HOMEOWNERS MARKET DATA CALL (C) TASK FORCE

Draft: 8/22/26

Homeowners Market Data Call (C) Task Force
and the Homeowners Market Report (C) Working Group
Columbus, Ohio
August 12, 2026

The Homeowners Market Data Call (C) Task Force met in Columbus, OH, Aug. 12, 2026, in joint session with the Homeowners Market Report C) Working Group. The following Task Force members participated: Michael Yaworsky, Chair, and Nicole Crockett (FL); John F. King, Vice Chair (GA); Mark Fowler (AL); Peter M. Fuimaono (AS); Charles Bassett represented by Lori Dreaver Munn and Tom Zuppan (AZ); Ricardo Lara represented by Mike Peterson (CA); Michael Conway (CO); Joshua Hershman represented by George Bradner and Wanchin Chou (CT); Trinidad Navarro represented by Christina Miller (DE); Scott Saiki represented by Lance Hirano (HI); Dean L. Cameron represented by Randy Pipal (ID); Timothy J. Temple represented by Ron Henderson (LA); Marie Grant (MD); Timothy M. Schott and Sandra Darby (ME); Peter Brickwedde and Phil Vigliaturo (MN); Mike Chaney represented by Andy Case (MS); Ned Gaines represented by Gennady Stolyarov II (NV); Judith L. French represented by Stewart Trego and Tom Botsko (OH); TK Keen represented by Cassie Soucy (OR); Michael Humphreys (PA); Suzette M. Del Valle (PR); Elizabeth Kelleher Dwyer represented by Matthew Gendron (RI); Michael Wise represented by Will Davis (SC); Larry D. Deiter represented by Tony Dorschner (SD); Amanda Crawford represented by Marianne Baker (TX); Kaj Samson represented by Rosemary Raszka (VT); and Erin K. Hunter represented by Robert Grishaber (WV). The following Working Group members participated: Marie Grant, Chair, and Jamie Sexton (MD); Angela L. Nelson, Vice Chair, (MO); Mark Fowler (AL); Lori Dreaver Munn and Tom Zuppan (AZ); Mike Peterson (CA); Michael Conway (CO); George Bradner and Wanchin Chou (CT); Craig Van Aalst (KS); Jackie Horigan (MA); Timothy M. Schott and Sandra Darby (ME); Peter Brickwedde and Phil Vigliaturo (MN); Andy Case (MS); Emily Doherty (NH); Stewart Trego and Tom Botsko (OH); Cassie Soucy (OR); Michael Humphreys (PA); Matthew Gendron (RI); Dan Bumpus and Zuhairah Tillinghast (VA); Rosemary Raszka (VT); and Robert Grishaber (WV).

1. <u>Adopted the Task Force's Spring National Meeting Minutes</u>

Commissioner Fowler made a motion, seconded by Director Nelson, to adopt the Task Force's Spring National Meeting minutes (*see NAIC Proceedings – Spring 2026, Homeowners Market Data Call (C) Task Force*). The motion passed unanimously.

The Task Force also met May 20 in regulator-to-regulator session, pursuant to paragraph 3 (specific companies, entities or individuals) of the NAIC Policy Statement on Open Meetings, to discuss and decide to extend the data call due date to July 15.

2. <u>Adopted the Working Group's June 12 Minutes</u>

Commissioner Grant said the Working Group met June 12 to receive feedback from interested parties regarding the homeowners data call data elements and related metrics for inclusion in a public report.

The Working Group also met July 27, May 27, and May 13 in regulator-to-regulator session, pursuant to paragraph 3 (specific companies, entities or individuals) of the NAIC Policy Statement on Open Meetings, to discuss the homeowners data call metrics and data.

Gendron made a motion, seconded by Director Nelson, to adopt the Working Group's June 12 minutes (Attachment One). The motion passed unanimously.

3. Received an Update on the Status of the 2026 Homeowners Market Data Call

Commissioner Yaworsky said the due date for the data call was July 15. He said there were about 880 companies that met the $50,000 premium threshold and were not surplus lines or otherwise excluded from the data call, and over 700 insurers had passed the initial validation checks. He said reminders were sent to insurers that did not file data or failed initial validations.

Yaworsky said the NAIC, as well as individual states, are conducting some additional validation checks to improve the quality of the data. He said companies will receive questions about their submitted data.

Yaworsky said state insurance regulators have access to the data through the NAIC, are using the data for state-specific purposes, and are also working with the Homeowners Market Data Call Report (C) Working Group on a public report.

