

I N S T I T U T D E S T A T I S T I Q U E
B I O S T A T I S T I Q U E E T
S C I E N C E S A C T U A R I E L L E S
(I S B A)

UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE DE LOUVAIN



D I S C U S S I O N
P A P E R

1023

LONGEVITY-INDEXED LIFE ANNUITIES

DENUIT, M., HABERMAN, S. and A. RENSHAW

This file can be downloaded from
<http://www.stat.ucl.ac.be/ISpub>

LONGEVITY-INDEXED LIFE ANNUITIES

Abstract.

This paper addresses the problem of the sharing of longevity risk between an annuity provider and a group of annuitants. An appropriate longevity index is designed in order to adapt the amount of the periodic payments in life annuity contracts. This accounts for unexpected longevity improvements experienced by a given reference population. The approach described in the present paper is in contrast with Group Self-Annuitization where annuitants bear their own risk. Here, the annuitants only bear the non-diversifiable risk that the future mortality trend departs from that of the reference forecast. In that respect, the life annuities discussed in this paper are substitutes for reinsurance and securitization of longevity risk.

Key words and phrases.

Longevity risk, mortality projection, Lee-Carter model.

1. Introduction and motivation

In this paper, we address the problem of the sharing of longevity risk between an annuity provider and a group of annuitants. A conventional approach to this problem is via reinsurance. However, reinsurance treaties covering longevity risk are usually expensive and many life insurance companies are reluctant to buy long-term reinsurance coverage (because of credit risk). Securitization offers an interesting alternative to reinsurance; see, e.g., Denuit, Devolder & Goderniaux (2007) and the references therein. In that respect, the first publicly offered longevity derivative was issued by the European Investment Bank/Banque Nationale de Paris in November 2004. This was a 25-year bond, issued by EIB, with coupon payments linked to the mortality experience of the base group of males in England and Wales who were age 65 in 2003 (precisely, to the proportions of this cohort reaching ages 66 and over). The initial coupon was scaled each year by the survival rate of the base population group. To actuaries this is simply a group life annuity on the base population. In this paper, we further investigate this idea for annuities but no longer in the context of securitization. Rather, we scale the annuity payments in a similar way.

It should be emphasized here that the danger for annuity providers is in the mid term. Khalaf-Allah, Haberman & Verrall (2006) have studied the relationship between mortality differences and the corresponding change in the expected present value of a life annuity. They provide a simple and effective tool for calculating the difference in annuity values resulting from using two different sets of mortality rates. They investigate which are the age ranges that contribute most to the additional cost associated with allowing for future mortality improvements. In the case of an annuity starting at age 60, the critical age range is 73-80 in their study. This can be understood as follows. The number of survivors is still large at these ages and even modest improvements compared to the life table which is used for pricing and

reserving result in large additional costs for the annuity provider. This clearly shows that annuity providers need financial instruments with a maturity of over 15-20 years in order to offset the longevity risk. This horizon may be too distant for many investors so that securitization for longevity risk may be difficult to implement in practice.

Considering the cost of these risk management tools, a viable alternative might well be to leave the systematic part of the mortality risk with the annuitants. Indeed, when the insurance company contracts long-term obligations, it is often efficient to let the premium evolve according to some well-chosen index. This creates an effective risk sharing mechanism between the insurance company and the policyholders, leaving the latter with the risk reflected in the index (often, inflation or some other systematic risk that cannot be diversified across the portfolio). Since immediate life annuities are sold for a single premium, it is not possible to let the amount of premium depend on an appropriate index, but it would be possible to adjust the insurer's payments: if the actual longevity exceeds that of a reference forecast, then the payments are reduced accordingly. We acknowledge that the coverage against individual longevity risk provided by such a product is inferior to that of a life annuity offering guaranteed payments. However, transferring only part of the longevity risk to the annuity provider decreases its need for risk capital, reinsurance and/or securitization and is expected to make the product less expensive for future retirees. For a given amount of premium, the policyholders will be granted a higher initial periodic payment in a longevity-indexed life annuity. Annuitants have then to decide whether they prefer fixed periodic payments or agree to let them vary according to some specified longevity index. Note also that, in the case where the actual mortality improvements turn out to be weaker than expected, the payments to the annuitants are increased correspondingly in a longevity indexed contract. Moreover, periodic payments can be subjected to caps and floors in order to reduce the adverse effect of longevity improvements on annuity payments. For instance, the contract could specify that, in any case, the annuity payments will not be smaller than 80%, say, of the initial amount, whatever the improvements in longevity.

