ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To the God, the Almighty for His blessings and lights throughout my research work so that I could complete it successfully.

To my promotor and co-promotors Prof. Dr. Ir. Sugiarto, M.Sc., Dr. Gracia S. Ugut, MBA., and Dr. Drs. Edison Hulu, M.E. whose diligence and expertise greatly guide me to finish my dissertation.

To all the examiners Dr. (Hon) Jonathan L. Parapak, M.Eng.Sc., Prof. Ir. Roy Sembel, MBA., Ph.D., Khoirunurrofik, S.Si, M.A, MPM., Ph.D., Maydison C. Ginting, Ph.D., who keeps challenge me to think and improve my research.

To my beloved friends at batch two and other batches, for which I could not thank them enough for their sharing and motivation and genuine friendship.

To my family and friends at work who understood the time committed to complete this doctoral program and always provide encouragement to stay focus till finish.

To the leadership of Pelita Harapan University who established this doctoral program so that I could conduct my research and develop my knowledge.

BIOGRAPHY

Drs. AGUS SETIAWAN, M.Sc.

Born in Jakarta, Agus is a qualified actuary from Society of Actuary of Indonesia. Upon completing his senior high school, he continued his study at Mathematics Department University of Indonesia majoring in actuarial science. He was the first graduate from actuarial science and he graduated with Cum Laude.

By the grace of almighty God, he continued his study for Master in Actuarial Science at University of Michigan Ann Arbor. His passion in actuarial science brought him to take another Master in Actuarial Science at Kent University from which he left with one exam to be qualified as Fellow from the Institute of Actuaries UK. Agus's professional experiences in life insurance since 1991 enable him to have vast knowledge in actuarial science. Besides a qualified actuary, he is also a fellow of Life Management Office USA and Indonesia.

Agus has hold several executive roles and appointed actuary role in some joint venture companies such as Prudential, Metlife, ING Life, Panin Life and Commonwealth Life. Currently, he is the Technical Director and Chief Actuary at Commonwealth Life

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ORIGINALITY STATEMENT OF THE DISSERTATION ……ii

DISSERTATION SUPERVISOR'S APPROVAL ……...iii

DISSERTATION EXAMINATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL …… iv

