

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 1, Life Insurance Overview | A- 1 to A- 8 |
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 2, Product Development | A- 9 to A- 19 |
| SN ILA-D101-07, Product Development Trends (pp. 46-61) | A- 20 to A- 22 |
| SN ILA-D104-07, The Product Development Process, Easton and Harris, Chapter 3 | A- 23 to A- 24 |
| SN ILA-D111-07, Product Design for Life Insurance & Annuities, Conant, Chapter 1 | A- 25 to A- 27 |
| SOA, Marketing and Distribution Section Product Implementation Survey, Summary of Results, June 2007 | A- 28 to A- 29 |
| SOA, The Process of Premium Formulation | A- 30 to A- 33 |

DRIVERS OF PRODUCT DESIGN

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Laporte, Marketing for Actuaries, Chapter I, Introduction | B- 1 to B- 1 |
| Laporte, Marketing for Actuaries, Chapter II, Marketing Management Objectives and Strategies | B- 2 to B- 3 |
| Laporte, Marketing for Actuaries, Chapter III, Market Research | B- 4 to B- 7 |
| Laporte, Marketing for Actuaries, Chapter IV, Traditional Distribution Systems | B- 8 to B- 19 |
| Laporte, Marketing for Actuaries, Chapter V, Nontraditional and Emerging Distribution Systems | B- 20 to B- 23 |
| Laporte, Marketing for Actuaries, Chapter VI, Marketing and Pricing | B- 24 to B- 27 |
| Laporte, Marketing for Actuaries, Chapter VII, Illustration and Disclosure | B- 28 to B- 41 |
| Laporte, Marketing for Actuaries, Chapter VIII, Sec.4228 of the NY State Insurance Law | B- 42 to B- 46 |
| Allen/Peterson, Insurance Marketing, Chapter 2, How Companies Manage Marketing | B- 47 to B- 50 |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Allen/Peterson, Insurance Marketing, Chapter 3, Market Segmentation And Target Marketing | B- 51 to B- 53 |
| Allen/Peterson, Insurance Marketing, Chapter 4, Marketing Information And Research | B- 54 to B- 56 |
| Allen/Peterson, Insurance Marketing, Chapter 5, Customer Behavior and Customer Relationship Marketing | B- 57 to B- 59 |
| Allen/Peterson, Insurance Marketing, Chapter 7, Pricing Insurance Products: A Marketing Perspective | B- 60 to B- 61 |
| Allen/Peterson, Insurance Marketing, Chapter 8, Distribution Systems and Strategies | B- 62 to B- 64 |
| SN ILA-D111-07, How Insurers Develop New Products, Conant, Chapter 1, (Ref. Section A) | A- 25 to A- 27 |

FEASIBILITY STEP OF NEW PRODUCT

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 2, Product Development (Ref. Section A) | A- 9 to A- 19 |
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 3, Pricing Assumptions | C- 1 to C- 13 |
| Marino, Chapter 1, The History of Life Insurance Policy Taxation | C- 14 to C- 18 |
| Marino, Chapter 3, Taxation of Life Insurance Policies, Dispositions And Selected Valuation Issues | C- 19 to C- 24 |
| Marino, Chapter 14, Taxation of Annuity Contracts | C- 25 to C- 31 |
| Marino, Chapter 15, Deferred Annuities | C- 32 to C- 34 |
| Marino, Chapter 19, Segregated Funds | C- 35 to C- 37 |
| SN ILA-D609-08, Notes on the Taxation of Life Insurance Policies And Annuity Contracts | C- 38 to C- 44 |
| SN ILA-D614-09, Guideline G6 – Illustrations, CLHIA | C- 45 to C- 46 |
| SOA, Hidden Costs of Administering Complex Products, Nov. 2003 | C- 47 to C- 47 |
| SOA, Hidden Costs of Product Complexity, Nov. 2003 | C- 48 to C- 48 |

