial liabilities.

Modify section 9 of the actuarial opinion instructions to ensure that guidance related to the type of opinion rendered by an appointed actuary covers both actuarial assets and actuarial liabilities.

Section 4

4. The IDENTIFICATION section should specifically indicate the appointed actuary’s relationship to the company, qualifications for acting as appointed actuary, date of appointment, and should specify that the appointment was made by the Board of Directors, or its equivalent or by a committee of the Board. A person who is not a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries but is recognized by the Academy as qualified must attach, each year, a copy of the approval letter from the Academy.

This section should contain only one of the following:

For a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries who is an employee of the organization, the opening paragraph of the opinion should contain all the following sentences if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

“I, (name and title of actuary), am an employee of (named organization) and a member of the American Academy of Actuaries. I was appointed on [date of appointment] in accordance with the requirements of the annual statement instructions. I meet the Academy qualification standards for rendering the opinion.”

For a consultant who is a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries, the opening paragraph of the opinion should contain all the following sentences if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

“I, (name and title of consultant), am associated with the firm of (name of firm). I am a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and have been retained by the (name of organization) to render an opinion with regard to loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, actuarial assets, and related items. I was appointed on [date of appointment] in accordance with the requirements of the annual statement instructions. I meet the Academy qualification standards for rendering the opinion.”

Section 5:

5. The SCOPE section should contain only the following statement (including all specified lines even if the value is zero) if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

“I have examined the assumptions and methods used in determining loss reserves, actuarial liabilities, actuarial assets, and related items listed below, as shown in the annual statement of the organization as prepared for filing with state regulatory officials, as of December 31, 20__.

Section 7:

7. The OPINION section should include only the following statement if the appointed actuary is using the prescribed wording:

“In my opinion, the amounts carried in the balance sheet on account of the items identified above:

A. Are in accordance with accepted actuarial standards consistently applied and are fairly stated in accordance with sound actuarial principles;

B. Are based on actuarial assumptions relevant to contract provisions and appropriate to the purpose for which the statement was prepared;
C. Meet the requirements of the Insurance Laws and regulations of the state of [state of domicile] and:
(Use of one of the following phrases, as appropriate, is considered prescribed wording. Replacing “[list states]” with an actual list of states in parentheses is also considered prescribed wording.)

are at least as great as the minimum aggregate amounts required by any state,

or

are at least as great as the minimum aggregate amounts required by any state with the exception of the following states [list states]. For each listed state a separate statement of actuarial opinion was submitted to that state that complies with the requirements of that state;

D. Make a good and sufficient provision for all unpaid claims and other actuarial liabilities of the organization under the terms of its contracts and agreements, when such liabilities are considered in combination with any actuarial assets included in the scope of this opinion…”

Section 9:

9. If the appointed actuary is able form an opinion that is not qualified, adverse or inconclusive as those terms are defined below, he or she should issue a statement of unqualified opinion. If the opinion is adverse, qualified or inconclusive, the appointed actuary should issue an adverse, qualified or inconclusive opinion explicitly stating the reason(s) for such opinion. In all circumstances the category of opinion should be explicitly identified in the TABLE of KEY INDICATORS section of the Actuarial Opinion.

An adverse opinion is an actuarial opinion in which the appointed actuary determines that the reserves and liabilities, when considered in combination with any assets included in the scope of the opinion, are not good and sufficient. (An adverse opinion does not meet item D of Section 7.)

When, in the actuary’s opinion, the reserves or assets included in the scope of the opinion for a certain item or items are in question because they cannot be reasonably estimated or the actuary is unable to render an opinion on those items, the actuary should issue a qualified opinion. Such a qualified opinion should state whether the stated reserve amount makes a good and sufficient provision for the liabilities associated with the specified reserves, when considered in combination with any assets included in the scope of the opinion, except for the item or items to which the qualification relates. The actuary is not required to issue a qualified opinion if the actuary reasonably believes that the item or items in question are not likely to be material. (A qualified opinion does not meet one or more of the items A, B, C or F of Section 7.)

The actuary’s ability to give an opinion is dependent upon data, analyses, assumptions and related information that are sufficient to support a conclusion. If the actuary cannot reach a conclusion due to deficiencies or limitations in the data, analyses, assumptions or related information, then the actuary should issue an inconclusive opinion. An inconclusive opinion shall include a description of the reasons a conclusion could not be reached.
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The Long-Term Care Actuarial (B) Working Group of the Health Actuarial (B) Task Force met May 17, 2021. The following Working Group members participated: Perry Kupferman, Chair (CA); Jennifer Li (AL); Paul Lombardo (CT); Benjamin Ben (FL); Nicole Boyd (KS); Marti Hooper (ME); Fred Andersen (MN); Rhonda Ahrens (NE); Anna Krylova (NM); Bill Carmello (NY); Andrew Schallhorn (OK); Jim Laverty (PA); Andrew Dvorine (SC); Barbara Snyder and Mike Boerner (TX); and Tomasz Serbinowski (UT).

