

# MCAS BEST PRACTICES GUIDE

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
MCAS Timeline.....	3
September: Call Letter Review/Update .....	3
Mid-December: Call Letters Sent .....	3
January 31: Portal Closes .....	3
March to April: Training Webinars .....	3
April: Companies Submit Data and Make Extension or Waiver Requests .....	4
April 30: Data Submissions Due.....	4
<i>Late Filings and Revised Filings</i> .....	4
<i>Waiver and Extension Requests</i> .....	4
April to June: Validation of Incoming Data.....	5
<i>MCAS Data Review</i> .....	6
May to June: Analysis .....	7
<i>Ranks</i> .....	7
<i>Tools and Reports Available</i> .....	8
<b>Analysis Techniques</b> .....	8
<i>Trending</i> .....	8
<i>Comparisons</i> .....	9
<i>Company to Company</i> .....	9
<i>Standard versus Non-standard Lines</i> .....	9
<i>Company to State Ratio</i> .....	9
<i>State Ratios to Other State Ratios</i> .....	9
<i>Review of Individual Company Data</i> .....	10
<i>Combining MCAS with Other Market Information Tools</i> .....	10
<b>Next Steps</b> .....	10
<i>When to Contact the Company</i> .....	10
<i>Integrating MCAS Data into the Market Analysis Framework</i> .....	11
<i>Integrating Other Data into MCAS</i> .....	11
July 1: Scorecards .....	11
Appendix A: MCAS Best Practices .....	12
Appendix B: Resource List .....	13

# Introduction

The Market Conduct Annual Statement (MCAS) was developed with the input of state insurance regulators and representatives from the insurance industry to provide an analysis tool for certain key market data elements. Some of the states collected private passenger auto data as early as the 1990s. In 2003, the NAIC Market Regulation and Consumer Affairs (D) Committee established an annual statement pilot program for life and annuity and property/casualty companies. Today, the vast majority of the states participate in MCAS and the NAIC collects the data on behalf of the states.

By using common data and analysis, the states have a uniform method of comparing the performance of companies. If a company's performance appears to fall outside of industry norms, the state will want to undertake further review of that company. The purpose of this document is to encourage the use of best practices in the collection and review of MCAS data.

Before moving forward with follow-up activity or continuum actions, the following three principles should be considered:

- Always refer back to the underlying raw data. Is the company following the definitions? Did they leave claims open when actually all payments had been made?
- Before moving on, check the company comments. These comments can save time by directing you to specific data or explaining a market shift.
- Always interpret the MCAS within the context of all other available information. Was there a catastrophic event that caused the spike in number of claims?

Data consists of various market indicators, primarily related to two areas:

- Claims handling – claim denials, processing times and lawsuit activity.
- Underwriting – new issues, policies in force, non-renewals and cancellations.

Other line-specific indicators are used to determine, for example, the number of policy exchanges and resisted claims for life insurance policies.

As of the document revision date, MCAS data are collected for the following lines of business with 49 participating jurisdictions:

- Annuity
- Disability Income
- Health
- Homeowners
- Lender-Placed Home and Auto
- Life
- Long-Term Care
- Private Passenger Auto
- Private Flood (effective for the 2020 data year).

## MCAS Timeline

- September – Call letter review/update
- December 15 - Call letters sent
- January 31 – Portal closes for the prior year plus one data
- March – April – MCAS Training Webinars
- April – Companies submit data and make extension or waiver requests
- April 30 – Data submissions are due\*
- April – June – Data Validation by the NAIC and states
- May – June – data analysis by states and next steps
- May – States contact late filers
- July 1 – Scorecards are published

Please note that some lines of business may have due dates that vary from the standard April 30 filing due date. For the most current information on due dates for all lines of business, please refer to the MCAS webpage’s calendar of key MCAS dates ([http://www.naic.org/mcas\\_main.htm](http://www.naic.org/mcas_main.htm)).

### September: Call Letter Review/Update

In September the NAIC requests that the participating states’ MCAS contacts submit any changes to the data call letters. These letters are sent to companies to obtain information for the next year. The data call letter identifies changes to the MCAS submission, as well as the contact person for the state requesting submission.