DESIGN AND PURPOSE OF PRODUCT BENEFITS AND FEATURES

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Atkinson-Dallas, Chapter 13, Annuity and Investment Products | D- 1 to D- 8 |
| Marino, Chapter 2, Life Insurance Products | D- 9 to D- 14 |
| Marino, Chapter 4, Leveraged Life Insurance – Borrowing Against a Policy | D- 15 to D- 19 |
| Marino, Chapter 9, Trusts and Life Insurance | D- 20 to D- 22 |
| Hardy, Chapter 1, Investment Guarantees | D- 23 to D- 26 |
| SN ILA-D102-07, Equity Indexed Annuities | D- 27 to D- 32 |
| SN ILA-D105-07, Life and Annuity Products and Features | D- 33 to D- 74 |
| SN ILA-D116-10, Variable Annuities, Kalberer and Ravindran, Chapters 5, 9, 10, 11 | D- 75 to D- 80 |
| SN ILA-D601-08, Lapse Experience under Universal Life Level Cost Of Insurance Policies, October 2007 | D- 81 to D- 82 |
| SN ILA-D600-07, Lapse Experience Under Lapse-Supported Policies | D- 83 to D- 85 |
| SN ILA-D608-08, Lapse Experience under Term-to-100 Insurance Policies, October 2007 | D- 86 to D- 87 |
| SN ILA-D610-08, Pricing Critical Illness Insurance in Canada | D- 88 to D- 89 |
| SN ILA-D611-08, Product Design of Critical Illness Insurance in Canada | D- 90 to D- 92 |
| SOA, EIUL: The Devil’s in the Details, August 2005 | D- 93 to D- 94 |
| SOA, Inflation-Indexed Income Annuities: Pricing Considerations and Investment Strategies, Sept. 2006 | D- 95 to D- 96 |
| SOA, What’s Backing Your Life Insurance Guarantee?, Feb. 2005 | D- 97 to D- 99 |
| SOA, VUL Secondary Guarantees: Catalyst for Sales Rebound, July 2003 | D- 100 to D-102 |
| SOA, Return of Premium Term, July 2004 | D- 103 to D-103 |
| SOA, Term Mortality and Lapses, August 2005 | D- 104 to D-105 |
| SOA, Designing & Pricing LTCI Combination Products | D- 106 to D-106 |
| Combination Annuities – A Market to Get Into?, June 2009 | D- 107 to D-108 |
| Annuity/LTCI Combinations, More to Come, October 2009 | D- 109 to D-109 |