The idea of indexing life insurance products is of course not new. It is common in actuarial practice to let the premiums and/or benefits depend on the development of mortality. However, in the context of life annuities used to provide an income after retirement, the individual is poorly placed to absorb the longevity risk in the post-retirement phase. In this respect, it should be pointed out that the volatility implied by the increasingly popular variable annuities contracts (which are offered without guaranteed interest rates: see Ledlie et al (2007)) is much higher than that implied by the longevity indexed annuities discussed in the present paper. Therefore, investors favouring variable life annuities could also consider buying longevity indexed products as long as they offer comparable returns. Increased returns are made possible since, as noted above, passing part of the longevity risk to the annuitants substantially decreases the insurer's need for capital or for reinsurance.

The present proposal is related to the concept of Group Self-Annuitization, studied by Piggott, Valdez & Detzel (2005) and Valdez, Piggott & Wang (2006). The term Group Self-Annuitization (GSA) is used to describe a group self-annuity plan which will allow retirees to pool together and form a fund in order to provide for protection against longevity. These Authors report that annuities where payments reflect evolving mortality have for some time been issued in the US by the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association (TIAA) and that, historically, the impact of annual mortality adjustments has been relatively modest. Compared with GSA, the type of annuities discussed in the present paper is not a tontine scheme and offers a superior protection to policyholders. The annuitants only bear the systematic part of

the longevity risk, whereas the insurer covers the random fluctuation of mortality as well as the expected future mortality improvements and possible departures from the guaranteed interest rates. In the framework of Piggott, Valdez & Detzel (2005), Van de Ven & Weale (2008) discuss the way in which payments from pooled annuity funds need to be adjusted when future mortality rates are not known with certainty. They investigate “mortality adjusted” annuities, which are variable annuities in which aggregate mortality risk is transferred from the provider to the annuitants, allowing for the level of risk aversion of the annuitant.

The approach described in the present paper shares some similarities with the “adaptive algorithmic annuities” designed by Luthy et al. (2001). These Authors suggest the use of frequent estimates of the actual mortality in order to adjust the benefits to the policyholders. More precisely, forecasts of future mortality are updated and produce new expected present values of life annuity payments. The benefits paid to the annuitants are then scaled according to these new amounts of premium. Compared to this approach, the updates of periodic payments proposed in the present paper are based on official data published by National Institute of Statistics or regulatory authorities (and not on mortality forecasts). This makes the indexing mechanism more transparent to policyholders.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes indexed life annuity products. Section 3 studies these insurance contracts when the Lee-Carter model is used to describe the trend in future mortality. Section 4 offers numerical illustrations. The final Section 5 concludes and discusses the results.

To end with, let us introduce some notation used throughout this paper. Henceforth, we analyze the changes in mortality as a function of both age x and calendar time t . This is the so-called age-period approach. The remaining lifetime of an individual aged x on January the first of year t is denoted as $T_x(t)$. Thus, this individual will die at age $x + T_x(t)$ in calendar year $t + T_x(t)$. Then, $q_x(t) = P[T_x(t) \leq 1]$ is the probability that an x -aged individual in calendar year t dies before reaching age $x+1$ and $p_x(t) = 1 - q_x(t) = P[T_x(t) > 1]$ is the probability that an x -aged individual in calendar year t reaches age $x+1$.

2. Longevity indexed life annuities

Let us consider an individual buying an immediate longevity indexed life annuity at age x_0 in calendar year t_0 . According to this contract, the annuitant receives an annual payment as long as he or she survives. The amount specified in the contract is one monetary unit, scaled by a longevity index.

Let $p_{x_0+k}^{ref}(t_0 + k)$, $k = 0, \dots, \omega - x_0$, be a forecast for the survival of some reference population to which the individual belongs, where ω denotes the ultimate age (for which the one-year survival probability vanishes). This forecast may be provided by governmental agencies performing mortality projections (National Institute or insurance regulators). The reference population may be the general population of a given country or some market life table.

As time passes, the observed values of the one-year survival probabilities become available. In an indexed life annuity contract, the risk remaining with the annuitants is the spread

between the forecast $p_{x_0+k}^{ref}(t_0+k)$ and its actual value $p_{x_0+k}^{obs}(t_0+k)$. Specifically, the annual payment of due at time k is adjusted by the factor

$$i_{t_0+k} = \frac{{}_k P_{x_0}^{ref}(t_0)}{{}_k P_{x_0}^{obs}(t_0)} = \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{p_{x_0+j}^{ref}(t_0+j)}{p_{x_0+j}^{obs}(t_0+j)}$$

Hence, if the contract specifies an annual payment of 1, the annuitant receives a stream of payments $i_{t_0+1}, i_{t_0+2}, \dots$ as long as he or she survives.

