Modelling and pricing of multi-region catastrophe bonds

Krzysztof Burnecki, Marek Teuerle, Martyna Zdeb

ICCF24, 02.04.2024, Amsterdam

NATIONAL SCIENCE CENTRE

This work was supported by the NCN Opus 24 Grant No. 2022/47/B/HS4/0213





Wrocław University of Science and Technology

OUTLINE OF THE TALK

- 1. Introduction and motivation
- 2. Catastrophe bond pricing
- 3. Multi-region CAT bond
- 4. PCS data example







CAT bond construction





	Sakura Re Ltd. (Series 2022-1) – At a glance:
	 Issuer: Sakura Re Ltd. Cedent / sponsor: Sompo International Placement / structuring agent/s: Aon Securities is sole structuring agent and bookrunner Risk modelling / calculation agents etc: AIR Worldwide Risks / perils covered: U.S. (inc. DC, Puerto Rico & Virgin Islands) & Canada named storm and earthquake Size: \$150m
	Trigger type: Industry loss index
Multi-region	Ratings: NR Date of issue: Dec 2022
aspect	Nature Coast Re Ltd. (Series 2023-1) – At a glance:
	Cedent / sponsor: Safepoint Insurance Company
	 Placement / structuring agent/s: Aon Securities is sole structuring agent and bookrunner
	Risk modelling / calculation agents etc: AIR Worldwide
	Risks / perils covered: U.S. named storm (Florida, Louisiana)
	• Size: \$195m
	Trigger type: Indemnity
	Ratings: NR
	Date of issue: Nov 2023
	Source: https://www.artemis.bm/deal-directory



5



Pricing methods



General pricing formula

The general pricing formula at time t for CAT bonds can be written as:

$$V_t = e^{-r(T-t)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[P(T)|\mathcal{F}_t],$$

where P(T) is the payoff at maturity T of the bond, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}$ denotes the expectation under the real-world measure, r is a constant interest rate over [0, T] and \mathcal{F}_t is the filtration up until time t.



Aggregate loss process

Aggregate loss process (ALP) is a stochastic process $\{L(t), t > 0\}$ that describes the total amount of losses in time. It is defined as:

$$X(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{N(t)} X_k$$
,

where $\{N(t), t > 0\}$ is a loss counting process and the loss amounts are i.i.d. positive random variables $\{X_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with $\mathbb{E}[X_k] < \infty$.

We also assume that loss counting process and loss amounts are independent.



Zero-coupon (ZC) CAT bond

The payoff of a zero-coupon CAT bond per unit nominal is given by:

$$P_{ZC}(T) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } L(T) < D, \\ c \text{ if } L(T) \ge D, \end{cases}$$

where T is the term of the bond, D is a specified threshold level triggering the bond and $0 \le c \le 1$ is a constant recovery rate.

The arbitrage-free price of a zero-coupon CAT bond is given by:

$$V_0 = e^{-rT} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \Big[\mathbb{I}_{L(T) < D} + c \mathbb{I}_{L(T) \ge D} \Big] = e^{-rT} [c + (1 - c) \mathbb{P}(L(T) < D)].$$



Multi-Region ZC CAT BOND

Let $\mathbf{L} = (L_1, L_2, ..., L_n)$ be a multi-dimensional ALP process, where $\{L_i(t), t > 0\}$ denotes ALP resulting from *i*-th region, for i = 1, ..., n.

The payoff of a multi-region zero-coupon CAT bond per unit nominal is given by:

$$P_{ZC}^{MR}(T) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } \cap_{i=1}^{n} \{L_{i}(T) < D_{i}\}, \\ c \text{ if } \cup_{i=1}^{n} \{L_{i}(T) \ge D_{i}\}, \end{cases}$$

where T is the term of the bond, $D_1, D_2, ..., D_n$ are specified threshold levels for the corresponding ALPs $L_1, L_2, ..., L_n$ and $0 \le c \le 1$ is a constant recovery rate.



Two-region ZC CAT BOND

In case of a two-region bond, we can define the payoff as:

$$P(T) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } (L_1(T) < D_1 \land L_2(T) < D_2), \\ c \text{ if } (L_1(T) \ge D_1 \lor L_2(T) \ge D_2). \end{cases}$$

The price of a two-region zero-coupon CAT bond is given by:

$$V_0 = e^{-rT} [c + (1 - c) \mathbb{P}(L_1(T) < D_1 \land L_2(T) < D_2)].$$



Proposed models

Independent losses	Proportionally split common losses	Dependent common losses
We assume all losses are mutually independent.	Losses that are common for both regions are shared with a given proportion $p, 0 \le p \le 1$.	Losses that are common for both regions are correlated with given correlation coefficient.
$\begin{cases} S_{1}(t) = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ N^{(2)}(t)}}^{N^{(1)}(t)} X_{i} \\ S_{2}(t) = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i=1}}^{N^{(2)}(t)} Y_{i} \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} S_1(t) = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \ N^{(2)}(t)}}^{N^{(1)}(t)} X_i + p \sum_{\substack{i=1 \ N^{(2)}(t)}}^{N^{(3)}(t)} Z_i \\ S_2(t) = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \ i=1}}^{N^{(2)}(t)} Y_i + (1-p) \sum_{\substack{i=1 \ i=1}}^{N^{(3)}(t)} Z_i \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} S_1(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N^{(1)}(t)} X_i^{(1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{N^{(3)}(t)} X_i^{(2)} \\ S_2(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N^{(2)}(t)} Y_i^{(1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{N^{(3)}(t)} Y_i^{(2)} \end{cases}$