1. Discussed an LTCI Data Call

Mr. Kupferman said the purpose of the meeting is to gauge state insurance regulator and industry interest in conducting a mandatory long-term care insurance (LTCI) morbidity data call. He said he is concerned that federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) restrictions will preclude collection of needed data for individuals older than age 90, and this is a block of data that is crucial for the success of the project. Pete Miller (Society of Actuaries—SOA) said he is confident this data can be collected at a level that will not violate HIPAA and be of sufficient granularity to be useful.

Mr. Kupferman said LTCI companies rely on company experience or consultant experience studies for reserving, and he would like the NAIC to sponsor a mandatory LTCI data call to be used for this purpose.

Mr. Andersen said approximately five years ago, the Life Actuarial (A) Task Force’s Experience Reporting (A) Subgroup evaluated whether mandatory company data reporting is warranted for various lines of business, and one of the lines evaluated was LTCI. He said LTCI was ranked as very high for morbidity data usefulness and low to moderate for the usefulness of industry-wide averages. He said there is not currently a tested format for collecting LTCI morbidity data, but recent SOA experience study formats may be convertible to a Valuation Manual (VM)-51, Experience Reporting Formats, structure.

Mr. Andersen gave an overview of a life insurance mortality data call by New York. He said New York and Kansas led the effort, MIB acted as the statistical agent, and the SOA aggregated the data. He said the data call was highly successful, but it took two to three years to complete and required new state laws to be written. He said the data call was conducted annually, and there has never been an annual experience study conducted for LTCI. Ms. Ahrens said an annual LTCI experience study would be too burdensome.

Mr. Carmello asked if authority like that for life insurance principle-based reserving (PBR) is needed for a similar LTCI project. Ms. Ahrens said the scope of the current VM-51 includes health insurance, so authority for LTCI is not an issue. Mr. Boerner noted that the current Health Actuarial (B) Task Force charge to “[d]evelop LTCI experience reporting requirements in VM-50, Experience Reporting Requirements, and VM-51, Experience Reporting Formats, of the Valuation Manual” allows for conducting an LTCI data call.

Ms. Boyd said an LTCI data call overseen by Kansas went smoothly, but it was expensive. She said the data was collected by MIB and then forwarded to the SOA for analysis. She said there was not much pushback from subject companies concerning providing data.

Mr. Lombardo said Connecticut supports a mandatory LTCI data call, and it is very important for state insurance regulators and industry. He said he believes companies will comply with the request.

Dan Schelp (NAIC) said the NAIC is concerned the study may violate aspects of HIPPPAA and with the availability of needed financial and staff resources for the project.

Pat Allison (NAIC) said the NAIC’s current life insurance PBR data collection goes through a two-step validation process. She said the data is first checked for missing or disallowed values, then a more detailed analysis of the data’s appropriateness is conducted.

Ray Nelson (America’s Health Insurance Plans—AHIP) said he is concerned that requiring companies to submit data to the data call while also voluntarily contributing data to current SOA studies may be overly burdensome. He asked if the SOA...
studies can be expanded to meet the needs of an NAIC data call. Ms. Ahrens said she believes expansion of its studies is the direction the SOA is heading in. She said a feasible way forward is for the SOA to modify the design of its studies to fit into a form that fits the VM-51 statistical plan. She said the SOA has indicated it has the appetite for such an approach.

Mr. Andersen proposed providing the proposal below to be used to survey Working Group members for their opinions on the usefulness of an NAIC mandatory data call. He said he believes taking the time to explore all of these issues and then weighing the pros and cons before making a commitment will lead to a better chance of having a helpful, useful project.

The recommendation is to start laying the groundwork, without 100% commitment at this time, toward collecting the LTCI morbidity data starting in 2024.

The regulatory actuaries can reach out to industry to determine how helpful mandatory data collection resulting in tables of industry averages will be. The question is whether it adds much value when the SOA and Milliman already have voluntary studies and the Valuation Analysis (E) Working Group has access to timely information direct from the companies.

NAIC staff can investigate issues such as resources, technology, operations, legal issues, and money availability. The ultimate decision would be made by NAIC leadership.

Mr. Kupferman agreed to surveying Working Group members on the proposal’s merit.

Having no further business, the Long-Term Care Actuarial (B) Working Group adjourned.
The Long-Term Care Actuarial (B) Working Group of the Health Actuarial (B) Task Force met March 29, 2021. The following Working Group members participated: Perry Kupferman, Chair (CA); Jennifer Li (AL); Paul Lombardo (CT); Benjamin Ben (FL); Nicole Boyd (KS); Marti Hooper (ME); Fred Andersen (MN); Rhonda Ahrens (NE); Anna Krylova (NM); Bill Carmello (NY); Laura Miller (OH); Andrew Schallhorn (OK); Jim Laverty (PA); Andrew Dvorine (SC); Barbara Snyder (TX); and Tomasz Serbinowski (UT).