Yaworksy said the regulator drafting group, which has been validating and analyzing data, has also discussed how the data call might be improved in future years. He asked that group to provide the Task Force with any recommendations by mid-September, after which the Task Force will discuss and receive feedback from interested parties later in the year, in advance of next year's data call.

4. Heard a Presentation on the Homeowners Report

Jeff Czajkowski (Center for Insurance Policy and Research—CIPR) said the *Examining Homeowner Property Insurance Market Dynamics* report was released Aug. 5. He said one of the main conclusions was that the overall homeowners market remains robust. At the same time, market adjustments have transpired, and homeowners are starting to see higher premiums and higher rates of nonrenewals. He said the analysis shows why it is important not to treat trends in homeowners insurance as a single national problem with a single national answer. He said a more detailed, data-driven view helps state insurance regulators separate broad trends.

Czajkowski said the report analyzes data from about 715 companies that wrote at least $50,000 in homeowners premium from 2018 to 2024. He said the report analyzes six MCAS homeowners policy data fields, including the number of policies in force at the end of the period, the dollar amount of direct premium written during the period, the number of claims closed with payment during the period, the number of company-initiated non-renewals during the period, the number of company-initiated cancellations that occur after the effective date, and the number of cancellations for nonpayment. He said the data was supplemented with additional NAIC financial data and is presented at the NAIC zone level for confidentiality.

Czajkowski said that of the 715 companies included in the report, about 50% are operating within any zone. He said there has been a slight increase in the number of companies operating in each zone since 2018, or it has remained relatively flat. He said the report shows a significant and diverse mix of both regional and national carriers operating in each zone.

Czajkowski said the report shows homeowners insurance companies in the admitted market absorbed a growing number of policyholders. He said that although the number of policies is growing, more than half of the companies that consistently operate in each zone are writing fewer policies. He said the companies that are increasing the number of policies are taking on more than those that are decreasing them. He said the analysis does not account for companies operating within a group, and some of the policy decreases may be due to group dynamics.

Czajkowski said homeowners property insurance markets are exhibiting relatively strong signs of availability and affordability stress, especially from 2022 to 2024. He said adjusted for inflation, the average direct written premium has increased from 2018, ranging from 18% to 43% across the country, resulting in average premium increases of 2.4% to 5.3% per year. He said the report adjusts the premium each year to 2025 dollar values to account for inflation and rising costs in the economy. He said that since 2018, the ratio of company-initiated non-renewals per 1,000 policies-in-force has been increasing in all zones, anywhere from 96% to 216%, with rates between 11.7 and 25.1 per 1,000 policies-in-force in 2024. He said in comparison to cancellations for nonpayment, these nonrenewals are about 30% to 50% of those nonpayment cancellations.

Czajkowski said nuances to the aggregate market and loss data exist and need to be better understood. He said while the homeowners property insurance market cannot fully be understood at the zone, state, or national level, this zone-level property market data can help provide context for localized disruptions. He said the report looks at premium increase in relation to median home values within the states to get an effective rate of homeowners insurance. He said the effect rate decreases can be seen from 2018 to 2022 due to housing values increasing at a more rapid pace than homeowners insurance premiums.

Czajkowski said the homeowners insurance market is complex and comprehensive, and it is important to have different regulatory views of the data. He said the report points out that more granular ZIP code data would be helpful in analysis. He said this report, along with the forthcoming homeowners market data call (HMDC) analysis, provides critical insights to policymakers and regulators that support potential actions or decisions in their communities.

Stolyarov asked whether the zone data could be disaggregated to further analyze this information on a more granular level. Commissioner Grant said this report is a foundational understanding of homeowners markets, and the potential future HMDC report could provide information at a state level. Czajkowski said while the MCAS data is available at the state level, which state regulators can use for their own analysis, this report needed to be aggregated due to confidentiality. Commissioner Yaworsky said Florida has built its own MCAS database and would be happy to support other states in utilizing the MCAS data.

Henderson asked whether the report accounts for losses from catastrophic events or catastrophic-loss-related inflation over time. Czajkowski said the losses are soaked into the data, but the report does not specifically address catastrophic losses.

5. Discuss the Potential Scope of the Public Homeowners Market Data Call Report

Commissioner Grant said the Homeowners Market Report (C) Working Group received feedback from five interested parties during its June 12 meeting. She said there was general agreement on many of the data elements that consumers would want to see in a public report. She said consumer groups urged as granular a release as possible, and the industry stressed the need to provide context for any release of metrics.

