Why is the term “big data” not included in the MCAS definition of Accelerated Underwriting?

The term “big data” was used in the NAIC’s Accelerated Underwriting (AU) Educational Report but was intentionally removed from the MCAS definition of Accelerated Underwriting. The term was removed for vagueness because it was an undefined term which could lead to inconsistency in MCAS reporting. By doing so, the intent of the MCAS reporting is to exclude any processes intended solely to speed up or automate the underwriting process.

For example, on MCAS filings, even if the data you use includes such data as criminal history, consumer credit or motor vehicle report data it would not be considered accelerated underwriting for MCAS reporting purposes if those data are used in stand-alone rules, such as declining coverage if there is a prior conviction of insurance fraud, a recent bankruptcy or multiple speeding violations. If, however, the data is run through an algorithm that will, at points in the process, choose from multiple possible decisions, it is considered accelerated underwriting under the MCAS definition.

How would the company determine if its processes are considered accelerated underwriting?

All three elements below that must be present to meet the MCAS AUW reporting requirements:

1) AI/ML: Predictive models and machine learning algorithms are used to analyze applicant data. **OR** If, however, the data is run through a predictive model or machine learning algorithm, it is considered accelerated underwriting under the MCAS definition.

For example, on MCAS filings, even if the data you use includes such data as criminal history, consumer credit or motor vehicle report data it would not be considered accelerated underwriting for MCAS reporting purposes if those data are used in stand-alone rules, such as declining coverage if there is a prior conviction of insurance fraud, a recent bankruptcy or multiple speeding violations. If, however, the data is run through an algorithm that will, at points in the process, choose from multiple possible decisions, it is considered accelerated underwriting under the MCAS definition.

**OR** possibly re-worded: A model or algorithm prediction is used to limit or replace a human decision. For example, if the data is run through an algorithm that will, at points in the process, choose from multiple possible decisions, it is considered accelerated underwriting under the MCAS definition. However, even if the data you use includes such data as criminal history, consumer credit or motor vehicle report data it would not be considered accelerated underwriting for MCAS reporting purposes if those data are used in stand-alone rules, such...
as declining coverage if there is a prior conviction of insurance fraud, a recent bankruptcy or multiple speeding violations.

2) Data: **FCRA Compliant non-medical third-party data** and/or **Other non-medical third-party data** is used, including if it is used in conjunction with **Application data and/or Medical data**. This can include traditional and non-traditional data— if only traditional **Application data and/or Medical data** is used, it **does not meet** the definition.

3) Decision: Life Insurance is underwritten by predicting an insurance outcome.

**Can you provide examples of what would not be included as accelerated underwriting?**

For the purposes of MCAS reporting, AUW does not include:

- Simply automating analysis of **traditional, application and/or medical information**. (does not meet elements #1 or #2, above)
- Using insurance claims or motor vehicle violation data in a stand-alone underwriting rule such as declining coverage for a driving under the influence conviction. (does not meet element #1, above)
- Use of medical data only in an algorithm. (does not meet element #2, above)

**How is “predictive modeling” defined?**

Applying predictive modeling (AI/ML) means non-medical information is used by itself or in combination with other medical or non-medical data in an algorithm to predict an insurance outcome, such as mortality, likelihood of lapse or likelihood of fraud.