1. **Heard a Presentation from the SOA on COVID-19 Impacts on LTCI**

   Mike Bergerson (Milliman) and Robert Eaton (Milliman) gave a presentation (Attachment One-D1) on the Society of Actuaries’ (SOA’s) survey of long-term care insurance (LTCI) companies’ reaction to the impact of COVID-19 on LTCI mortality, voluntary lapse and morbidity experience.

   Mr. Kupferman suggested that it may be interesting to analyze the experience data separated by policyholders who were in long-term care (LTC) facilities during the exposure period and those who were not. He also suggested analyzing the data separated by individual versus group LTCI and attained age brackets. He said the effects of the vaccination rate should also be considered.

   Mr. Andersen said recent state insurance regulator analyses of reserves held by LTCI companies shows COVID-19 impacts that are similar to those shown in the SOA survey.

   Having no further business, the Long-Term Care Actuarial (B) Working Group adjourned.
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Background

- The Society of Actuaries (SOA) retained Milliman, Inc. (Milliman) to conduct a survey on the impact of COVID-19 on Long-Term Care (LTC) insurance mortality, voluntary lapse, and morbidity experience.
- The survey studied the emerging impact of COVID-19 for the period from April 1, 2020 through September 30, 2020.
- The survey did not reflect the surge of COVID-19 morbidity and mortality that took place after September 2020; further survey work is necessary to assess the impact of those cases.
- The survey was sent to companies with LTC blocks of insurance. 15 companies participated in the survey, which represented approximately 50% of the insured lives in force at year-end 2019.

Active Life Mortality

- About half of the respondents reported observing an increase in active life mortality.
Disabled Life Mortality

• About half of the respondents reported observing an increase in disabled life mortality.

![disabled_life_mortality_graph](image)

Additional Comments on Mortality

• Three companies observed a higher mortality impact on disabled life mortality than on active life mortality. Two companies observed a smaller impact on disabled life mortality compared to active life mortality.

• A number of companies indicated that mortality levels increased initially but started to regress towards pre-COVID levels by the end of the survey reporting period.

![additional_comments_graph](image)

Voluntary Lapse

• Results on voluntary lapse rates were mixed.

• A number of companies indicated that they have not adjusted lapse rates for premium grace period extensions due to COVID-19.

![voluntary_lapse_graph](image)

Morbidity

© 2021 National Association of Insurance Commissioners
Claim Incidence

- The biggest impact on mortality observed by companies thus far has been related to claim incidence.
- Seven companies (58%) reported seeing a shift in claim sites toward a home health care setting. This was true for both existing claims and new claims but especially so for new claims.
- Some companies indicated that claim incidence levels decreased initially but started to regress toward pre-COVID levels by September 2020.

Reserves

- A majority of the respondents reported observing a decrease in claim reserves.
- This is consistent with the increase in disabled mortality and decrease in claim incidence experience observed by many companies.

Other Reserves

- Half of respondents indicated there was no impact on gross premium reserves (GPR), premium deficiency reserves (PDR), or additional actuarial reserves (AAR). Of the companies that indicated there was an impact, most said one or more of these reserves increased as a result of a decrease in new money interest rates.
- For companies that reported no impact on GPR, PDR, or AAR reserves, we believe that companies are indicating they have not changed valuation assumptions due to COVID-19. However, some companies may be indicating there is no net change (i.e., no impact) due to updates in valuation assumptions from COVID-19.
What’s next?

• Continued research as data emerges on shorter-term impacts
• Watching data closely to see if short-term habits become long-term
• Shift towards home health care instead of facility
• Hygiene/social changes – impact on regular flu in the future
• Following medical research to understand any longer lasting health impacts from COVID-19 and considering potential impact on LTC assumptions

Looking Forward
2022 PROPOSED CHARGES

HEALTH ACTUARIAL (B) TASK FORCE

The mission of the Health Actuarial (B) Task Force is to identify, investigate, and develop solutions to actuarial problems in the health insurance industry.

Ongoing Support of NAIC Programs, Products or Services

1. The Health Actuarial (B) Task Force will:
   A. Provide recommendations, as appropriate, to address issues and provide actuarial assistance and commentary with respect to model requirements for appropriate long-term care insurance (LTCI) rates, rating practices, and rate changes.
   B. Provide support for issues related to implementation of, and/or changes to, the federal Affordable Care Act (ACA).
   C. Continue to develop health insurance reserving requirements (VM-25, Health Insurance Reserves Minimum Reserve Requirements) using a principle-based reserving (PBR) framework.
   D. Develop LTCI experience reporting requirements in VM-50, Experience Reporting Requirements, and VM-51, Experience Reporting Formats, of the Valuation Manual.
   E. Provide recommendations, as appropriate, to address issues and provide actuarial assistance and commentary to other NAIC groups relative to their work on health actuarial matters.