Seen from t_0 , this index is of course a random variable as the future survival probabilities are unknown (but their distribution function can be derived from the mortality projection model). Hence, it becomes

$$I_{t_0+k} = \frac{{}_k P_{x_0}^{ref}(t_0)}{{}_k P_{x_0}(t_0)} \quad (2.1)$$

where ${}_k P_{x_0}(t_0)$ is the future unknown survival probability from age x_0 to age x_0+k .

The scaling factor can be intuitively seen as the ratio of the proportion of the population reaching age x_0+k based on the reference forecast to the actual proportion of the population reaching that age. If the predictions contained in the reference forecast are actually realized over time, the payout rates determined at the point of entry will remain constant. If the increases in longevity turn out to be larger than anticipated, then the annuity payments are reduced accordingly. Note that the insurer retains the interest rate risk as well as the non-systematic mortality risk and only transfers to the policyholder the systematic longevity risk.

As the annuitant is unlikely to be in a position to absorb all of the longevity risk, it seems reasonable to limit the impact of the index on the annuity payments. Therefore, instead of using the longevity index i_t , only part of it impacts the annuity payment. For instance, if at most 20% of variation is allowed then $\max\{\min\{i_{t_0+k}, 1.2\}, 0.8\}$ is used to scale the annuity payment. This means that the index i_{t_0+k} is replaced with its capped version

$$i_{t_0+k}(i_{\min}, i_{\max}) = \max\{\min\{i_{t_0+k}, i_{\max}\}, i_{\min}\} \quad (2.2)$$

for some $0 < i_{\min} < 1 < i_{\max}$.

3. Distribution of the conditional expected present value of longevity indexed life annuity payments in the Lee-Carter model

3.1. Lee-Carter model

We recall the basic features of the classical Lee-Carter approach. In this framework, the population central death rate at age x in calendar year t , denoted as $m_x(t)$, is of the form

$$\ln m_x(t) = \alpha_x + \beta_x \kappa_t. \quad (3.1)$$

Interpretation of the parameters involved in model (3.1) is straightforward. The value of α_x is an average of $\ln m_x(t)$ over time t so that $\exp \alpha_x$ represents the general shape of the age-specific mortality profile. The actual forces of mortality change over time according to an overall mortality index κ_t which is modulated by an age response variable β_x . The coefficient β_x indicates the sensitivity of different ages to the time trend so that the shape of the β_x profile indicates which rates decline rapidly and which slowly over time in response to changes in κ_t .

An appropriate error structure has to be specified in order to estimate the parameters involved in (3.1). Lee & Carter (1992) opted for Normal disturbances and an estimation procedure based on Singular Value Decomposition whereas the Authors propose Binomial, Poisson or Negative Binomial regression models. For more details about inference issues, we refer the reader to Pitacco et al. (2009).

In order to make forecasts, Lee & Carter (1992) assume that the α_x and β_x remain constant over time and forecast future values of κ_t using a standard univariate time series model. Here, we assume that the κ_t obey an ARIMA($p,1,q$) model, with arbitrary values of p and q , which are to be determined. Furthermore, we assume that the κ_t are positively dependent, in the sense that the covariance between any pair $(\kappa_{t_1}, \kappa_{t_2})$ of time indices is non-negative. Since the κ_t are multivariate Normal, this ensures that the κ_t are positively associated, that is, the inequality

$$\text{Cov} \left[\Psi_1(\kappa_{t_1}, \kappa_{t_2}, \dots, \kappa_{t_n}), \Psi_2(\kappa_{t_1}, \kappa_{t_2}, \dots, \kappa_{t_n}) \right] \geq 0$$

is valid for all values $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n$ and for all choices of the non-decreasing functions Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 such that the covariance exists.

3.2. Future survival probabilities in the Lee-Carter model

Let us denote as ${}_d P_x(t_0 | \boldsymbol{\kappa})$ the random d -year survival probability for an individual aged x in year t_0 , that is, the conditional probability that this individual reaches age $x + d$ in year $t_0 + d$, given the vector $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ of the κ_t . It is formally defined as

$$P[T_x(t_0) > d | \boldsymbol{\kappa}] = {}_d P_x(t_0 | \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \exp \left\{ - \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \exp(\alpha_{x+j} + \beta_{x+j} \kappa_{t_0+j}) \right\}.$$

3.3. Indexed life annuity

Let us consider a basic life annuity contract paying 1 unit of currency at the end of each year, as long as the annuitant survives. The random life annuity single premium, that is, the

conditional expectation of the payments made to an annuitant aged x in the year t_0 given the time index, is

$$a_{x_0}(t_0|\boldsymbol{\kappa}) = E \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T_{x_0}(t_0) \rceil} v(0,k) | \boldsymbol{\kappa} \right] = \sum_{k=1}^{\omega-x_0} {}_k P_{x_0}(t_0|\boldsymbol{\kappa}) v(0,k)$$

where $v(.,.)$ is the discount factor (precisely, $v(s,t)$ is the present value at time s of a unit payment made at time t). Note that $a_x(t_0|\boldsymbol{\kappa})$ corresponds to the generation aged x in calendar year t_0 , and accounts for future mortality improvements experienced by this particular cohort. Clearly, $a_x(t_0|\boldsymbol{\kappa})$ is a random variable that depends on the future trajectory of the time index (that is, on $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{t_0}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{t_0+1}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{t_0+2}, \dots$). An analytical computation of the distribution function of $a_x(t_0|\boldsymbol{\kappa})$ seems to be out of reach.

