

WGP 130 (23) Development of a code for claims classification in the engineering insurance industry

Andy Kane Head of Construction & Engineering, QBE European Operations

Christian Kolbe Head of Global Construction Claims Allianz Commercial







05 Proposed next steps.

02 Why do we need a new classification system?

Questions / Discussion.

03 The process.







TOPICWorking Group Members



3

WGP130 (23) Members



Arne Ziegert, Chair (SWISS RE) Andy Kane (QBE) Christian Kolbe (ALLIANZ) Darren Smart (LIBERTY) Devrim Aksar (ANADOLU) Giacomo Paolo Dentoni (ZURICH) Martin Schörkhuber (VRS-SSP) Paulina Harrington (SCOR) Raik Wittowski (HELVETIA) Richard Gordon (ZURICH) Yuki Takahashi (SOMPO) Francesca De Rosa, sponsor (AXA)





Why do we need a new classification system?

slido

Join at slido.com





• How easy do you find it to access accurate claims data in your portfolio.

Poll

• Easily – Very Difficult

Why do we need a new classification system?



- Without a common claims classification system for engineering claims, statistical analysis become problematic.
- Portfolio Management (accurate data is essential).
- Simplify IMIA Statistics survey through unified claims data.
- Enable spotting claims trends through enhanced data quality.
- Target risk engineering activities accurately.
- Improve Insurance service to policyholders.



London market current process using the e-file

- In the event of a claim the broker presents the initial Electronic Claims File (ECF) through a shared system.
- The broker will enter the initial cause of loss.
- The cause of loss should be updated by the lead syndicate or market.
- Once the claim is agreed by the lead it will be settled by all markets through the system.
- Often the claim cause is not updated and is shown as "Contractors All Risk".
- All markets are relying on the lead market to choose the correct cause.







The process



Process

- Collection of data (available classification systems in the market).
- Reduction of data to the minimum relevant.
- Workshop (definition of the scope of the code).
- Test cases.
- Findings from testing.
- Output.





Process

- Classifications were obtained from eleven insurance companies.
- Classifications received represent the current approaches of insurance companies on three continents.
- Consideration of classifications from two organizations operating in London (LMA-London Market Association and LPC- London Processing Centre) and three national insurance associations (Italy, Austria, and Turkey) were also included in the review.



Workshop/Testing/Outcome









Proposed classification system

The Phase – The Peril – The Cause





THE MARKET REPORT

The Phase

Works (all kind, both 'early' and 'late') Commissioning/testing Maintenance Initial operations/1st year/ramp-up

The Peril

Breakdown - electrical Breakdown - mechanical Collapse/structural damage Communicable disease Contamination Corrosion Cracking/fracture/rupture DSU/ALOP Earthquake/seismic Explosion (chemical), e.g. ignition Explosion (physical), e.g. rupture/over pressurization/overheating Fire Hail Impact Landslide, among others mudslide Lightning Mailicious act Mysterious disappearance Named windstorm Seepage and pollution Snow/ice/freezing Storm/tropical storm/windstorm hurricane/typhoon/cyclone Subsidence, e. g. settlement Theft/burglary Third party: bodily injury Third party: property damage Tsunami Water damage (external) e.g. flood and alike Water damage (internal) e.g. piping and alike Wildfire

The Cause

Arson

Breakdown - whether electric/mechanical Collision/derailment Control/management/operating systems failure by human failure Control/management/operating systems failure by software failure Cyber as act Cyber as incident Defective design, plan or specification Defective material/equipment Defective workmanship Escape of fluid Fluvial Groundwater ingress Hail Handling/lifting Lightning Never established Other Pluvial Preventative measures Service/power interruption Short circuit/electrical failure Snow/ice/freezing Storm surge Stress corrosion cracking Strike riot and civil commotion Terror Thermal runaway Third party Transit Tsunami Wildfire Wind

Poll

• HEPP case study

What was the **Phase** of the project when the loss occurred?

What was the **Peril** that manifested the damage?

What was the predominant <u>Cause</u> of the loss?

Results of the test classification

- Only one case with a consistency score of 100%.
- Phase was the most consistent with full agreement 50% of the time and an average of 93% consistency score.
- Peril was also in full agreement 50% of the time with an average of 84% consistency score.
- Cause was the least consistent with full agreement in only 2 cases and an average consistency score of 69%.

Proposed next steps

Next steps

- Propose implementation in WGP member companies.
- Collect Feedback.

- Further refinement (notably related to Natural Perils and Cause).
- Eventual future add on: Item.
- Elaborate Guidance/Manual.
- Include IDI in the assessment.

Poll

- Would you support the implementation of a global market standard classification system for claims causation and peril?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know or yet to be convinced

Questions / discussion

Questions and Comments?

• Thank you to Francesca for sponsoring the working group and Arne for chairing the group.

• Thank you to all the team members for participating.

• Thank you for your attention and participation.