2. The Long-Term Care Actuarial (B) Working Group will:
   A. Assist the Health Actuarial (B) Task Force in completing the following charges:
      1. Provide recommendations, as appropriate, to address issues and provide actuarial assistance and commentary with respect to model requirements for appropriate LTCI rates, rating practices, and rate changes.
      2. Continue to develop health insurance reserving requirements (VM-25, Health Insurance Reserves Minimum Reserve Requirements) using a PBR framework.

3. The Long-Term Care Pricing (B) Subgroup will:
   A. Assist the Long-Term Care Actuarial (B) Working Group in completing the following charge:
      1. Provide recommendations, as appropriate, to address issues and provide actuarial assistance and commentary with respect to model requirements for appropriate LTCI rates, rating practices, and rate changes.

4. The Long-Term Care Valuation (B) Subgroup will:
   A. Assist the Long-Term Care Actuarial (B) Working Group in completing the following charges:
      1. Continue to develop health insurance reserving requirements (VM-25, Health Insurance Reserves Minimum Reserve Requirements) using a PBR framework.

NAIC Support Staff: Eric King
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The CMS and NAIC development teams have been working on a system connection between the System for Electronic Rates & Forms Filing (SERFF) and the Health Insurance Oversight System Unified Rate Review (HIOS URR) module tentatively scheduled for release in Spring 2022. This connection allows automatic data and file transfers between the two systems to reduce duplicative manual entry work for both Issuers and State reviewers. The new system connection is not applicable to States without an Effective Rate Review process, or states that do not utilize the SERFF system. The issuers in these states should continue to submit filings in the HIOS URR module directly.

**STEP 1 – New Tab in SERFF**

All rate filing information for the individual and small group markets will be entered directly into SERFF where there will be a new tab added titled URRT. This includes:

- Part I – URRT
- Part II – Written Description Justifying the Rate Increase
- Part III – Rate Filing Documentation (both the Actuarial Memorandum and the Redacted Actuarial Memorandum)

Once validated by the system, the information will be automatically transferred to the URRT module of HIOS.

**STEP 2 – Is the URRT Required?**

Once the user navigates to the URRT view, they will be asked if URRT is applicable to this rate filing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information</th>
<th>Rate Schedule</th>
<th>Form Schedule</th>
<th>Supporting Documentation</th>
<th>URRT</th>
<th>Company App Contact</th>
<th>Filing Fees</th>
<th>Filing Correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Unified Rate Review Template is required to be submitted by Issuers for both QHPs and non-QHPs offering a single risk pool plan in the individual or small group market. Issuers can submit quarterly rate changes for the small group market if allowed by the State regulatory authority. Quarterly rate changes must be submitted at least 105 days prior to the effective date of the rate change (or earlier State deadline).

Note: These filings do not include Student Health or Excepted Benefit products, such as Stand-alone Dental products.
STEP 3 – Adding the URRT

The second field is the template itself; additional items cannot be uploaded until the template has been added:

5

STEP 4 – Validation of the URRT

Once the template has been uploaded, it will be sent to CMS for validation and a message appears to the issuer:

6

STEP 5 – Regenerated URRT

Once the validation request has been processed, the message will update accordingly. If the validation is successful, SERFF also displays the regenerated Excel file:

7

STEP 6 – Actuarial Memorandum

Issuers will be required to upload the Actuarial Memorandum and Redacted Actuarial Memorandum:

8
STEP 7 – Consumer Justification Narrative

Issuers can upload the Consumer Justification Narrative (CJN) if not above the threshold, but if the CJN is required, they will also be required to upload the CJN and the user interface indicates this new requirement:

STEP 8 – Supporting Documentation

Finally, there is the Additional Supporting Documentation section where up to 30 files can be uploaded.

STEP 9 – Other SERFF Functions

Upon Submission of the filing, the information from the URRT tab will be submitted to the state but also sent to CMS. The template and supporting URR items can also have the following SERFF functions applied, but these functions will not be transferred to the URR module of HIOS:

- Request Confidentiality
- Objections/Objections Letters
- Change Schedule Items
- Response Letters
- Amendment Letters
- State Public Access

STEP 10 – State Determinations

Finally, once the state review is complete, the state will mark the URRT as complete as their determination. If the filing contains only plans below the threshold:
STEP 10 – State Determinations (cont.)

If the filing contains at least one plan above the threshold:

STEP 11 – Determination Display

Once a state regulator enters a final determination, the following information will be displayed. The URRT determination and the comments will be sent to the URR Module of HCOS and displayed on ratereview.healthcare.gov. Once a determination has been sent to CMS, there can be no further action on the URRT tab from the issuer or the state.