Let $I_{t_0+k}(i_{\min}, i_{\max})$ be the index applying to the annuity periodic payments, that is,

$$I_{t_0+k}(i_{\min}, i_{\max}) = \max \left\{ \min \{ I_{t_0+k}, i_{\max} \}, i_{\min} \right\}$$

where I_{t_0+k} is given in (2.1). After k years, its realization is just $i_{t_0+k}(i_{\min}, i_{\max})$ defined in (2.2). The random variable $a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \boldsymbol{\kappa})$ is the corresponding conditional expectation if the payments are subject to the index $I_{t_0+k}(i_{\min}, i_{\max})$, $k=1, 2, \dots$, that is,

$$a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = E \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T_{x_0}(t_0) \rceil} I_{t_0+k}(i_{\min}, i_{\max}) v(0,k) | \boldsymbol{\kappa} \right]$$

The comparison of $a_x(t_0|\boldsymbol{\kappa})$ with $a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \boldsymbol{\kappa})$ helps to quantify the risk passed from the annuity provider to the annuitant. Thus, $a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \boldsymbol{\kappa})$ is the systematic risk remaining with the annuity provider.

In order to determine the distribution of the conditional expected present value of the payments for such an indexed life annuity product given $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$, let us define

$$S_d = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \exp(\alpha_{x+j} + \beta_{x+j} \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{t_0+j}) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \delta_j \exp(Z_j),$$

where $\delta_j = \exp(\alpha_{x+j}) > 0$ and $Z_j = \beta_{x+j} \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{t_0+j}$. Clearly ${}_d P_x(t_0|\boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \exp(-S_d)$. Conditional on $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{t_0}$, it follows that $Z_j \sim N(\mu_j, \sigma_j^2)$ with

$$\mu_j = \beta_{x+j} E[\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{t_0+j}] \text{ and } \sigma_j^2 = (\beta_{x+j})^2 \text{Var}[\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{t_0+j}]$$

subject to the convention that a Normally distributed random variable with zero variance is constantly equal to its mean (note that the mean and variance are taken conditionally on past values of the time index).

Now, in the Lee-Carter model, $I_{t_0+k}(i_{\min}, i_{\max})$ depends on κ and is given by

$$I_{t_0+k}(i_{\min}, i_{\max}) = I_{t_0+k}(i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \kappa) = \max\left\{\min\left\{p_{x_0}^{ref} \exp(S_k(\kappa)), i_{\max}\right\}, i_{\min}\right\}$$

so that

$$a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \kappa) = \sum_{k=1}^{\omega-x_0} I_{t_0+k}(i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \kappa) \exp(-S_k(\kappa)) v(0, k)$$

Here, we assume that interest rates are deterministic (so that the $v(0, k)$ s also are). If the interest rates were allowed to be stochastic, then conditional independence given κ needs to be postulated. This conditional independence may be justified by the fact that interest rates are influenced by the age pyramid of the population but not by the mortality itself. However, we note that Hanewald (2009) has found significant correlations between the Lee-Carter time index and real GDP growth rates and with unemployment rate changes in several OECD countries.

3.4. Comonotonic approximations

Assuming a random walk with drift model for the κ_t 's, Denuit & Dhaene (2007) have proposed comonotonic approximations for the quantiles of the random survival probabilities ${}_d P_x(t_0 | \kappa)$. Since the expression for $a_x(t_0 | \kappa)$ involves the weighted sum of the ${}_d P_x(t_0 | \kappa)$'s, Denuit (2007, 2008) supplemented this first comonotonic approximation with a second one. Denuit, Haberman & Renshaw (2009) extended these results to general ARIMA dynamics for the κ_t 's. Here, we show that a similar idea applies to the longevity-indexed life annuities.

Approximating S_d by a sum of perfectly dependent random variables, with the same marginal distributions, gives the approximation

$$S_d \approx S_d^u = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \delta_j \exp(\mu_j + \sigma_j Z), \text{ with } Z \sim N(0, 1).$$

Since S_d^u is a sum of comonotonic random variables, its quantile function is additive. The quantile function $F_{S_d^u}^{-1}$ of S_d^u is given by

$$F_{S_d^u}^{-1}(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \delta_j \exp(\mu_j + \sigma_j \Phi^{-1}(z)), \quad (3.2)$$

where, as above, Φ^{-1} is the quantile function of $N(0, 1)$.