**Best Practice:** Be sure your MCAS contact is current. You can check/update your state MCAS contact here: Link to [Participating Jurisdiction Contacts](#).

### Mid-December: Call Letters Sent

In December, the data call letters are sent to each company’s MCAS contact; companies are expected to keep their contact information current. At the same time, the NAIC updates its submission portal in preparation for the submission of new data.

### January 31: Portal Closes

By January 31, companies may no longer use the MCAS portal to make changes to the prior year’s data. Changes to prior year’s data will need prior approval from the state(s) affected.

### March to April: Training Webinars

The NAIC provides webinars detailing changes to the MCAS data process. Additional information is also available on the NAIC website. To properly analyze the MCAS data, the analyst needs to stay current on what the ratios and data elements mean and why these elements were chosen.

For companies not familiar with the MCAS process, the NAIC provides training on how to submit filings.

The MCAS webpage ([http://www.naic.org/mcas\\_main.htm](http://www.naic.org/mcas_main.htm)) has the most current training materials for each filing year on the left side of the page under the heading “TRAINING”. NAIC Education and Training ([https://content.naic.org/education\\_schedule.htm](https://content.naic.org/education_schedule.htm)) also provides links to training for both MCAS and market analysis (Market Analysis Techniques (MAT) On-line).

## April: Companies Submit Data and Make Extension or Waiver Requests

Several methods are used to address questions by the companies regarding data submissions, including bulletin boards, frequently asked questions (FAQs), training webinars and other resources. The NAIC maintains a webpage dedicated to explaining the MCAS process and any changes expected. These resources are available to assist the states with incoming questions from insurance companies.

MCAS resources are located along the left-hand side on the MCAS webpage ([http://www.naic.org/mcas\\_main.htm](http://www.naic.org/mcas_main.htm)).

### April 30: Data Submissions Due

#### *Late Filings and Revised Filings*

Late or inaccurate filings may impact statewide ratios. Regulators should balance the need for accurate data with company accountability. Companies should be encouraged to file timely and accurately. Changes associated with re-filings are detailed in the “MCAS Audit Trail” report, as are any comments the company may have as to why the data was changed. Companies that submit data late, or with changes, may have internal control issues. It also needs to be determined if a company is re-filing for a small number of states or is re-filing globally.



**Best Practice:** When a company re-files to correct an issue, the analyst should review the filings submitted to other states. If filings in other states have the same issues, then coordination with other states, or the domestic state, should be initiated when contacting the company.

Company re-filings should be kept to a minimum. A significant volume of re-filings can alter overall state ratios and change company rankings. Regulators should develop strategies to ensure data is submitted correctly the first time. Companies that habitually re-file over several years should be identified and contacted to help remediate difficulties. Companies should submit an extension request rather than submit data known to be incorrect with the expectation that it can simply re-file at a later date. If a company does have to re-file, it should provide a complete explanation, in the comments section, of the data errors and steps taken to ensure there is not recurrence.

If an insurer that files in multiple states has more than two filings in error within a five-year period and/or files late (a late filing includes failing to meet an extension due date in two consecutive years), information is available on i-Site+ in a Tableau dashboard available to regulators. If a majority of jurisdictions agree, a referral will be made to include the company in the Market Actions (D) Working Group’s National Analysis Program. To ensure that companies are aware of the submission requirements, the NAIC develops training classes for company as well as state representatives.

Companies who have multiple revised filings must provide a risk management or loss control policy that outlines their process to address these control/compliance issues. Companies that have a pattern of submitting late or re-filing may have other internal control issues that require additional analysis.



**Best Practice:** Companies that habitually re-file over several years should be identified using the Tableau dashboard and contacted to help remediate difficulties.