QUESTIONS???
## SOA HEALTH EXPERIENCE STUDIES RESEARCH IN PROGRESS - December 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2014 Individual Disability Income - Termination Report Update</td>
<td>Complete a study of claim termination for individual disability and release an updated report with the findings and an aggregated database of the experience data.</td>
<td>Complete on SOA website. [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2015 Individual Disability Income - Experience Modifications to the 2013 Individual Disability Income Valuation Table Claim Termination Rates</td>
<td>Complete a study of claim termination for individual disability and release a report of Experience Modifications to the 2013 Individual Disability Income Valuation Table Claim Termination Rates. 11/18/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2011 LTC Lapse and Mortality Valuation Assumptions</td>
<td>Develop a replacement mortality LTC valuation table and a proposal to replace the current LTC voluntary lapse parameters. Work done in conjunction with the AAA. 11/30/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Experience Studies

### Clarification of Health Uninsured Rates
- Analyze different measurements of the uninsured rate and will attempt to provide explanations for these different measures.
- Complete on SOA website. [1]

### Oral Health in US Children and Its Impact on Disparities of Overall Health and Health Expenditures
- Using machine learning methods, assess the oral health of U.S. children, by subgroup, and its impact on disparities of overall health and health expenditures over time.
- Complete on SOA website. [2]

### 2022 Health Care Cost Model v3.0
- Release a model that will enable users to estimate health care cost levels in insured plans across a wide variety of Return Stage scenarios. (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation funded project.)
- 11/18/2021

### Modeling the Individual Costs of Kidney Disease
- Build a model to track the progression of kidney disease to help actuaries estimate future kidney costs.
- 1/31/2022

### Financial Wellness and Health Care
- A research team of actuaries, data scientists and sociologists will examine the impact of disparities in healthcare access, cost and quality of care on financial wellness across various racial, ethnic, socioeconomic groups.
- 2/28/2022

### Medicaid Underwriting Gain
- Build on a previous project designed to provide a theoretical methodology for Medicaid rate setting actuaries to determine the appropriate way to evaluate the risk associated with Managed Medicaid on the carriers underwriting this risk.
- 3/31/2022

[1] https://www.soa.org/resources/research-reports/2021/uninsured-rate-measurements/

## SOA HEALTH PRACTICE RESEARCH IN PROGRESS - DECEMBER 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of Health Uninsured Rates</td>
<td>Analyze different measurements of the uninsured rate and will attempt to provide explanations for these different measures.</td>
<td>Complete on SOA website. [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 Health Care Cost Model v3.0</td>
<td>Release a model that will enable users to estimate health care cost levels in insured plans across a wide variety of Return Stage scenarios. (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation funded project.)</td>
<td>11/18/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling the Individual Costs of Kidney Disease</td>
<td>Build a model to track the progression of kidney disease to help actuaries estimate future kidney costs.</td>
<td>1/31/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Wellness and Health Care</td>
<td>A research team of actuaries, data scientists and sociologists will examine the impact of disparities in healthcare access, cost and quality of care on financial wellness across various racial, ethnic, socioeconomic groups.</td>
<td>2/28/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Underwriting Gain</td>
<td>Build on a previous project designed to provide a theoretical methodology for Medicaid rate setting actuaries to determine the appropriate way to evaluate the risk associated with Managed Medicaid on the carriers underwriting this risk.</td>
<td>3/31/2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] https://www.soa.org/resources/research-reports/2021/uninsured-rate-measurements/
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About the American Academy of Actuaries

The Academy assists public policymakers on all levels by providing leadership, objective expertise, and actuarial advice on risk and financial security issues. The Academy and its boards also set qualification, practice, and other professionalism and ethical standards for actuaries credentialed by one or more of the five U.S.-based actuarial organizations in the United States.

Public Policy and the Academy

The Academy, through its public policy work, seeks to address pressing issues that require or would benefit from the application of sound actuarial principles. The Academy provides unbiased actuarial expertise and advice to public policy decision-makers and stakeholders at the state, federal, and international levels in all areas of actuarial practice.