ASSUMPTIONS, PROFIT MEASURES AND MODELING APPROACHES

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 3, Pricing Assumption (Ref. Section C) | C- 1 to C- 13 |
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 4, Basic Actuarial Mathematics | E- 1 to E- 2 |
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 5, Life Insurance Cash Flows | E- 3 to E- 7 |
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 7, Reinsurance | E- 8 to E- 12 |
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 9, Taxes | E- 13 to E- 16 |
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 10, Required Capital | E- 17 to E- 22 |
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 11, Profit Measurement and Analysis | E- 23 to E- 28 |
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 13, Annuity and Investment Products (Ref. Section D) | D- 1 to D- 8 |
| Atkinson/Dallas, Chapter 14, Financial Modeling | E- 29 to E- 39 |
| Hardy, Chapter 1 (p.14), Pricing and Capital Requirement (Ref. Section D) | D- 23 to D- 26 |
| Hardy, Chapter 2, Modeling Long-term Stock Returns | E- 40 to E- 45 |
| Hardy, Chapter 6, Modeling the Guarantee Liability | E- 46 to E- 49 |
| Hardy, Chapter 8, Dynamic Hedging for Separate Account Guarantees (pp. 133-143 only) | E- 50 to E- 50 |
| Hardy, Chapter 9, Risk Measures | E- 51 to E- 53 |
| Hardy, Chapter 12, Guaranteed Annuity Options | E- 54 to E- 55 |
| Hardy, Chapter 13, Equity-Indexed Annuities | E- 56 to E- 59 |
| SN ILA-D102-07, Equity-Indexed Annuities (Ref. Section D) | D- 27 to D- 32 |
| SN ILA-D103-07, Innovative Financing: Life Insurance Securitization | E- 60 to E- 61 |
| SN ILA-D106-07, Gross Premium for Disability Waiver Benefits | E- 62 to E- 66 |
| SN ILA-D107-07, Experience Assumptions for Individual Life Insurance and Annuities | E- 67 to E- 79 |
| SN ILA-D109-09, Moody's Investors Service Corporate Default and Recovery Rates, 1920-2008 | E- 80 to E- 83 |
| SN ILA-D110-07, Advanced Policyholder Dividends | E- 84 to E- 93 |
| SN ILA-D113-09, The Economics of Insurance: How Insurers Create Value for Shareholders, Swiss Re | E- 94 to E- 104 |
| SN ILA-D114-09, CIA, Life Insurance Costing and Risk Analysis, June 2008 | E- 105 to E- 114 |
| SN ILA-D115-09, IAA, Current Estimate and Risk Margins, April 2009, (Ch. 6 and Appendices C and D) | E- 115 to E- 122 |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| SN ILA-D615-10, PD-15 Combo Product: Where are we Now? | E- 123 to E- 124 |
| SN ILA-D616-10, PD-19, Life Hot Topics | E- 125 to E- 125 |
| SN ILA-D617-10, PD-29, Individual Product Structures: Product Development and Innovation | E- 126 to E- 128 |
| ASOP #1, Nonguaranteed Charges or Benefits for Life Insurance Policies and Annuity Contracts | E- 129 to E- 132 |
| SOA, Ending the Mortality Table | E- 133 to E- 134 |
| SOA, The Response of Life Insurance Pricing to Life Settlements | E- 135 to E- 136 |
| SOA, Mortality Table Slope – The Discussion Goes On, July 2004 | E- 137 to E- 137 |
| SOA, Does Preferred Wear Off ?, July 2004 | E- 138 to E- 140 |
| SOA, Product Development Challenges in a Principles-Based World | E- 141 to E- 141 |
| SOA, Across America, Valuation Actuaries are Being Warmly Welcomed to Product Development Project Teams, Feb. 2007 | E- 142 to E- 142 |
| SOA, TSA XXXIX, Pricing in a Return-on-Equity Environment | E- 143 to E- 146 |
| Risk Based Pricing – Risk Management at Point of Sale, June 2009 | E- 147 to E- 148 |
| SOA, Stochastic Pricing, Session 62 TS | E- 149 to E- 150 |
| SOA, Stochastic Pricing, RSA Vol. 27, No 2, Session 86PD | E- 151 to E- 154 |
| SOA, Stochastic Pricing for Embedded Options in Life Insurance and Annuity Products, Milliman | E- 155 to E- 158 |

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRODUCT DESIGN AND SELECTION OF APPROPRIATE ASSUMPTIONS FOR PRICING

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| SN ILA-D107-07, Experience Assumptions for Individual Life Insurance and Annuities (Ref. Section E) | E- 67 to E- 79 |
| SN ILA-D110-07, Advanced Policyholder Dividends (Ref. Section E) | E- 84 to E- 93 |
| SN ILA-D111-07, Technical Product Design, Conant, Chapter 2 (pp.31-33) | F- 1 to F- 1 |
| SN ILA-D117-10, Life and Health Ins. Marketing, Third Ed. pp.242-243 | F- 2 to F- 2 |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| ASOP #23, Data Quality | F- 3 to F- 6 |
| CIA Recommendations – Dividend Determination and Illustration, June 1982 | F- 7 to F- 13 |
| <u>REVIEW QUESTIONS</u> | Q- 1 to Q- 297 |
| <u>SOLUTIONS TO REVIEW QUESTIONS</u> | S- 1 to S- 181 |

HARDY, CHAPTER 9, RISK MEASURES

I. Introduction

- A. A risk measure is a method of encapsulating the riskiness of a distribution in a single number or in a real-valued function.
- B. Regulators use risk measures as a succinct way of quantifying risk.
- C. A risk measure is functional, mapping a distribution to the real numbers.