#### *Waiver and Extension Requests*

**Waivers:** Data call letters are sent to each company that exceeds premium thresholds on the financial annual statement (FAS) for each line of business captured by MCAS. Because there are slight definitional discrepancies between the FAS and MCAS, a company may receive a call letter even though they are exempt from filing. For example, antique auto products may be reported in the FAS as private passenger auto business, while such products are excluded from the MCAS. In these situations, the company may request a waiver from each state in which it markets these products. Please Note: Companies that market regular private passenger auto products and reach the

\$50,000 threshold are still required to file even if they also market custom auto products.

It is recommended that the states verify the company's request prior to granting a waiver.

*For example*; there may be situations where the company requests a waiver for a product line that is actually covered under MCAS. This happened in the past when companies stated they only market motorcycle coverages. While there was a time when motorcycle coverages were excluded from MCAS, this was changed for the 2011 submission. As some companies were not aware of the change, waivers were requested.

**Extensions**: There are situations where the company knows it will not be able to submit its MCAS filing on a timely basis. In these situations, the company may request an extension of up to 14 calendar days. Requests should be accompanied by the following:

1. Have you requested an extension within the five previous years?
2. If so, is your current request for the same reason?
  - a. If the answer is yes, please provide the following:
    - i. Any steps your company has taken to prevent this concern moving forward.
    - ii. The progress your company has made toward streamlining MCAS filings so it is not dependent on staffing concerns.
    - iii. Whether your company includes this process/review as part of the risk management plan.
3. If a company asks for an extension *on or after the due date*, additional information must be required of the company.



**Best Practice**: Requests for additional information should be made within the MCAS Extension tool. This allows your jurisdiction and other jurisdictions to view the requests over multiple years.

All extension requests must be processed through i-Site+. If a company's request is not processed in i-Site+, the state analyst will not be able to see if the company has actually filed when reviewing the MCAS Filing Status Report. Analysts should review the responses of other states to the extension request. Coordination among the states is important to maintain consistency. Otherwise, one state may grant a 14-day extension where another might not grant one at all.

For additional reference, please see the *MCAS Industry User Guide* located in the Resources section of the MCAS webpage ([http://www.naic.org/mcas\\_main.htm](http://www.naic.org/mcas_main.htm)). For situations where a company requests more than a two-week extension, it is recommended that such an extension request be coordinated with other MCAS states.

### April to June: Validation of Incoming Data

It is important to review the MCAS Correspondence Tracking link in the Summary Reports Section of i-Site+ when beginning review of a company. The NAIC notifies reporting companies by email if data anomalies are discovered.

In addition, inferences should be based only on statistically credible data. If the company is small and has few claims, a delay in a small number of claims could create a large impact on various ratios. The company should also be aware that its data is outside the norm and provide comments. If the company has made comments, the analyst should review them by going to the MCAS Pick-A-Page Section in i-Site+ and select the Jurat Company Contact Information report, as well as the interrogatories.

## MCAS Data Review

### Tier 1: Validation Review

- Once a company has submitted its MCAS data, the NAIC performs validations to test the data for internal consistency and reasonability. For example, a validation exception is generated if a company's direct written premiums reported on their FAS and those reported on the MCAS vary by +/- 20%. All validation warnings can be viewed on the company's Validation Exception Report, which is available on i-Site+. These tolerances have been established to avoid corresponding with insurers regarding validations that are generated due to small amounts of data provided by the company or small (immaterial) differences.
- The following table provides some examples of MCAS data validation conducted by the NAIC:

Line of Business	Validation Description	Review Tolerance
PPA/HO	claims closed w/o pay > claims closed with pay	(claims closed with pay + claims closed w/o pay) >= 100 claims AND >= 25% more claims closed w/o pay than with pay
PPA/HO	policies in force < new policies issued	policies in force and policies issued each must be >= 500 AND policies in force is three times < new policies issued
HO	FAS direct written premiums (DWP) and MCAS DWP vary by +/- 20%	MCAS > FAS by >= 100% OR FAS > MCAS by > = 20%
Life/Annuity	total claims closed with payment <= claims denied, resisted or compromised	(total claims closed with payment) + (claims denied, resisted or compromised) >= 100
Life/Annuity	replacements applied for < policies issued	(replacements applied for + policies issued) >=100 AND >= 25% more replacements applied for than policies issued
Life/Annuity	If new policies issued or policies in force >0 then DWP must be > 0	(new policies issued >50) OR (policies in force > 100) AND DWP = 0
Life/Annuity	If DWP > 0 then (policies issued + policies in force) must be > 0	DWP > 100,000 AND Policies in force = 0