Another approximation of S_d is $S_d^l = E[S_d | \Lambda_d]$, where Λ_d is taken as the first-order approximation of S_d , that is, $\Lambda_d = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \delta_j \exp(\mu_j) Z_j$. A straightforward computation gives

$$S_d^l = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \delta_j \exp\left(\mu_j + r_j(d) \sigma_j Z + \frac{1}{2}(1 - (r_j^2(d)) \sigma_j^2)\right)$$

where $r_i(d)$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$, is the correlation coefficient between Λ_d and Z_i , that is

$$r_i(d) = \frac{\text{Cov}[Z_i, \Lambda_d]}{\sigma_i \sigma_{\Lambda_d}} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \delta_j \exp(\mu_j) \beta_{x+i} \beta_{x+j} \text{Cov}[\kappa_{t_0+i}, \kappa_{t_0+j}]}{\sigma_i \sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \delta_j \delta_k \exp(\mu_j + \mu_k) \beta_{x+i} \beta_{x+j} \text{Cov}[\kappa_{t_0+i}, \kappa_{t_0+j}]}}. \quad (3.3)$$

In the applications we have in mind, β_{x+i} and β_{x+j} typically have the same sign so that all of the r_i 's are non-negative. This means that the S_d^l 's are sums of comonotonic random variables and allows us to take advantage of the property of quantile additivity. Specifically, the quantile function of S_d^l is given by

$$F_{S_d^l}^{-1}(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \delta_j \exp\left(\mu_j + r_j(d) \sigma_j \Phi^{-1}(z) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - (r_j^2(d)) \sigma_j^2)\right). \quad (3.4)$$

From the approximations S_d^u and S_d^l derived for S_d , we get the following approximations for the random survival probabilities

$${}_d P_x(t_0 | \boldsymbol{\kappa}) \approx \exp\left(-F_{S_d^u}^{-1}(1-U)\right) \text{ and } {}_d P_x(t_0 | \boldsymbol{\kappa}) \approx \exp\left(-F_{S_d^l}^{-1}(1-U)\right)$$

where U is uniformly distributed on the interval $(0, 1)$. Note that the same random variable U is used for all of the values of d , making the approximations to the conditional survival probabilities comonotonic. Hence, we obtain the following approximations for $a_x(t_0 | \boldsymbol{\kappa})$

$$a_x(t_0 | \boldsymbol{\kappa}) \approx \sum_{d \geq 1} \exp\left(-F_{S_d^u}^{-1}(1-U)\right) v(0, d)$$

and

$$a_x(t_0 | \boldsymbol{\kappa}) \approx \sum_{d \geq 1} \exp\left(-F_{S_d^l}^{-1}(1-U)\right) v(0, d).$$

Since these approximations are sums of comonotonic random variables, their quantile functions are additive. We then obtain the following approximations for the quantile function $F_{a_x(t_0 | \boldsymbol{\kappa})}^{-1}$ of $a_x(t_0 | \boldsymbol{\kappa})$

$$F_{a_x(t_0 | \boldsymbol{\kappa})}^{-1}(z) \approx \sum_{d \geq 1} \exp\left(-F_{S_d^u}^{-1}(1-z)\right) v(0, d)$$

(3.5)

where $F_{S_d^u}^{-1}$ is given in (3.2), and

$$F_{a_x(t_0|\kappa)}^{-1}(z) \approx \sum_{d \geq 1} \exp\left(-F_{S_d^l}^{-1}(1-z)\right) v(0, d) \quad (3.6)$$

where $F_{S_d^l}^{-1}$ is given in (3.4).

Let us now consider the longevity indexed annuities. It is easily seen that each term included in the sum over k defining $a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \kappa)$ in the Lee-Carter framework is non-increasing in $S_k(\kappa)$ so that natural approximations are

$$a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \kappa) \approx \sum_{k=1}^{\omega-x_0} \max\left\{\min\left\{p_{x_0}^{ref} \exp(S_k^u), i_{\max}\right\}, i_{\min}\right\} \exp(-S_k^u) v(0, k) \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \kappa) \approx \sum_{k=1}^{\omega-x_0} \max\left\{\min\left\{p_{x_0}^{ref} \exp(S_k^l), i_{\max}\right\}, i_{\min}\right\} \exp(-S_k^l) v(0, k) \quad (3.8)$$