II. The Quantile Risk Measure (QRM)

A. Introduction

1. L_0 = PV of losses discounted at risk-free rate of interest.
2. QRM is $H(L_0) = V_\alpha = \inf \{V : \Pr [L_0 \leq V] \geq \alpha\}$.
3. V_α is the 100 α percentile of the loss distribution.
4. It is the smallest sum to hold in risk-free assets in order that at maturity, the probability of having a sufficient amount to pay the guarantee G is at least α .
5. The probability distribution used is the real-world measure or P-measure.
6. Q-measure is only used for pricing or determining the hedge portfolio.

B. Simulation

1. QRM is very easy to estimate when liability distribution is constructed by stochastic simulation.
2. The estimated α -quantile risk measure is the $N\alpha^{\text{th}}$ value of ordered liability values.
3. It is useful to calculate the standard error of the estimate $L_{0(N\alpha)}$.
4. A 100 $\beta\%$ confidence interval for the α -quantile is $(L_{0(N\alpha-A)}, L_{0(N\alpha+A)})$.
5. $A = \Phi^{-1} [(1 + \beta) / 2] \sqrt{N\alpha(1 - \alpha)}$.

C. Exact Calculation

1. Assume $L_0 = (G - F_n) e^{-r_n}$ for $G \geq F_n$ and 0 for $G < F_n$.
2. Assume $F_k = S_k (1 - m)^k$ for integer k and assume $\varepsilon = \Pr [L_0 = 0]$.
3. Assume that stock returns follow a lognormal process.
4. Then $\varepsilon = 1 - \Phi \{ \log G/S_0 - n [\mu + \log (1 - m)] / \sqrt{n\sigma} \}$.
5. Quantile risk measure is V_α , the smallest amount satisfying $\Pr [F_n + V_\alpha e^{rn} > G] \geq \alpha$.
6. Assume F_n is a continuous random variable then $V_\alpha = [G - F_{F_n}^{-1}(1 - \alpha)] e^{-rn}$.
7. Assume $z_p = \Phi^{-1}(p)$ then $V_\alpha = \{G - F_0 \exp [-z_\alpha \sqrt{n\sigma} + n(\mu + \log(1 - m))]\} e^{-rn}$.
8. It is also possible to calculate QRMs for other distributions analytically.
9. Effect of calibration brings results closer together.

III. The Conditional Tail Expectation (CTE) Risk Measure

A. Introduction

1. Expected value of loss given that loss falls in the upper $(1 - \alpha)$ tail of distribution.
2. $CTE_\alpha(L) = E[L_0 | L_0 > V_\alpha]$.
3. Find $\beta' = \max\{\beta : V_\alpha = V_\beta\}$.
4. $CTE_\alpha(L) = \{(1 - \beta') E[X | X > V_\alpha] + (\beta' - \alpha) V_\alpha\} / (1 - \alpha)$.

B. Simulation

1. Start by ordering the simulated losses.
2. Provided $N\alpha$ is an integer, $CTE_\alpha(L_0) = \sum L_{0(j)} / N(1 - \alpha)$, for $j = N\alpha + 1$ to N .
3. Estimate will have uncertainty attached from sampling variability.
4. This may be quantified by standard error or by confidence interval.
5. $SD(L_{(j)} : j > N\alpha) / \sqrt{N(1 - \alpha)}$, where $SD()$ denotes standard deviation of the L 's.

C. Exact Calculation

1. It is possible to calculate the CTE risk measure for a plain vanilla GMMB, with no allowance for margin offset and no dynamic hedging.
2. As with QRMs effect of calibration is to bring tail measures closer.

IV. Quantile and CTE Measures Compared

- A. Both are very simple to work with.
- B. $CTE > QRM$ until maximum value of L_0 is reached, when they will be equal.
- C. If distribution of $L_0 | L_0 > V_\alpha$ is uniform then $CTE_\alpha(L_0) = V_{(1+\alpha)/2}$.
- D. For most GMMB, GMDB and GMAB contracts, $CTE_\alpha(L_0) > V_{(1+\alpha)/2}$.
- E. Coherence of risk measures: $H[X]$ is said to be coherent if it is
 1. Bounded above by maximum loss: $H[X] \leq \max(X)$.
 2. Bounded below by the mean loss: $H[X] \geq E[X]$.
 3. Scalar additive and multiplicative: $H[aX + b] = aH[X] + b$, for $a, b > 0$.
 4. Subadditive: $H[X + Y] \leq H[X] + H[Y]$.
- F. Quantile risk measures fail both property 2. and property 4. above.
- G. CTE satisfies all criteria for coherence.
- H. Quantile measure is determined by one point on loss distribution.
- I. CTE uses all of loss distribution to the right of the quantile.
- J. Robustness under simulation: Sensitivity to sampling variability
 1. Quantile takes a single ordered outcome to determine risk measure.
 2. CTE takes an average of set of largest outcomes: less sensitive.