### Tier 2: Ratio and Indicator Review

- The MCAS published ratios are also reviewed to find any company ratios generated from data entry errors or other data anomalies. The ratio results for a given state are reviewed by sorting them to find extreme high or low values. The data is then further examined to determine if a possible data error exists.
- In addition to the MCAS published ratios, additional ratios and indicators are examined to find potential data errors. Following are examples of additional ratios and indicators that are used by NAIC staff:

PPA/HO	Dwellings or autos to policies in force
PPA/HO	DWP to policies in force
PPA/HO	Claims opened to policies in force
PPA/HO	Suits open during the period to policies in force
PPA/HO	Suits open end of period to (claims/1000)
PPA/HO	Median days as reported compared to calculated median days
LIFE	Denied, resisted or compromised claims to policies in force
LIFE/ANNUITY	Surrenders to policies in force
LIFE/ANNUITY	DWP to policies in force
LIFE	Face amount of policies in force to policies in force
LIFE	Face amount of policies issued to policies issued

LIFE	Death claims to policies in force
ANNUITY	Immediate contracts issued to policies in force
ANNUITY	Deferred contracts issued to policies in force
ANNUITY	Immediate contracts issued to deferred contracts issued

### Tier 3: Individual Data Element Review

- Once the previous two tiers of review have been completed, each individual data element, by line of business and state, are reviewed. This review is done to find possible data errors. Where possible, the data elements are compared to the value reported in the previous year to identify significant changes in reporting.

Validation of MCAS filings are performed by NAIC staff as well as the participating jurisdictions. All inquiries sent by the NAIC data analysts to companies are located in the Correspondence Tracking application found in i-Site+. Within Correspondence Tracking, and analyst can review the correspondence between the NAIC and the company, and can see the status of the validation issue—“in progress”, “state handling”, “resolved”, or “no action required”.

★ **Best Practice:** It is the responsibility of the states to verify that the data is reasonable. For example, are ratios that are extreme outliers an accurate reflection of company market practices, or are they reporting errors? Before contacting the company, check to see if the company has already been contacted by an NAIC data analyst for the same issue.

## May to June: Analysis

For specifics on ratio formulas, see the MCAS Scorecard Ratio Formulas on the MCAS webpage ([http://www.naic.org/mcas\\_main.htm](http://www.naic.org/mcas_main.htm)).

The core of any MCAS analysis consists of developing ratios that serve as potential indicators of company performance and comparing these ratios to an industry-wide baseline. To assess the degree to which ratios deviate from the baseline, analysis can be done in various ways. One of the easiest is to use the MCAS Market Analysis Prioritization Tool (MAPT) for the respective line of business and determine the average for each ratio. Then, identify companies with ratios substantially above that average. For example, private passenger auto Ratio 3 is the percentage of claims paid beyond 60 days. If the state average for all private passenger auto companies is 25%, then companies with a value of 50% could be considered outliers. Though there may be situations where the focus is on very high ratios, attention should be paid to low ratios, as well. A company with a very low ratio of 5% for Ratio 3 may not be conducting any investigations and simply paying all claims. This could have a future impact for the company if loss ratios suddenly increase.

### Ranks

The company’s ratio rank is a function of the company’s ratio value compared to those of all other filing companies. A ranking of zero indicates the ratio value is zero, null or incalculable. A ranking of 21 indicates the ratio value is greater than 100 or the ratio has the highest value of those being ranked. This may be due to anomalies with the data. It should be noted that private passenger auto and homeowners underwriting ratios cannot be calculated at the coverage level, as underwriting information is collected only at the line of business level.