These approximations turn out to be comonotonic sums so that their quantile functions are additive. Hence, the quantile functions of $a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \kappa)$ can be approximated as

$$F_{a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \kappa)}^{-1}(\varepsilon) \approx \sum_{k=1}^{\omega-x_0} \max\left\{\min\left\{p_{x_0}^{ref} \exp\left(F_{S_k^u}^{-1}(1-\varepsilon)\right), i_{\max}\right\}, i_{\min}\right\} \exp\left(-F_{S_k^u}^{-1}(1-\varepsilon)\right) v(0, k)$$

And

$$F_{a_{x_0}(t_0, i_{\min}, i_{\max} | \kappa)}^{-1}(\varepsilon) \approx \sum_{k=1}^{\omega-x_0} \max\left\{\min\left\{p_{x_0}^{ref} \exp\left(F_{S_k^l}^{-1}(1-\varepsilon)\right), i_{\max}\right\}, i_{\min}\right\} \exp\left(-F_{S_k^l}^{-1}(1-\varepsilon)\right) v(0, k)$$

4. Numerical illustrations

In the numerical examples, we use the England & Wales 1983-2004 male insured pensioners data set, for ages 60-99, in combination with a variety of reference distributions. The mortality projection for this data set is performed with the help of the Lee-Carter model using an ARIMA(0,1,0) dynamics for the time index. The reference life tables are as follows:

Ref.1 the point-wise projection (on a cohort basis) obtained for the England & Wales 1983-2004 male insured pensioners data set, using a Lee-Carter model, is taken as the reference life table. In this case, the reference forecast relates to the insurance market and not to the general population, and corresponds to the population being simulated,

thereby reducing the “basis risk”. This particular choice of reference life table results in the vertical alignment that is visible for each age x_0 in Fig 1.

- Ref.2** the point-wise projection (on a cohort basis) obtained for the England & Wales male 1961-2005 general population using the Age-Period-Cohort version of the Lee-Carter model (as in Renshaw and Haberman (2006)) with $ARIMA(0,1,0)$ dynamics is used as the reference life table in Fig 2.
- Ref.3** the point-wise projection (on a cohort basis) obtained for the England & Wales male 1961-2005 general population using the standard Lee-Carter model with $ARIMA(0,1,0)$ dynamics is used as the reference life table in Fig 3.
- Ref.4** the CMI Bureau Life Office Pensioners current period standard life table (for male lives who have retired at normal retirement age – ultimate experience) is used as the reference distribution in Fig 4.
- Ref.5** the empirical periodic life table obtained by averaging the England & Wales male 1961-2005 general population experience over time for each age (that is, the term $\exp(\alpha_x)$ when fitting the conventional Lee-Carter model) is used as the reference life table in Fig 5.

The ultimate age ω , with one-year survival probability $p_\omega(t) = 0$, is set as $\omega = 120$ for all 5 reference life tables. The details of the construction of Refs.2-3 for the cohort years $2005 - x_0$ and also the method used to “top-out” 4 of the 5 reference life tables (Refs.1-3, 5) is available from the Authors.

The next table displays the life expectancies at the given ages for the different reference life tables:

ages	60	65	70	75
Ref.1	25.24	20.41	15.78	11.83
Ref.2	24.55	19.58	15.22	11.16
Ref.3	23.10	18.42	14.25	10.68
Ref.4	21.55	17.41	13.64	10.37
Ref.5	17.07	13.61	10.61	8.09

This allows us to rank the reference life tables considered in the numerical illustrations from the point of view of longevity. Note also, that Refs.1-3 are constructed by the cohort method (with the Age-Period-Cohort model for Ref.2 providing a better fit to the data than the Age-Period model for Ref.3: as noted for a similar data set by Renshaw & Haberman (2006)), while Refs.4-5 are constructed by the period method.

Figures 1-5 depict the results. For each age $x_0 = 60, 65, 70, 75$, and each reference distribution, 2.5, 5, 50, 95, 97.5 u-type quantiles (3.7) and l-type quantiles (3.8) are displayed for the longevity indexed life annuities together with (3.5)-(3.6) where there is no indexing. In the figures, the values of (i_{\min}, i_{\max}) are given to make visible the effect of indexing. Here, (1,1) corresponds to no indexing and $(0, +\infty)$ corresponds to using the deterministic reference

portfolio and so the confidence intervals shrink to a point. Thus, the effect of i_{\min} decreasing and i_{\max} increasing is to cause the intervals to become smaller. Note that in the (1,1) case, we are in the case considered by Denuit, Haberman & Renshaw (2009).