12

Normal approximation

The price of a two-region zero-coupon CAT bond can be approximated as:

$$V_0 \approx V_0^{approx} = e^{-rT} [c + (1 - c) \mathbb{P}(N_1 < D_1 \land N_2 < D_2)],$$

where $N = (N_1, N_2)$ is a random vector with bivariate normal distribution with mean and covariance matrix:

$$\mu = \begin{pmatrix} ES_1(T) \\ ES_2(T) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} Var S_1(T) & Cov(S_1(T), S_2(T)) \\ Cov(S_1(T), S_2(T)) & Var S_2(T) \end{pmatrix}$$



.



s.

Oklahoma & Texas

- There were 85 catastrophes
 in Oklahoma and 163 in Texas,
 44 of them occurred in both
 states.
- For model with proportionally split common losses, we set the proportion p = 0.35.
- The Spearman correlation coefficient was $\rho = 0.3116$, for model with correlated common losses.



Figure 2 Adjusted losses in Oklahoma and Texas. Losses from common catastrophes are presented in green, from unrelated ones are in red.





Figure 3 Comparison of real common losses in Oklahoma and Texas and common losses simulated in (a) proportionally split model and (b) dependent model.





Figure 4 Model with independent losses. Zero-coupon CAT bond for Oklahoma and Texas: (a) price from Monte Carlo simulations, (b) normal approximation and (c) relative difference.





Figure 5 Model with proportionally split common losses. Zero-coupon CAT bond for Oklahoma and Texas: (a) price from Monte Carlo simulations, (b) normal approximation and (c) relative difference.





Figure 6 Model with correlated common losses. Zero-coupon CAT bond for Oklahoma and Texas: (a) price from Monte Carlo simulations, (b) normal approximation and (c) relative difference.





Figure 7 Differences between prices of zero-coupon CAT bond for Oklahoma and Texas obtained from models with: (a) proportionally split common losses and independent losses, (b) correlated common losses and independent losses, (c) proportionally split and correlated common losses.



Illinois & Kentucky

- There were 111 catastrophes
 in Illinois and 45 in Kentucky,
 27 of them occurred in both
 states.
- For model with proportionally split common losses, we set the proportion p = 0.56.
- The Spearman correlation coefficient was $\rho = 0.2244$, for model with correlated common losses.



Figure 8 Adjusted losses in Illinois and Kentucky. Losses from common catastrophes are presented in green, from unrelated ones are in red.





Figure 9 Comparison of real common losses in Illinois and Kentucky and common losses simulated in (a) proportionally split model and (b) dependent model.





Figure 10 Model with independent losses. Zero-coupon CAT bond for Illinois and Kentucky: (a) price from Monte Carlo simulations, (b) normal approximation and (c) relative difference.





Figure 11 Model with proportionally split common losses. Zero-coupon CAT bond for Illinois and Kentucky: (a) price from Monte Carlo simulations, (b) normal approximation and (c) relative difference.





Figure 12 Model with correlated common losses. Zero-coupon CAT bond for Illinois and Kentucky: (a) price from Monte Carlo simulations, (b) normal approximation and (c) relative difference.





Figure 13 Differences between prices of zero-coupon CAT bond for Illinois and Kentucky obtained from models with: (a) proportionally split common losses and independent losses,
 (b) correlated common losses and independent losses, (c) proportionally split and correlated common losses.



Baryshnikov, Y., Mayo, A., and Taylor, D., 1998. *Pricing of CAT Bonds*.

References

- Burnecki, K., Kukla, G., Taylor, D., 2005. Pricing of Catastrophe Bonds, in: Statistical Tools for Finance and Insurance
- Burnecki, K., Teuerle, M., Zdeb, M., 2023. Pricing of insurance-linked securities: A multi-peril approach, Journal of Mathematics in Industry (in review)
- Braun, A., Kousky, C., *Catastrophe bonds*, Wharton Risk Center Primer, 2021
- Chernobai, A., Burnecki, K., Rachev, S., Trück, S. and Weron, R., 2006. Modelling catastrophe claims with left-truncated severity distributions, Computational Statistics 21, 537–555
- Hofer, L., Zanini, M.A., Gardoni, P., 2020. Risk-based catastrophe bond design for a spatially distributed portfolio. Structural Safety 83, 101908.
- Fackler, P., 2000, Generating correlated multidimenstional variates
- Lee, J., and Yu M., 2002. Pricing default-risky CAT bonds with moral hazard and basis risk. Journal of Risk and Insurance 69: 25–44.
- Ma, Z. and Ma. C., 2013. Pricing catastrophe risk bonds: A mixed approximation method. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 52: 243–54.
- Nowak, P., and Romaniuk, M. 2013. Pricing and simulations of catastrophe bonds. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 52: 18–28.
- Reshetar, G., 2008. Pricing of multiple-event coupon paying CAT bond.
- Vaugirard, V., 2003. Pricing catastrophe bonds by an arbitrage approach. The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance 43: 119–32.



Thank you

for your attention!





Wrocław University of Science and Technology