Key Health Policy Priorities for 2021

- COVID-19: Implications for Health Care Utilization and Spending
- Health Insurance Coverage and the Affordable Care Act
- Health Equity
- Long-Term Care
- Medicare Sustainability
COVID-19: Implications for Health Care Utilization and Spending

- Issue Briefs / Papers:
  - COVID-19's Impacts on Long-Term Care Insurance
  - Telehealth After COVID-19
  - Medicaid Managed Care Plan Rate Setting as Impacted by COVID-19

- Comment Letters:
  - Comments to Treasury, DOL, and HHS on Insurance and Health Plan Coverage of COVID-19 Testing

Health Insurance Coverage and the Affordable Care Act

- Issue Briefs:
  - Drivers of 2022 Health Insurance Premium Changes

- Comment Letters:
  - Health Practice Council (HPC) Comments on Review of Agency Actions Related to the Affordable Care Act and Medicaid
  - Comments to HHS, DOL, and the Treasury on the No Surprises Act
  - Comments to CMS on Updating Payment Parameters Proposed Rule

Health Equity

- Discussion Briefs:
  - Health Equity From an Actuarial Perspective
  - Health Equity and Premium Pricing
  - Health Equity and Health Plan Benefit Design
  - Health Equity and Provider Contracting/Network Development
  - Health Equity and Managing Population Health

- Comment Letters:
  - Comments on Colorado Senate Bill 21-169 (March and April 2021), a bill to protect consumers from unfair discrimination in insurance practices.
  - Request for information (RFI) on Assessing Whether or How Actuarial Practices Affect Health Disparities - Information due to the Academy by Jan. 14, 2022

Long-Term Care

- Issue Briefs
  - Regulatory Options for Long-Term Care (LTC) Insurance Innovation
  - Long-Term Care Financing Reform Proposals Involving Public Programs

- Reports
  - Long-Term Care Insurance Mortality and Lapse Study
    - Request from NAIC Long-Term Care Actuarial Working Group (LTCAWG)

- Practice Notes
  - Long-Term Care Insurance
Medicare Sustainability

- Issue Briefs:
  - Medicare's Financial Condition: Beyond Actuarial Balance

Additional Academy HPC Updates

- Practice Note: Actuarial Standard of Practice (ASOP) No. 6—Development of Age-Specific Retiree Health Cost Assumptions, Including Applications to Pooled and Non-Pooled Health Plans
  - Oct. 2021 Presentation at the CCA Annual Meeting

- The Academy formed the Climate Change Joint Task Force in Oct. 2021, and membership is comprised of the HPC, the Casualty Practice Council (CPC), and the Risk Management and Financial Reporting Council (RMFRC).

HPC NAIC Workstreams—HATF

- Health Actuarial (B) Task Force
  - Request for comments on proposal to modify the definition of “actuarial assets” as used in the instructions for the Health Statement of Actuarial Opinion
    - April and May 2021 Academy comment letters

HPC NAIC Workstreams—HRBC

- Health Risk-Based Capital (E) Working Group
  - Request for Analysis to Incorporate Investment Income into the Underwriting Risk Component of the Health Risk-Based Capital Formula
    - Jan. 2021, Feb. 2021, and April 2021 Academy comment letters
  - Request for Comprehensive Review of the H2—Underwriting Risk Component and Managed Care Credit Calculation in the Health Risk-Based Capital Formula
    - July 2021 Academy comment letter
HPC NAIC Workstreams—LTC (EX)

- NAIC Long-Term Care Insurance (EX) Task Force Long-term Care Insurance MSA Framework. Academy comments on:
  - Long-Term Care Insurance (LTC) Multistate Rate Review Framework
  - Actuarial Sections
  - Operational and Actuarial Sections, Sept. 2021 Exposures
- Long-Term Care Insurance Reduced Benefit Options (EX) Subgroup
  - Academy comments on exposure draft, Issues Related to LTC Wellness Benefits

HPC NAIC Workstreams—Special (EX) R&I Workstream #5

- NAIC Special (EX) Committee on Race and Insurance—Workstream 5 (Health)
  - Comments on Exposure Draft of White Paper on Provider Network Outline
  - Comments on the Revised Exposure Draft of Principles for Data Collection

2021 HPC Virtual Hill Visits

- April 15 and 16, 2021, via Zoom
- More than 20 Academy volunteers took part in 24 meetings with Hill and agency staffs
- Issues discussed included: Medicaid and Medicare, health equity, telehealth, COVID-19, surprise billing, prescription drug prices, long-term care (LTC), and the Affordable Care Act (ACA)

Academy Presentations

- Feb. 2021 Senior Health Fellow presentation on “Medicare Solvency Projections and Potential Policy Solutions” webinar sponsored by the Alliance for Health Policy.
- April 2021 presentation to Columbus Actuarial Club on “Long-Term Care Insurance: Public Policy Update”
- May 2021 Academy webinar on “Health Equity: An Actuarial Perspective”
- June 2021 presentation to the SOA on “Health Equity: How Actuaries Are Contributing to Efforts to Reduce Health Disparities”
- Oct. 2021 presentations to the CCA on “Social Determinants of Health & Health Equity” and “ASOP No. 6 Practice Note”
Academy 2021 Annual Meeting and Public Policy Forum

- Nov. 4 and 5, 2021, annual conference
- Three health-specific breakout sessions
  - “Addressing the Risk of Medicare Insolvency”
  - “Regulating the Affordable Care Act: What’s New for 2022”—Presentation from CMS/CCIIO
  - “Expanding Access to Health Insurance Coverage”
- Plenaries covering cross-practice equity and COVID-19 issues

Stay Up-to-Date at actuary.org

Under the Public Policy tab, access Academy:
- Comments and letters
- Issue briefs
- Policy papers
- Presentations
- Reports to the NAIC
- Testimony

Questions?