In addition to the overall ranks, the homeowners and private passenger auto lines of business have a claims rank, an underwriting rank and a suits rank. These supplemental ranks are calculated at the line of business, state and national levels. Ranks can be used to look at multiple companies simultaneously. Outliers can be identified by finding the mean and then calculating the standard deviation in Microsoft Excel or other spreadsheet programs.

Ranks should be evaluated with an understanding of the data elements and underlying raw data. There may be variations in the raw data that make a company appear normal when looking at the ranking. Also, companies with low ranks may be cause for concern. Very low ranks may indicate problems with the company's data. Analysts should not concentrate only on those companies with higher ranks. On occasion, carriers with low underwriting ranks have failed to report certain underwriting-related activity; e.g., nonrenewals or cancellations. Also note that ranks can be trended; i.e., companies moving up or down in ranks over a three-year period can be identified.

It is important to determine whether the underlying data is statistically credible. Due to what statisticians term the "law of large numbers," valid inferences require a sufficient volume of data points. Ratios for smaller companies may not be meaningful indicators of general business practices but, rather, random fluctuations in the underlying data.

*For example;* if a company has only three claims and two of them were denied, their ratio of denials is 60%, and is very likely well above the industry norm. However, any inferences based on this ratio are likely to be unwarranted.

### *Tools and Reports Available*

When reviewing MCAS filings, the analyst may find it useful to review rate and form filings to see what business is being marketed. The company's Management's Discussion and Analysis (MDA) filing may also assist. The MCAS-MAPT is a great tool to conduct analysis, as additional worksheets can be added for doing sorts or conditional formatting, and columns that are not needed can be hidden.

Review of the interrogatories is also helpful. Companies are to report if they are still actively writing; if there has been a significant event or business strategy change that affects the data; or if the insurer has sold, closed, or moved a block of business to another company. Having this knowledge is extremely helpful when reviewing the company's data, especially when comparing it to prior years.

i-Site+ shows premium changes per year, which may be of assistance, and Microsoft Access can also be used to query several MAPT reports at the same time.

 **Best Practice:** Make use of the tools available for MCAS analysis including; rate & form filing history, the company's MDA, the MCAS-MAPT and a review of interrogatory responses.

## **Analysis Techniques**

Analysis is an ongoing process, but it should begin as soon as data becomes available. The MCAS-MAPT can be used to review rankings and ratios. The mean of the data can be identified, and data that significantly deviate from the mean can be viewed as outliers. In other situations, depending on the skew of the data, using the median may be more representative of the center point of the data. Whether to use the mean or the median should be based on the analyst's judgment, based upon a particular data set.

Thresholds can also be established in Tableau or using Microsoft Excel. With Microsoft Excel, conditional formatting can be used to quickly identify outliers. The analyst may also use highlighted colors with conditional formatting.

### *Trending*

The MCAS-MAPT provides the availability to trend data. Companies that ranked low in prior years but high in the current year can be quickly identified. Claims payment patterns can also be trended to see if there are any patterns of concern. If a company is just entering a product line, trending can be used to identify the new activity and the company's growth. If a company is leaving a market or shifting product lines, these activities can also be monitored.



Data needs to be monitored to identify false trends or reporting errors. If the company recently expanded into the state but trending indicates a decline, then additional steps to verify the data must take place. This may require contacting the company or performing market analysis.

### *Comparisons*

Once the data is in a searchable format, such as in Tableau, Excel or Access, additional comparisons can be performed. The data can be viewed by insurer group to identify possible non-standard underwriting companies or outlying companies that are part of the group.

### *Company to Company*

Comparisons to other companies can also be conducted. If the industry is seeing higher claims utilization, is that reflected in the data? Are some companies affected more than others?

Newer companies may behave differently than older ones or may have slightly different policyholder demographics.

### *Standard versus Non-standard Lines*

It is important for the analyst to be familiar with the company being reviewed. There may be value to looking at the rate or form filings to determine if products offered are standard or non-standard. Some companies that offer non-standard lines, such as homeowners or private passenger auto, may rank higher on many ratios than standard or preferred coverage. By understanding the product design before review, the analyst can determine if the non-standard company should be reviewed separately from the other companies. When reviewing private passenger or homeowners' coverages, it is important to look at the interrogatory page that contains information about the amount of business written in the non-standard market. This can be located in the MCAS Pick-A-Page section of i-Site+. It can also be found on MCAS-MAPT.