We comment in more detail on the results as follows:

- Setting the bounds to be (1,1) means that the reference distribution does not feature in the calculations and there is no indexation. This reproduces the results in Denuit, Haberman & Renshaw (2009).
- In all cases, the intervals decrease in width as the bounds are increased. If we allow for more indexing then the width of the prediction intervals for the conditional expected present values of the annuity decreases as less risk is borne by the insurance company providing the longevity indexed annuity.
- Using Ref.1, the vertical alignment is a natural consequence of using the model predictions for the reference distribution.
- For the other 4 reference distributions, the predictions are in decreasing order of longevity (as measured by life expectancy) with increasing bounds (with one exception), indicating the effect of indexation. This effect does not appear to depend on whether or not the reference distribution was constructed on a period or cohort basis. The medians (and other quantiles) also react to the choice of the reference life table: thus, if the longevity expressed by the reference life table is smaller compared to the point forecast of the mortality projection model, then the index is more likely to be less than 1 and future annuity payments will probably be reduced.
- Also note that, where there is “basis risk” between the population and the reference distribution, the prediction intervals shift to the left as we move down the page (and the bounds widen). This is especially noticeable in Figure 5 which has the reference distribution with the lowest life expectancy. This effect is least noticeable in Figure 1 (as noted above) where there is a close match between the reference distribution and the distribution being simulated.
- In many cases, we see that allowing for +/-20% in the annuity payments greatly reduces the risk borne by the annuity provider.

5. Discussion

Life annuities will certainly become an essential product in the future, as our Western societies are progressively ageing. Actuaries have to make these products more attractive than they are today. The present paper makes some concrete proposals in that direction.

As an alternative to securitization, we have examined indexed life annuities, where periodic payments are scaled by the ratio of the proportion of the population still alive compared to some reference forecast. The systematic risk is thus passed to the annuitants. Considering the difficulties that have been experienced in issuing longevity-based financial instruments, this might well be an efficient alternative to help insurers to write annuity business.

The approach described in the present paper could also apply to alternative annuity products, such as the advanced-life delayed annuities (ALDA) proposed by Milevsky (2005). This is a deferred inflation-adjusted life annuity contract. The deferment period can be seen as a deductible: the policyholder finances his consumption until some advanced age, 80, 85 or even 90, say, and the insurer starts paying the annuity at this age provided the annuitant is still alive. Hence, the ALDA transforms the consumer choice and asset-allocation problem from a

stochastic date of death to a deterministic one in which the terminal horizon becomes the annuity payment commencement date. The longevity risk involved in the ALDA is substantial for the insurance company. As the premium amount reflects this high risk, the product can become expensive unless some indexing applies. As the index is publicly available, the annuitant is able to adjust his or her consumption level during the deferred period. Note that we could also think of alternative indexing mechanisms for ALDA. Considering a deferred life annuity bought at age 65 with payments starting at age 80, say, we could let the starting age vary according to actual longevity improvements: if longevity increases more than expected, then payments start at age 82 instead of 80, for instance.

Acknowledgements

References

Denuit, M. (2007). Distribution of the random future life expectancies in log-bilinear mortality projection models. *Lifetime Data Analysis* 13, 381-397.

Denuit, M. (2008). Comonotonic approximations to quantiles of life annuity conditional expected present values. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 42, 831-838.

Denuit, M., Devolder, P., & Goderniaux, A.-C. (2007). Securitization of longevity risk: Pricing survivor bonds with Wang transform in the Lee-Carter framework. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* 74, 87-113.

Denuit, M., & Dhaene, J. (2007). Comonotonic bounds on the survival probabilities in the Lee-Carter model for mortality projections. *Computational and Applied Mathematics* 203, 169-176.

Denuit, M., Haberman, S., & Renshaw, A. (2008). Comonotonic approximations to quantiles of life annuity conditional expected present values: extensions to general ARIMA models and comparison with the bootstrap. Working Paper 08-05, Institut des Sciences Actuarielles, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

Hanewald, K. (2009). Mortality modeling: Lee-Carter and the macroeconomy. SFB 649 Discussion Paper 2009-008 (available at <http://ssrn.com>).

Khalaf-Allah, M., Haberman, S., & Verrall, R. (2006). Measuring the effect of mortality improvements on the cost of annuities. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 39, 231-249.

Lee, R.D. & Carter, L. (1992). Modelling and forecasting the time series of US mortality. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 87, 659-671.

Ledlie, M.C., Corry, D.P., Finkelstein, G.S., Ritchie, A.J., Su, K. & Wilson, D.C.E. (2007). Variable Annuities. Presented to the Institute of Actuaries, London.

Luthy, H., Keller, P.L., Binswangen, K., & Gmur, B. (2001). Adaptive algorithmic annuities. *Bulletin of the Swiss Association of Actuaries*, 123-138.

Milevsky, M. (2005). Real longevity insurance with a deductible: Introduction to advanced-life delayed annuities. *North American Actuarial Journal* 9, 109-122.