K CTE is used for both reserve and solvency capital calculations for segregated fund contracts in Canada

1. Recommended by CIA and accepted by OSFI.
2. For reserves, use α around 80% and for total solvency capital, use $\alpha = 95\%$.

V. Risk Measures for GMAB Liability: Examples

A. CTE and Quantile Risk Measure for Actuarially Managed GMAB

1. Quantile falls below mean at all values of $\alpha <$ around 60%.
2. CTE curve lies above quantile curve until maximum value is reached.
3. CTE curve is somewhat smoother than the quantile curve.
4. Significant tail risk arises from offering reset option (+ 3% of fund value).
5. Restricting reset option to 2 shouts, or resets per year does not help a lot.

B. Comparison of Actuarial and Hedging Approaches to Risk Management of GMAB

1. Risk measure using dynamic hedging includes cost of the hedge.
2. $V_{.9}^{\text{act}} = 1.29\%$ of fund while $V_{.9}^{\text{dh}} = 1.06\%$ of fund.
3. These results indicate very similar risk under 2 approaches (deceptive).
4. $\text{CTE}_{.9}^{\text{act}} = 5.92\%$ of fund while $\text{CTE}_{.9}^{\text{dh}} = 1.74\%$ of fund.
5. These results indicate more of a difference.
6. Difference also increases as the α parameter increases.

VI. Risk Measures for VA Death Benefits: Examples

- A. Many VA contracts carry only a death benefit guarantee.
- B. Mortality and withdrawals are treated deterministically.
- C. Costs are fairly low and simulation evidence supports this.
- D. Risk measures for VA-type GMDB benefits, 30-year contract, as % of initial fund value

1. Fixed GMDB carries relatively little risk.
2. Slight tail risk using actuarial risk management but this is damped by using hedging strategy, that virtually eliminates the risk.
3. Increasing GMDB is a more substantial risk.
4. Hedging strategy significantly reduces the tail risk.

SECTION Q

Review Questions

Introductory Note

This section of the study manual contains an array of review questions covering the entire syllabus. These questions were written to serve as an aid in assessing your understanding of the material after you have completely covered it through your studies. It is unlikely that you would see questions of this type on the actual exam, since those questions are developed with an eye toward application of multiple parts of the syllabus in actual job situations.

While these questions were not developed as possible exam questions by themselves, it is entirely possible that you could see some of these questions as parts of actual exam questions.

This section of the manual is relatively new. We would welcome your feedback on it, both as it is presented here and any suggestions you have for improvement.

Source: Hardy, Chapter 13**Question 2**

(55 Points)

A 7-year EIA contract is indexed to the S&P 500 index. If the guaranteed payout is found by accumulating 95% of premium at 4% per year interest, the payout is twice the guaranteed amount, the floor rate is 0% and the values of the index over the 7-year term are the following

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| t | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| S_t | 100 | 125 | 150 | 120 | 120 | 150 | 240 | 300 |

- (a) What is the participation rate of the contract under a point-to-point (PTP) indexing?
- (b) If the participation rate is 80% of that in (a), what is the ratio of the payout under the compound annual ratchet (CAR) indexing to that in (a)?
- (c) If the participation rate is 80% of that in (a), what is the ratio of the payout under the simple annual ratchet (SAR) indexing to that in (a)?
- (d) Same as (b) with a cap rate of 15%?
- (e) Same as (c) with a cap rate of 10%?
- (f) If the participation rate is 80% of that in (a), what is the ratio of the payout under the high water mark indexing to that in (a)?