*For example;* non-standard companies' ratios generated from claims data may deviate from the industry norm because, historically, more claims are filed by non-standard policy owners or insureds are harder to locate.

### *Company to State Ratio*

The company can be viewed in relation to the state-wide ratios. Is the company significantly higher or lower than average compared to other companies? Does a particular ratio appear to be high for a company compared to the state ratio? Is the company still writing in the line of business? Are there any trends over the past several years? These questions need to be considered when looking at company data compared to state ratios.

### *State Ratios to Other State Ratios*

Average ratios or company ratios may differ between the states. If the company is writing the same product in specific states, MCAS data in those states may be relevant. The company may have different claims adjusters in different states. Also, data that should be similar between the states may be vastly different.

The analyst may review neighboring states for comparisons of state ratios or may look for states that have similar premium volumes and demographics. This approach may identify if the company has similar issues in multiple states and allow the analyst to develop strategies to resolve them.

## *Review of Individual Company Data*

The underlying data must always be considered. If a company has very few claims and reports a delay in only one, this might cause the rankings and ratios to spike significantly. Annuity companies that no longer write business may see Ratio 3 spike when a consumer surrenders a policy.

It is important to note that the ratios are based on the underlying data. If the underlying data has inconsistencies, it may not be noticed by looking at the overall ratios.

As stated previously, the analyst needs to know and understand the various companies' markets and how business is conducted in the state. If ratios are outliers, the analyst should look at the underlying data to see if the ratios are skewed for certain types of claims.

*For example*; for private passenger auto claims, the analyst should look at how claims are processed for collision, bodily injury, etc.

Also be careful of "false positives."

*For example*; Ratio 3 for life and annuities measures surrenders to new policies issued. If the company writes little or no new business, but has surrenders, this ratio may be very high. Again, it is important to know what the company writes in the respective state. Where applicable, this can be determined by reviewing filings submitted to the state for review. The company may also use its comments section to provide clarification of outliers.

## *Combining MCAS with Other Market Information Tools*

Analysis should not focus exclusively on MCAS data to make inferences about a company's market behavior. Data from other NAIC systems—such as the Regulatory Information Retrieval System (RIRS), Market Analysis Review System (MARS), Examination Tracking System (ETS) and Market Analysis Prioritization Tool (MAPT)—provide a basis for a much more general overview of a company's market performance. The data may be viewed in conjunction with the MAP-T by a specific line of business; e.g., private passenger, homeowners, life, etc. The state insurance department's complaint database can be a resource, as well. By the time MCAS data is received, there may be five or six months of complaint data available within the department not viewable from the i-Site+ Level 1 screens. In addition, other states may have already performed Level 1 or other analyses, and such actions can be viewed in i-Site+. Just because the MCAS filing is unremarkable and does not reveal any areas of concern, the analyst should not infer that the company does not have other issues.

*For example*; the company could still be marketing unapproved forms through unlicensed producers, or engaging in other behaviors not reflected in the MCAS ratios.



**Best Practice:** Analysis should not focus exclusively on MCAS data – when there are questions, bring in data from other NAIC systems to gain a fuller understanding of a company's market behavior.

## **Next Steps**

### *When to Contact the Company*

If MCAS data anomalies have no apparent explanation, then the analyst should contact the company's MCAS representative. Every effort should be made to determine whether the data is accurate, and whether the representative can provide an explanation for the anomalies related to a company's market practices. If the company representative appears to lack training or the understanding to adequately address concerns, then additional analysis of the company may be appropriate.

*For example*; does a high ratio of claims closed without payment reflect the manner in which claims are counted in the production of the MCAS, as opposed to claims handling practices?