Commissioner Grant said there is general support for releasing most data elements at a national and state level, over time, and by policy type. For some elements, context should be provided; for instance, releasing average premiums per $1,000 of Coverage A rather than just an average premium figure without context around the amount of insurance being purchased. She said the Working Group has also discussed which factors influence pricing and how to build that context in a metric, such as affordability, rather than releasing figures in the abstract.

Crockett said that on July 28, the Florida Office of Insurance Regulation (OIR) submitted comments to the Working Group on a national report framework. She said the recommendations center on ensuring the national report provides a clear and meaningful picture of homeowners insurance markets across the country. She said the OIR recommends organizing the data in two primary themes: availability and affordability. She said the data should not be viewed in isolation, as every state has a unique risk profile that significantly influences premiums and market conditions. She said the OIR recommends pairing key metrics with broader state-specific factors, such as catastrophe exposure, economic conditions, reinsurance costs, litigation environment, and market structure. Crockett said the OIR encourages the Working Group to use state-level data as the foundation of the national report while allowing states to leverage their more granular data for their own regulatory and policy purposes. She said the proposed affordability and availability metrics are intended to help identify important trends in premiums, coverage, consumer retention, and ensure appetite over time. She said the Working Group should consider other existing and forthcoming NAIC reports covering similar issues to avoid duplication and ensure consistency.

Brickwedde said he agreed with the idea of organizing around affordability and availability. He said it would be helpful to contextualize consumers' ability to afford insurance and use it, including the cost-sharing involved in filing a claim. He agreed that the Working Group should consider the work happening in other NAIC groups and publications to remain consistent.

Director Nelson suggested either defining the term "affordability" very carefully or using a different word when analyzing cost metrics in the report. Darby agreed with this point and said it was considered during the analysis period of the previous data call.

Soucy said some states may have data skewed by highly concentrated population centers, and there may need to be consideration of breaking the data down by counties with different population sizes to account for rural counties. Commissioner Grant said the current procedure for a public report is authorized at the state level.

Kenneth Klein (NAIC Consumer Representative) said the Working Group should consider the speed at which it releases the data, and that while offering context is important, it would slow down the release of data. Commissioner Yaworsky said when referring to contextualizing the data, the report is not looking to offer a preferred narrative of the data, but rather to ensure the data is framed in a way the public can understand. Director Nelson said the first iteration of a report on the data call may take longer as it is shaped, but future iterations will be easier and expedited.

Bradner said an example of this context is being able to inform the public about the importance of deductibles and their role in determining the portion of risk for any loss event.

Commissioner Grant said the next steps for the Working Group are to build a straw proposal of report metrics for interested parties to comment on. She said that proposal would be followed by a Working Group meeting in September.

Having no further business, the joint meeting of the Homeowners Market Data Call (C) Task Force and the Homeowners Market Report (C) Working Group adjourned.

Draft: 7/6/26

Homeowners Market Report (C) Working Group
Virtual Meeting
June 12, 2026

The Homeowners Market Report (C) Working Group of the Homeowners Market Data Call (C) Task Force met June 12, 2026. The following Working Group members participated: Marie Grant, Chair (MD); Angela L. Nelson, Vice Chair (MO); Austin Childs (AK); Dan Gates (AL); Lori Dreaver Munn (AZ); Jason Lapham (CO); George Bradner (CT); Angela King (DC); Nicole Crockett (FL); Emily Beets (KS); Jackie Horigan (MA); Sandra Darby (ME); Peter Brickwedde (MN); Benjamin Ulery (MS); Blaine Bergstedt and Colton Schulz (ND); Robert McCullough (NE); Stewart Trego (OH); Zach Palank (OK); Spencer Peacock (OR); Michael McKenney (PA); Eric Lowe (VA); and Rosemary Raszka (VT).

1. Received Feedback from Interested Parties Regarding Homeowners Data Call Data Elements and Related Metrics for Inclusion in a Public Report

Commissioner Grant explained the Working Group was appointed during the Spring National Meeting and reports to the Homeowners Market Data Call (C) Task Force. The Working Group is charged to: "Consider drafting and public release of a report analyzing data from the homeowners market data call." Commissioner Grant noted that Director Nelson serves as vice chair of the Working Group.