Source: Marino, Chapter 3**Question 6**
(14 Points)

With respect to the taxation of life insurance policies, describe the disposition of an interest in a life insurance policy through a transfer of ownership or absolute assignment.

Source: Hardy, Chapter 13**Solution to Question 2**

| <u>Statement</u> | <u>Points</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----|------|----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|-----|-----|------|----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 1. $G = (0.95) P (1.04)^7 = 1.250 P$. | <u>3</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Total increase of index: 300%. | <u>3</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Annual increases of the index are | <u>7</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <table border="0" style="display: inline-table;"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">t</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">1</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">2</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">3</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">4</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">5</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">6</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">%</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">25%</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">20%</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">-20%</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">0%</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">25%</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">60%</td> <td style="padding-right: 10px;">25%</td> </tr> </table> | t | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | % | 25% | 20% | -20% | 0% | 25% | 60% | 25% | |
| t | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| % | 25% | 20% | -20% | 0% | 25% | 60% | 25% | | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) PTP indexing | <u>7</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Payout is: $P (1 + \alpha (3.00 - 1)) = 2.50 P$. | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. $P (1 + 2.00 \alpha) = 2.50 P$ | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. $\alpha = 1.50 / 2.00 = 0.75$. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (b) CAR indexing with $\alpha = 80\% \times 0.75 = 0.60$ | <u>7</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Payout is: $P (1+.15)(1+.12)(1+.15)(1+.36)(1+.15) = 2.32 P$. | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Ratio is $2.32 P / 2.50 P = 92.8\%$. | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (c) SAR indexing with $\alpha = 80\% \times 0.75 = 0.60$ | <u>7</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Payout is: $P (1 + (.15 + .12 + .15 + .36 + .15)) = 1.93 P$. | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Ratio is $1.93 P / 2.50 P = 77.2\%$. | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (d) CAR indexing with $\alpha = 80\% \times 0.75 = 0.60$ and cap rate of 15% | <u>7</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Payout is: $P (1+.15)(1+.12)(1+.15)(1+.15)(1+.15) = 1.96 P$. | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Ratio is $1.96 P / 2.50 P = 78.4\%$. | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (e) SAR indexing with $\alpha = 80\% \times 0.75 = 0.60$ and cap rate of 10% | <u>7</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Payout is: $P (1 + (.10 + .10 + .10 + .10 + .10)) = 1.50 P$. | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Ratio is $1.50 P / 2.50 P = 60.0\%$. | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (f) High water mark indexing with $\alpha = 80\% \times 0.75 = 0.60$ | <u>7</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Payout is: $P (1 + 0.60 (3.00 - 1)) = 2.20 P$. | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Ratio is $2.20 P / 2.50 P = 88.0\%$. | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL POINTS | <u>55</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Marino, Chapter 3**Solution to Question 6**

| <u>Statement</u> | <u>Points</u> |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. General rule: Policy gain = Transfer price – ACB. | 1 |
| 2. Specific rules apply to certain transactions | 1 |
| a. Transfer by way of gift or bequest. | 1 |
| b. Distribution from a corporation. | 1 |
| c. Disposition by way of operation of law only. | 1 |
| d. Disposition to any non-arm's length person. | 1 |
| 3. Value of interest for these special cases is usually CSV – policy loan. | 1 |
| 4. Tax-free rollovers (Proceeds = ACB) | 1 |
| a. Generation transfers and intergeneration transfers. | 2 |
| b. Inter vivos transfer to spouse or common-law partner. | 2 |
| c. Transfer to spouse or common-law partner at death. | 2 |
| TOTAL POINTS | <u>14</u> |

Solution to Question 7

| <u>Statement</u> | <u>Points</u> |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. CSV of the policy. | 1 |
| 2. Policy's loan value. | 1 |
| 3. Face value of policy. | 1 |
| 4. State of health of insured and his/her life expectancy. | 1 |
| 5. Conversion privileges under the policy. | 1 |
| 6. Other policy terms, such as term riders, double indemnity provisions. | 1 |
| 7. Replacement value of the policy. | 1 |
| TOTAL POINTS | <u>7</u> |