ABSTRACT ……..v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ……..vi

BIOGRAPHY ……...vii

LIST OF TABLES ……xv

LIST OF CHARTS ……xviii

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION ……... 1

1.1 Research Background ……. 1

1.2 Problem Statement ……... 4

1.3 Research Objectives ……. 5

1.4 Research Questions …… 5

1.5 Significance of the Study ……. 6

1.6 The Scope of the Study …… 8

1.7 Organization of the Dissertation …….. 9

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE 11

2.1 Introduction ……11

2.2 Sustainability Theory ……..12

2.2.1 Introduction ……. 12

2.2.2 Some Grand Theories ……. 13

2.2.2.1 Shareholder Theory …….. 13

2.2.2.2 Institutional Theory ……...14

2.2.2.3 Legitimacy Theory ……15

2.2.2.4 Signaling/Disclosure Theory ……15

2.2.2.5 Stakeholder Theory ……15

2.2.2.6 Enlightened Value Maximization and Enlightened Stakeholder Theory ……..16

2.3 Sustainable Finance – A New Paradigm ……17

2.3.1 Issue with Current Financial System ……...17

2.3.2 Sustainability and the Financial System ……..19

2.4 Sustainable Life Insurance Product – A New Approach for the Company ……21

2.5 Fair Price – A Key Factor for Sustainable Development ……...22

2.6 Actuarial Fairness ……...26

2.7 Current Approach to Price Unit Linked Product ……29

2.7.1 Introduction ……29

2.7.2 Profit Testing ……...29

2.7.3 Stochastic Profit Testing (SPT) ……..……..32

2.7.4 Econometric Model for SPT ……33

2.8 Risk Measure ……..36

2.8.1 Pre-Markowitz and Markowitz Risk Measurement Era ……..37

2.8.1.1 Pre-Markowitz Risk Measurement ……...37

2.8.1.2 Markowitz's Portfolio Theory (MPT) ……..37

2.8.2 Capital Asset Pricing Model ……39

2.8.3 Value at Risk (VaR) ……39

2.8.4 Coherent Risk Measures ……..40

2.8.5 Conditional Tail Expectation (CTE) / Expected Shortfall (ES) ……...42

2.8.6 Estimating Risk Measure Using Monte-Carlo Simulation ……..44

2.9 IFRS 17 ……..45

2.9.1 IFRS 17 and Sustainability ……..46

2.10 Key Points from Literature Review ……..51

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN……...56

3.1 Research Design ……..56

3.2 Profit Testing Model and Notation ……57

3.2.1 Deterministic Profit Testing for Unit Linked Product... ……..58

3.2.1.1 Time Step ……..59

3.2.1.2 Policyholder's Fund Projection ……59

3.2.1.3 Survivorship Factor ……..61

3.2.1.4 Insurer's Cash Flow Projection ……63

3.2.2 IFRS 17 ……65

3.2.2.1 Coverage Unit – Number of Policy Inforce ……..67

3.2.2.2 Coverage Unit – Policyholder Fund ……67

3.2.3 Econometric Models for Stochastic Profit Testing (SPT) ……...68

3.2.3.1 ARCH Model ……69

3.2.3.2 Symmetric GARCH Model ……..70

3.2.3.3 Asymmetric GARCH Model ……71

3.2.4 Stochastic Profit Testing (SPT) 71

3.3 Profit Testing from Policyholder's Point of View 72

3.4 Model Validity 75

3.5 Data Collection 75

3.6 Measurement 76

3.7 Analysis Using Numerical Illustration 78

3.8 Summary of the Framework 104

3.9 Key Points from Methodology and Research Design 105

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS 108

4.1 Assumptions Used by Companies' Products 109

4.1.1 Global Assumptions 110

4.1.2 Product Specific Assumptions and Features 110

4.2 Main Findings on the Assumptions Used 125

4.3 Main Findings from Current Practice on the Profit Testing Results Which Uses the Assumptions Investigated 126

4.4 Main Findings on The Fairness Problems from Current Practice.....132

4.4.1 Lack of Stakeholder Interest 132

4.4.2 Creating Non-Sustainable Finance System 133

4.4.3 Lack of UNEP FI Sustainable Insurance Principles 133

4.4.4 Lack of Fair Pricing Concepts 134

4.4.5 Lack of Actuarial Fairness 134

4.4.6 Lack of Equity in term of Risk Measure 135

4.5 Reasons to Use Risk Measure CTE as a Robust Reference Point to Address

Fairness Problems in Current Practice ……..135

4.6 Results of CTE in the New Framework ……137

4.7 How to Use CTE as a Reference Point? ……..145

4.8 Comparison of Current and Proposed Framework ……146

4.9 The Key Points from the Results and Discussions ……147

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ……149

5.1 Overview of the Research ……150

5.2 Summary of the Main Research Findings and Its Significance ……153

5.2.1 What are the assumptions used in current practice to price Unit Linked product?..……153

5.2.2 What are the results of current practice to price Unit Linked product?…..154

5.2.3 What are the main findings on the fairness problems from current practice?.....155

5.2.4 What are the reasons that make risk measure CTE is suitable as a robust reference point to address fairness between policyholder and company?……156