Contact: Matthew Williams, JD, MA
Senior Health Policy Analyst
williams@actuary.org
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Requests of the LTC Valuation Work Group

- Develop a replacement mortality table for LTC active life reserves
  - Based on the 2012 Individual Annuity Mortality Table
  - Recommend a margin for conservatism
- Develop a replacement lapse table
  - Recommend a margin for conservatism
- Consider developing tables for valuation on total lives basis as well as active lives basis

Executive Summary

- Developed valuation mortality table
  - Mortality is select and ultimate; all previous valuation mortality tables have been aggregate
  - Optional factors are provided for marital status and risk class
  - Mortality tables are provided for both total lives and active lives (off-claim) exposures
  - Margin for valuation mortality tables is included
  - Tables are included in the report as an Excel file
Executive Summary

- Developed valuation lapse table
  - Valuation lapse tables are developed separately for individual and group coverages; current valuation lapse tables vary for group coverage only for durations 5+ (3% vs 2%)
  - Optional factors are provided for marital status and risk class for individual coverages only
  - Lapse tables are provided for both total lives and active lives (off-claim) exposures
  - Margin for valuation lapse tables is included

Recommended Mortality Tables
(Total Lives)

Death Counts (Total Lives)
By Sex, Risk Class, Attained Age, and Marital Status

Recommended Mortality Table (Total Lives)
### Recommended Marital Status Adjustment Factors for Mortality Table (Total Lives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Recommended Status Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommended Underwriting Class Adjustment Factors for Mortality Table (Total Lives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Recommended Class Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommended Individual Lapse Table—Total Lives (With Margins)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Lapse Table Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** All tables and figures are reproduced from the original document with permission. The tables illustrate the recommended adjustment factors for mortality and lapse rates, with separate factors for marital status and underwriting classes. The individual lapse table provides factors for total lives, considering margin adjustments.
Recommended Group Lapse Table—Total Lives (With Margins)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Year</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended Individual Lapse Table—Active Lives (No Margins)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Age Group</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Credibility for Individual Lapses

Minimum of Number of Individual Lapses and 1.082 (Full Credibility) by Issue Age Group and Policy Duration

© 2021 National Association of Insurance Commissioners
Data Credibility for Group Lapses

Minimum of Number of Group Lapses and 1,082 (Full Credibility) by Issue Age Group and Policy Duration

Mortality Improvement to 2020

Recommended Mortality Improvement
- The study period is 2008 through 2011
- Recommend to apply improvement trend using the 2012 Individual Annuity Mortality Basic tables (2012 IAM) G2 scale from 2010 to 2020 (11 years)
- Recommended tables represent industry experience as of 2020
- G2 scale applies to both total lives and active lives

Alternatives for Mortality Improvement
- The mortality tables can be made dynamic by continuing to apply the G2 scale to future valuation dates
- For first principle valuation approach, G2 scale can be applied to both active lives and disabled lives
Recommended Margins

- 10% for mortality
- 15% for lapse
- Same for total lives and active lives

Actual Total Lives Mortality to Expected (Based on Recommended Tables) By Company

Actual Individual Total Lives Lapses to Expected (Based on Recommended Tables) By Company
Actual to Expected Mortality Rates
(Expected Based on Recommended Tables)

Actual Total Lives Mortality to Expected by Policy Year

Actual Total Lives Mortality to Expected by Issue Age Group

Actual Total Lives Mortality to Expected by Marital Status and Underwriting Class
Actual to Expected Lapse Rates (Expected Based on Recommended)

Actual Individual Total Lives Lapses to Expected by Policy Year

Actual Individual Total Lives Lapses to Expected by Issue Age Group

Actual Individual Total Lives Lapses to Expected by Marital Status and Underwriting Class
Actual Group Total Lives Lapses to Expected by Policy Year

Actual Individual Active Lives Lapses to Lapses by Policy Year

Actual Group Total Lives Lapses to Expected by Issue Age Group

Actual Individual Active Lives Lapses to Expected by Issue Age Group
Actual Individual Active Lives Lapses to Expected by Marital Status and Underwriting Class

Actual Group Active Lives Lapses to Expected by Policy Year

Actual Group Active Lives Lapses to Expected by Issue Age Group

Actual to Expected Total Policy Termination Rates
(Mortality and Lapse Combined—Total Lives Only)
Actual Individual Total Lives to Expected by Mortality and Lapse