Piggott, J., Valdez, E., & Detzel, B. (2005). The simple analytics of a pooled annuity fund. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* 72, 497-520.

Pitacco, E., Denuit, M., Haberman, S., & Olivieri, A. (2009). *Modelling Longevity Dynamics for Pensions and Annuity Business*. Oxford University Press.

Renshaw, A. & Haberman, S. (2006). A cohort-based extension to the Lee-Carter model for mortality reduction factors. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 38, 556-570.

Valdez, E., Piggott, J., & Wang, L. (2006). Demand and adverse selection in a pooled annuity fund. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 39, 251-266.

Van de Ven, J., & Weale, M. (2008). Risk and mortality-adjusted annuities. National Institute of Economics and social Research, Discussion Paper No 322.




Fig 1. Ref.1: comprising the point-wise projection (by cohort) obtained for the male pensioner 1983-2004 experience using a Lee-Carter model, with ARIMA(0,1,0) dynamics, and topping-out.




Fig 2. Ref.2: comprising the point-wise projection (by cohort) obtained for the England & Wales male 1961-2005 general population using an Age-Period-Cohort model, with ARIMA(0,1,0) dynamics, and topping-out.




Fig 3. Ref.3: comprising the point-wise projection (by cohort) obtained for the England & Wales male 1961-2005 general population using a Lee-Carter model, with ARIMA(0,1,0) dynamics, and topping-out.




Fig 4. Ref.4: comprising the CMI Bureau Life Office Pensioners, males, Normal, lives, ultimate, current periodic life-table.




Fig 5. Ref.5: comprising the empirical periodic life table obtained by averaging the England & Wales male 1961-2005 general population experience over time for each age, and topping-out.

Recent Titles

1001. BASRAK, B., KRIZMANIĆ, D. and J. SEGERS, A functional limit theorem for partial sums of dependent random variables with infinite variance
1002. MEINGUET, T. and J. SEGERS, Regularly varying time series in Banach spaces
1003. HUNT, J., A short note on continuous-time Markov and semi-Markov processes
1004. COLLÉE, A., LEGRAND, C., GOVAERTS, B., VAN DER VEKEN, P., DE BOODT, F. and E. DEGRAVE, Occupational exposure to noise and the prevalence of hearing loss in a Belgian military population: a cross-sectional study. *Military Medicine*, under revision.
1005. MEYER, N., LEGRAND, C. and G. GIACCONE, Samples sizes in oncology trials: a survey. To be submitted in the coming weeks (*British Medical Journal*).
1006. HAFNER, C.M. and O. REZNIKOVA, On the estimation of dynamic conditional correlation models
1007. HEUCHENNE, C. and I. VAN KEILEGOM, Estimation of a general parametric location in censored regression
1008. DAVYDOV, Y. and S. LIU, Transformations of multivariate regularly varying tail distributions
1009. CHRISTIANSEN, M. and M. DENUIT, First-order mortality rates and safe-side actuarial calculations in life insurance
1010. EECKHOUDT, L. and M. DENUIT, Stronger measures of higher-order risk attitudes
1011. DENUIT, M., HABERMAN, S. and A. RENSHAW, Comonotonic approximations to quantiles of life annuity conditional expected present values: extensions to general ARIMA models and comparison with the bootstrap
1012. DENUIT, M. and M. MESFIOUI, Generalized increasing convex and directionally convex orders
1013. DENUIT, M. and L. EECKHOUDT, A general index of absolute risk attitude
1014. PIGEON, M. and M. DENUIT, Composite Lognormal-Pareto model with random threshold
1015. DENUIT, M., EECKHOUDT, L. and M. MENEGATTI, Correlated risks, bivariate utility and optimal choices
1016. TRUFIN, J., ALBRECHER, H. and M. DENUIT, Ruin problems in presence of underwriting cycles
1017. DENUIT, M., EECKHOUDT, L. and B. REY, Some consequences of correlation aversion in decision science
1018. DENUIT, M. and L. EECKHOUDT, Bivariate stochastic dominance and common preferences of decision-makers with risk independent utilities
1019. TRUFIN, J., ALBRECHER, H. and M. DENUIT, Properties of risk measures derived from ruin theory
1020. DENUIT, M., EECKHOUDT, L. and M. MENEGATTI, Adding independent risks in an insurance portfolio: Which shape for the insurer's preferences?
1021. DENUIT, M. and B. REY, Prudence, temperance, edginess, and higher degree risk apportionment as decreasing correlation aversion
1022. TRUFIN, J., ALBRECHER, H. and M. DENUIT, Ruin problems under IBNR dynamics
1023. DENUIT, M., HABERMAN, S. and A. RENSHAW, Longevity-indexed life annuities

See also <http://www.stat.ucl.ac.be/ISpub.html>