Commissioner Grant said the strength of homeowners insurance markets across the country has been a topic of much discussion, study, and press. She noted that conditions and circumstances vary by state. The homeowners market data call (HMDC) promises to be an excellent resource for insurance commissioners. That data call is collecting data from 2018 to 2025, with data due July 15. The data collected is confidential, but insurance commissioners recognize the need to release some of that data to increase understanding of the state of the private homeowners' market nationwide.

Commissioner Grant also noted that the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee Ranking Member, Sen. Tina Smith (D-MN), released a report titled *Bold Solutions to the Home Insurance Crisis* that outlines a range of potential federal policy responses. The benefit of a state insurance regulator public report will be to provide an in-depth picture of the current status of state markets.

Commissioner Grant explained that data from the HMDC promises to provide accurate data at a granular level, as well as context for homeowners insurance markets. The Working Group is looking to take the data received in the HMDC and issue a public report that can be relied upon by state insurance regulators, legislators, media, experts, and consumers in order to better understand market dynamics and to better inform policy solutions, should they be warranted, at the state and federal levels.

Commissioner Grant reported that the Working Group met May 27 and May 13 in regulator-to-regulator session, pursuant to paragraph 3 (specific companies, entities, or individuals) of the NAIC Policy Statement on Open Meetings, to discuss the status of the data received, the reasons the data call was issued, and questions that state insurance regulators are seeking to answer.
Commissioner Grant said the HMDC was issued in March, and data is due on July 15. This Working Group will scope out an outline and timing of a public report. It will meet in open session and receive regulator and interested party feedback along the way.

Commissioner Grant said several interested parties offered to provide input on which data elements from the data call should be included in a public report and what questions those data points could answer.

Kenneth Klein (California Western School of Law) said data in the HMDC could be used in a report to answer what coverages have been purchased with what limits, at what cost, the impact of deductibles on cost, and the impact of mitigation on costs. He said information on building code upgrade endorsements, their prevalence at what percentage they exist, and what coverage limit there is should be collected. Other elements Klein said should be collected include guidelines or limits insurers provide to their producers on a consumer either purchasing more or less than the initially quoted Coverage A limits, incurred losses, reserve amounts, and catastrophe and total loss information. He also suggested adding information on endorsements and premium allocations. He said he favors a release of data in a transparent and aggregated manner so that third parties can study insights.

Jaclyn de Medicci Bruneau (Ceres) said Ceres strongly supports robust public reporting from the data call. The homeowners insurance market is in a period of significant stress, driven by increased frequency and severity of severe weather events. She said publicly available granular market data is essential not only for state insurance regulators, but also policymakers, researchers, and advocates to better understand what is actually happening on the ground for policyholders.

Bruneau noted six data elements that are essential to include in any public report: 1) coverage availability by geography and the counts of policies that exclude wind, wildfire, and earthquake coverage; 2) nonrenewal and cancellation volumes over time; 3) ratio of premium to Coverage A limits over time; 4) deductible escalation by peril; 5) replacement costs versus actual cash value; and 6) mitigation discount data. She said these should be reported publicly at the state and ideally ZIP-code level.

Bruneau said generally a public report should address the questions that consumer advocates and state legislators are asking about where insurance is becoming unavailable and unaffordable and where the policies that remain available are providing less protection than they used to.

Douglas Heller (Consumer Federation of America—CFA) said any reports released should also include public access to all of the data collected in full detail. He said ZIP code aggregates are less granular than other types of public financial services data, such as the transaction-level detail that comes out of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA). He said the insurers themselves have more detailed and more current real-time data about the activities and strategies of their competitors than any aging ZIP code data that will come from the report would ever reveal. He said publishing the full data allows a host of academics, other interested parties, policymakers, and researchers to analyze property insurance market conditions in ways that exceed the scope and capabilities of state insurance regulators. Moreover, people with access to other data sets that can be combined with this data will ensure more robust analyses.

Heller noted that a public report should include all of the data elements broken out by coverage, by year, and summarized by ZIP Code. He said a future data call should include incurred losses and earned premium. By using additional external data, he urged for a calculation of a percentage of owner occupied homes without property insurance, comparison of mitigation discounts to mitigation grants by year by ZIP code, comparison of changes in average premium and nonrenewal rates to foreclosures and delinquencies, racial composition and ethnic composition of ZIP codes compared to premium increases, increases in deductibles, changes to actual cash value (ACV) and replacement cost (RC) coverages, changes in cancellations and nonrenewals, comparison of the average household income to all data elements, and comparison of data elements to changes in average credit scores and changes following catastrophe events.