Actual Individual Total Lives Total Terminations to Expected by Policy Year

Actual Individual Total Lives Total Terminations to Expected by Issue Age Group

Actual Group Total Lives to Expected by Mortality and Lapse
Actual Group Total Lives Total Terminations to Expected by Policy Year

Actual Group Total Lives Total Terminations to Expected by Issue Age Group

Additional Information

Matthew Williams, JD, MA
Senior Policy Analyst, Health
American Academy of Actuaries
Email: williams@actuary.org
Phone: (202) 223-8196
Idaho’s Enhanced Short Term Health Plans

Wes Trexler
Deputy Director
Idaho Department of Insurance
doi.idaho.gov

Issues and Objectives

APTC has limitations and gaps
- Variable income – risky to lose APTC
- “Family glitch” – employer offers unaffordable spouse or dependent coverage
- Even with APTC, can still be unaffordable or higher cost than considered reasonable

Consumers seeking non-major medical or non-insurance health options due to lower cost
- Stacked limited benefits
- Back-to-back short-term
- Associations
- Health sharing
- Direct primary care

Traditional Short-term Plans

- Not guaranteed issue
- Not renewable
- Total duration less than 12 months (per Idaho statute)
- Preexisting conditions excluded
- Any licensed carrier can offer, without major medical presence
- Fewer benefits offered
- Internal limitations on covered benefits
- Fewer applicable consumer protections
- Consumers misunderstand their risks with limitations
- Being utilized for more than short-term needs

Legal Path for Enhanced STPs

2019 Idaho Rule 18.04.15
- Issued as temporary then final
- Applies to both Traditional STLDPs and ESTPs
- Delineates Trad from ESTPs
- Sets out enrollment, eligibility, renewal, reissuance, rating, coverage, and disclosure provisions for both
Enhanced vs Nonrenewable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guaranteed issue</th>
<th>Not guaranteed issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed renewable &amp; convertible to ACA plan</td>
<td>Nonrenewable: cannot be reissued (even by different carrier) within 63 days of termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total duration (with renewals) may not exceed federally-defined max months</td>
<td>Total duration may not exceed six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier must also offer Exchange plans</td>
<td>No requirement for carrier to offer renewable health benefit plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection against preexisting condition exclusions when coverage is continuous</td>
<td>Preexisting conditions excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More robust coverage and consumer protections</td>
<td>Limited benefits and consumer protection requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Parity applies</td>
<td>MHPAEA not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered year-round</td>
<td>Offered year-round</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enhanced vs Nonrenewable (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated by age, tobacco use, same geography as QHPs, underwriting</th>
<th>Rated by age, tobacco use, geography, duration of coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underwriting factor limited by statute</td>
<td>Underwriting only for coverage decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index rate tied to QHP single risk pool</td>
<td>Rates not tied to other products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Idaho Benchmark Medical Plan, including formulary</td>
<td>Rules provide minimum benefit standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive and wellness at no cost share</td>
<td>No requirement for preventive and wellness coverage at no cost share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide metal-level actuarial value</td>
<td>Often not comparable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollees by Plan Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exch</th>
<th>Non-Exch</th>
<th>GF/GM</th>
<th>ESTP</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sharing</th>
<th>ST/LDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2021</td>
<td>65,720</td>
<td>11,186</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td>89,680</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>67,739</td>
<td>11,936</td>
<td>8,105</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>90,614</td>
<td>28,167</td>
<td>3,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>84,596</td>
<td>14,017</td>
<td>9,223</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107,836</td>
<td>26,635</td>
<td>4,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>84,879</td>
<td>16,235</td>
<td>10,695</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111,609</td>
<td>24,282</td>
<td>2,871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACA and EST Plans and Premiums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exch Carriers</th>
<th>QHPs</th>
<th>Avg ACA Premium</th>
<th>QHP Prem Change</th>
<th>ESTP Carriers</th>
<th>ESTPs</th>
<th>Avg ESTP Premium</th>
<th>ESTP Prem Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>$517</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$272</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$521</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$313</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>$522</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$505</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are we achieving objectives?

Thousands of Idahoans finding value
Up from 4 Exchange carriers to 6 in 2022
Interest expressed in ESTPs
Agents appreciate another comprehensive option for tentative purchasers

Revised nonrenewable short-term products
Fewer internal benefit caps
Clearer application and disclosures
Reduced issuance of multiple short-term policies
Continued federal regulatory uncertainty

Thank you!
Weston.Trexler@doi.idaho.gov

https://naiconline.sharepoint.com/:b/r/sites/NAICSsupportStaffHub/Member%20Meetings/Fall%202021/TF/HealthActuarial/Conference%20Calls/11-29%20HATF/2021-11-29%20Idaho%20DOJ%20-%20HATF%20Enhanced%20Short%20Term%20Plans%20(reduced).pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=iZBgM9