### *Integrating MCAS Data into the Market Analysis Framework*

Level 1 analysis incorporates MCAS data for all MCAS lines in the states that require MCAS submissions. It is important to note, however, that there are states that do not require MCAS submissions; in these cases, MCAS data will not be incorporated into Level 1 or Level 2 analysis.

As noted in this document, there may be a variety of reasons a company is an outlier that are unrelated to market practices; in these cases, a Level 1 and/or Level 2 analysis may be revealing.

The analyst may also want to review Level 1 and Level 2 analyses conducted by other states prior to contacting the company about issues or concerns. This will allow the analyst to detect possible data issues, as opposed to contacting the company on a range of issues that may not represent true concerns. There may be other times when the company should be contacted directly.

*For example*; a significant number of lawsuits may require contact with the company for clarification.

### *Integrating Other Data into MCAS*

The intent of market analysis is to understand how companies interact with consumers. Are claims paid timely and correctly? Are the products marketed appropriate for the consumer? If the analyst has an understanding of the products filed and approved, the type of producer marketing the product and the company's claim payment method(s), the analyst will be better able to put the company's MCAS submission into context. If the MCAS data suggests a change in the company's practices, then the analyst can be more proactive in protecting consumers.

## July 1: Scorecards

MCAS scorecards are produced each year to show the jurisdiction-wide ratio and the distribution of ratios for all companies filing an MCAS in a given jurisdiction. Individual company ratio information is available through the online MCAS application. A company can gain a better understanding of where they fit in the insurance marketplace and what opportunities may exist to improve their performance in a jurisdiction by comparing their jurisdiction-specific ratios to the scorecard for that jurisdiction. Each year, the most recent scorecards for all participating MCAS jurisdictions are made available on the NAIC MCAS Web page via a link to the Contacts and Scorecards ([https://content.naic.org/mcas\\_data\\_dashboard.htm](https://content.naic.org/mcas_data_dashboard.htm)).

Scorecards are posted on the MCAS Web page. The scorecard allows companies to compare their specific results to the rest of industry for the particular line of business. Please refer to [https://www.naic.org/mcas\\_main.htm](https://www.naic.org/mcas_main.htm) for key dates.

## Appendix A: MCAS Best Practices

**Best Practice:** Be sure your MCAS contact is current. You can check/update your state MCAS contact here: Link to [Participating Jurisdiction Contacts](#).

**Best Practice:** When a company re-files to correct an issue, the analyst should review the filings submitted to other states. If filings in other states have the same issues, then coordination with other states, or the domestic state, should be initiated when contacting the company.

**Best Practice:** Companies that habitually re-file over several years should be identified on the Tableau dashboard and contacted to help remediate difficulties.

**Best Practice:** Requests for additional information should be made within the MCAS Extension tool. This allows your jurisdiction and other jurisdictions to view the requests over multiple years.

**Best Practice:** It is the responsibility of the states to verify that the data is reasonable. For example, are ratios that are found to be extreme outliers an accurate reflection of company market practices, or are they reporting errors? Before contacting the company, check to see if the company has already been contacted by an NAIC data analyst for the same issue.

**Best Practice:** Make use of the tools available for MCAS analysis including; rate & form filing history, the company's MDA, the MCAS-MAPT and a review of interrogatory responses.

**Best Practice:** Analysis should not focus exclusively on MCAS data – when there are questions, bring in data from other NAIC systems to gain a fuller understanding of a company's market behavior.

- Be sure your state's MCAS contact is current – check here: [https://www.naic.org/mcas\\_data\\_dashboard.htm](https://www.naic.org/mcas_data_dashboard.htm)

### Analysis:

- Always refer back to the underlying raw data
- Review ratio formulas to understand what each ratio is measuring  
[https://www.naic.org/mcas\\_main.htm](https://www.naic.org/mcas_main.htm) found under *Resources > Scorecard Ratio Formulas (PDF)*
- Check interrogatory pages for comments that may explain outliers
- Verify that reported data is reasonable; determine if outliers result from accurate data or are reporting errors
- Determine whether the underlying data is statistically credible
- Compare company data trend to state ratio trend
- Use other Market Information Tools to analyze company behavior in addition to MCAS and MAPT
- Contact the company if data anomalies have no apparent explanation

### Waiver/Extension Requests and Late Filings:

- Check company's history of waiver/extension requests
- Verify that company is entitled to a waiver before granting one
- Review filings submitted to other states to determine if similar issues are present
- Any company filing in multiple jurisdictions with prior history of extension requests, late filings, or incorrect filings will be elevated to discussion in the Market Analysis Bulletin Board.