Lisa Brown (American Property Casualty Insurance Association—APCIA) said a public report should not just be a data dump with no context. A report should explain not just whether premiums and policies changed, but also how market conditions and product designs are evolving, including shifts in new and renewal businesses, nonrenewals, deductibles, coverage terms, ACV versus RC, and the role of mitigation. The report should be framed as an education tool for consumers and policymakers.

Brown said a report should explain broad trends in homeowners insurance availability, affordability, and product changes. It should also provide context around inflation, catastrophe losses, and capital and reinsurance conditions influencing pricing and capacity. Additionally, it should present all results in a way that protects confidential, proprietary company information through aggregation and suppression.

Brown noted that APCIA believes the public report should include an opening section explaining that the 2018 to 2025 dataset spans a major inflation volatility period, so the numbers should be interpreted in context, not as isolated insurer behavior. A key message to include in the report is the cyclical nature of insurance markets, which can be influenced by changes in capital availability and risk concentration and may at times result in temporary market adjustments. She noted that when reporting on affordability, the report should avoid showing premium changes alone. A report should pair premium with exposure measures, such as coverage limits, by using a metric like premium per $1000 of Coverage A.

Brown suggested that the report presents changes in coverages and deductibles as market adaptation and product redesign rather than simply coverage reductions. She said the public report will be more accurate if it explains the trade-offs among price, scope of coverage, and continued market participation. If the purpose is education, the report should show that affordability and availability trends are linked to underlying loss experience. Brown also recommended the report include a meaningful section on cancellations and nonrenewals as this is one of the most important public education opportunities. Brown said the report should distinguish clearly between nonpayment cancellations, company-initiated cancellations, and nonrenewals because they are different phenomena and should be clearly differentiated in the public-facing narrative.

Brown said the report should explicitly state limitations, including that the data does not prove causation on its own, does not reflect all qualitative underwriting considerations, may not show the full timing lag between costs and pricing, and should not be used to compare or rank individual companies. She also noted the report should publish data only in a way that avoids company-specific identification and avoids ZIP Code-level outputs where small counts could reveal market participants and uses aggregations where necessary to avoid releasing proprietary information.

Schulz asked if APCIA would support a release of raw ZIP code-level data. Brown said APCIA would support an aggregated release of ZIP Code-level data with all reporting companies combined. She said the data is mostly collected under market conduct authority to keep the company level data confidential, but companies understand that the data will be used in a public report.

Commissioner Grant asked about industry access to data through various systems, as was mentioned by Heller. Brown said she was not aware of company access to competitor data.

Erica Weyhenmeyer (National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies—NAMIC) said a report should remain focused, risk aware, and grounded in aggregated and anonymized data. The most useful public report will be one that represents a set of derived metrics from the data call, supplemented where appropriate with limited contextual information from existing NAIC reports and other established public sources. The report should be organized around several core pillars, such as market size and structure, affordability, availability, loss experience mitigation, and a broader solvency context. That framework helps ensure the report is understandable for state insurance regulators, legislators, consumers, and other stakeholders while also reflecting how homeowners' markets actually function.

On affordability, NAMIC recommends metrics that normalize coverage and exposure rather than relying solely on raw premium comparisons. Measures such as premium per $1000 of Coverage A, median and average premium and, deductible distributions are more informative because they help distinguish between price increases that reflect greater insured value or risk and those that may suggest broader affordability pressure. On availability, Weyhenmeyer said the report should include data points that meaningfully reflect market access and coverage changes, including nonrenewal rates, company-initiated cancellation rates, and prevalence of endorsements for limited forms of coverage. She noted losses, claims, peril-specific paid losses ratio, claim frequency, and claims closed without payment metrics can add important insight, particularly when presented at an aggregated level and over time.

Weyhenmeyer said NAMIC also believes the report should include mitigation and resiliency metrics where credible and supported by the data. Comparisons of mitigation adoption and loss experience can make the report more constructive by identifying where resiliency efforts may be helping improve outcomes over time. She said pairing data call metrics with broader homeowners' loss and expense information can explain why affordability and availability pressures may emerge in certain markets without turning the report into a company-specific financial exercise. She said a report should include only aggregated and anonymized data.

Commissioner Grant asked if NAMIC agrees with APCIA on the release of aggregated ZIP code data, to which Weyhenmeyer said NAMIC does agree.

Commissioner Grant said the Working Group will take the interested party information as it continues to consider what data to release. The Working Group is also considering whether to release data and sections of a report in a staged approach.

Having no further business, the Homeowners Market Report (C) Working Group adjourned.