5.2.5 What are the results of using CTE in the new pricing framework?.....157

5.3 Implications ……..158

5.3.1 Contribution to Theory ……..158

5.3.2 Contribution to Regulator ……..159

5.3.3 Contributions to Policyholder and Companies ……..159

5.4 Limitations of the Research ……..160

5.5 Recommendations ……161

5.6 Future Research ……162

REFERENCES ……..163

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 ARCH/GARCH Model Used 34

Table 2.2 Linking the Research Questions and This Chapter 53

Table 3.1 Example of a Unit Linked Product 78

Table 3.2 Initial Projection Assumption for a Unit Linked Policy 79

Table 3.3 Initial Projection Assumption for a Unit Linked Policy (Continued) 80

Table 3.4 Initial Projection Assumption for a Unit Linked Policy (Continued) 81

Table 3.5 Initial Projection Assumption for a Unit Linked Policy (Continued) 82

Table 3.6 Policyholder Cashflows Projection 83

Table 3.7 Policyholder Cashflows Projection (Continued) 84

Table 3.8 Insurer Cashflows Projection 85

Table 3.9 Insurer Cashflows Projection (Continued) 86

Table 3.10 IFRS 17 Insurer Cashflows Projection 88

Table 3.11 IFRS 17 Insurer Cashflows Projection (Continued) 89

Table 3.12 IFRS 17 Insurer Cashflows Projection (Continued) 90

Table 3.13 Policyholder Cashflows Projection – GARCH (Counterpart of table 3.6).....94

Table 3.14 Policyholder Cashflows Projection – GARCH (Continued) (Counterpart table 3.7)..95

Table 3.15 Insurer Cashflows Projection – GARCH (Counterpart of table 3.8).....96

Table 3.16 Insurer Cashflows Projection – GARCH (Continued) (Counterpart of table 3.9) 97

Table 3.17 IFRS 17 Insurer Cashflows Projection – GARCH (Continued) (Counterpart 3.12)...98

Table 3.18 Policyholder Cashflows Projection for Profit Testing 100

Table 3.19 Policyholder Cashflows Projection for Profit Testing (Continued) 101

Table 3.20 Policyholder Cashflows Projection for Profit Testing (Continued) 102

Table 3.21 SPT PM Results Excluding Error Data the Monte Carlo Simulation ……...103

Table 3.22 SPT PM Results Adjusting Error Data the Monte Carlo Simulation ……...103

Table 3.23 SPT Results for Company and Policyholder ……104

Table 3.24 Linking the Research Questions and This Chapter ……..... 106

Table 4.1 Global Assumptions for Most of the Products ……110

Table 4.2 Company Expenses Assumptions ……..……115

Table 4.3 Economic Assumptions and Mangement Fee ……...……..117

Table 4.4 Allocation Rate ……...118

Table 4.5 Commission Rate Plus Other Commission Related Expenses ……...119

Table 4.6 Lapse Rate ……..120

Table 4.7 Supplementary / Foundation Fee ……121

Table 4.8 Cost of Administration ……122

Table 4.9 Surrender Charge ……....122

Table 4.10 Loyalty Bonus ……..124

Table 4.11 Mortality Table, Mortality Rate and Cost of Insurance (COI) …….……..125

Table 4.12 Profit Margin (PM) under Several Scenarios ……..…….128

Table 4.13 The Mean of PM distribution under SPT for Company and Policyholder ……..….138

Table 4.14 CTE Result for Company and Policyholder ……141

Table 4.15 Relative Fairness of a Product Compared to a Reference Point ……...146

Table 4.16 Comparison of Current and Proposed Framework ……...147

LIST OF CHARTS

Chart 4.1 Company Expenses Assumptions ……..116

Chart 4.2 Correlation between Supplementary Fee and Allocation Rate ……121

Chart 4.3 Statutory Profit Margin under DPT and SPT GARCH and EGARCH ……..130

Chart 4.4 GARCH vs EGARCH ……130

Chart 4.5 PM under Statutory and IFRS ……..……131

Chart 4.6 Mean of 5000 SPT Profit Margin Runs ……..138

Chart 4.7 Correlation between Mean Company vs Policyholder ……...139

Chart 4.8 CTE for Company and Policyholder ……..141

Chart 4.9 Correlation between CTE and the Mean of PM for Company …….……..142

Chart 4.10 Correlation between CTE and the Mean of PM for Policyholder ……143

Chart 4. 11 Subsample 1 & 2 - Correlation between CTE and the Mean for Company…...…144

Chart 5.1 (same as Chart 4.8) CTE for Company and Policyholder ……...……157