## Appendix B: Resource List

### For Industry:

NAIC website

[www.naic.org](http://www.naic.org)

Industry Links with a link to MCAS page:

[https://content.naic.org/index\\_industry.htm](https://content.naic.org/index_industry.htm)

MCAS History, General Filing Information, Training, Resources

[http://www.naic.org/mcas\\_main.htm](http://www.naic.org/mcas_main.htm)

The MCAS webpage is data year specific. Along the top of the webpage, underneath the logo, you will see four data years to choose from—the next year, the current year and the two prior years. The resources available on the MCAS Webpage often change from one year to the next as revisions or additions are included for the new year. Be sure you choose the relevant data year before choosing the resource. Descriptions of each resource is included in the main page narrative.

The resources on the MCAS Webpage include:

- The *Participation Requirements*
- Training materials for companies
- The data collection worksheets (blanks) for each line of business
- The *Data Call and Definitions* for each line of business
- A summary of changes for each data year
- The *MCAS User Guide* for each year (includes instructions for companies and a listing of all validations)
- CSV upload instructions and templates for each line of business
- Scorecard ratio formulas
- Data Call Communications—Call letter, authority references, and participating jurisdiction signatures
- FAQ—An FAQ for all lines of business is available near the “log in” button used by companies
- Key Dates—The MCAS Webpage also contains key dates for the data year filings. The key dates include the date of the call letter, training dates, filing due dates, scorecard dates and the last date filings for the prior data year can be submitted.

MCAS Scorecards:

[https://www.naic.org/mcas\\_data\\_dashboard.htm](https://www.naic.org/mcas_data_dashboard.htm)

### [Market Analysis Procedures Working Group](#) Webpage

The Market Analysis Procedures Working Group (MAP) is responsible choosing which lines of business to include in MCAS and revisions to current data. On its page you can find current comments on information on lines of business under consideration.

Also on the MAP website, under Related Documents, there are links to:

- [Process for Selecting New Lines of Business](#)
- [MCAS Revision Process](#)
- *The MCAS Best Practices Guide*

### [Market Conduct Annual Statement Blanks Working Group](#) Webpage

The Market Conduct Annual Statement Blanks Working Groups (MCAS Blanks WG) is responsible for the creation of new line of blanks, and the review and revisions of current MCAS blanks. On the MCAS Blanks WG website you will find discussions and comments on the creation of new blanks and reviews of existing blanks.

Under the Related Documents section there are links to:

- Data Calls and Definitions of recently adopted lines of business that will be collected in a later data year.
- [MCAS Revision Process](#)
- Recently adopted revisions and clarifications of current lines of business

**For Regulators:**

MCAS History, General Filing Information, Training, Resources

[http://www.naic.org/mcas\\_main.htm](http://www.naic.org/mcas_main.htm)

MCAS Scorecards:

[https://www.naic.org/mcas\\_data\\_dashboard.htm](https://www.naic.org/mcas_data_dashboard.htm)

NAIC i-Site+ Summary Reports:

[MCAS Correspondence Tracking](#)

[MCAS Filing Status Report](#)

[MCAS-MAPT](#)

[MCAS Ratio Summary Report](#)

[MCAS State Ratio Distribution Report](#)

[MCAS Validation Exception Summary](#)

NAIC i-Site+ Company Reports:

Enter **Cocode** of Company

Go to **Company/Firm Reports**

Under **Market Conduct Annual Statement**, the following reports are available:

MCAS Audit Trail

MCAS Company Specific Report

MCAS Company Waiver and Extension Report

MCAS Line Reports

MCAS Pick a Page

MCAS Validation Exceptions