Chapter 4

Risk Handling Techniques: Loss Control, Risk Transfer, and Loss Financing

RM Statement of Objectives and Principles

- Distinguish between pre-loss and post-loss objectives
- Pre-loss objectives
- Survival and growth
- Cash flow to fund stakeholders returns plus investments
- Compliance with government regulations
- Efficiency
- Procedures and principles are implemented and followed

Risk Handling Techniques Risk Handling Techniques Risk Transfer Loss Financing Retention Loss Prevention Loss Prevention Loss Prevention Diversification Loss Prevention Diversification Loss Prevention Diversification Risk Transfer Loss Prevention FIGURE 4-1 Methods of Handling Risk

| FABLE 4-1 T | he S | election of Risk-handling Techniqu | es, Based on Frequency and Severity |
|---------------------|--------|---|--|
| | | ow Severity | High Severity |
| High Frequenc | | self-insurance (for larger firms) and loss control | Avoidance (if possible) and loss control |
| Low Frequency | y I | Risk assumption and loss control | Insurance and loss control |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Coloati | .~ | the Diels Mana | mont Tooks: |
| selectif | ıg. | the Risk Manager | nent recinique |
| | | | |
| | | From | longy |
| | | Low Freque | ^{lency} High |
| _ | L | <u>Assume</u> | Loss Prevention |
| S e | О | loss prevention loss reduction | loss reduction assume risk |
| v | w | | |
| e r | Н | Insure | Avoid |
| i t | i | risk transfer loss reduction | loss prevention loss reduction |
| у | g h | loss prevention | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | 1 4 | oss of Income | • |
| | ப | JSS OF THEOTHE | |
| | | | |
| • Sources | | oss | |
| Problems Can be | | sonal in nature | |
| Difficu | | | |
| Best m | easu | rement still can only be an es | imate |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Measure (evaluation) • Frequency Severity • Expected Loss • Variance/standard deviation • Maximum possible loss • Maximum probable loss Importance of Indirect Losses • Large losses can cause indirect losses: • Lost profits • Clean-up costs · Costs of raising capital • Foregone investment opportunities Bankruptcy costs • Thus, reducing probability of large losses (MPL) can reduce indirect losses Importance of Indirect Losses • Main point: need to consider reduction in expected indirect losses when making risk management decisions • Diversification does not change expected direct losses, • Reduces maximum probable loss Therefore reduces expected indirect losses

Types of Loss Control • Loss control: • Expenditures of time, money, or effort to reduce expected losses • Loss Prevention – reduce probability of loss • Loss Reduction – reduce severity of loss Losses • Loss Prevention: • Activities that prevent losses. • Must be cost-efficient. Some losses will occur regardless. Hence: • Aim is to minimize impact when losses occur. • Duplication and Separation. Loss Control - Prevention Always engage in, if beneficial • Loss Prevention Take various steps to *reduce the probability* of losses occurring • How do you value the loss of life in the cost/benefit equation?

Loss Control - Reduction

Always engage in, if beneficial

- Loss Reduction
- Steps designed to reduce the severity
- Take steps to reduce the damage before and after a loss

How Loss Control Affects a Probability Distribution

- How would the probability distribution for property losses change if
 - Install a sprinkler system?
 - · Replace old wiring?
- Loss Distribution:

| Property Losses for the coming Year | Probability |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| \$1.000 million | 0.01 |
| \$0.500 million | 0.05 |
| \$0.250 million | 0.10 |
| \$0.100 million | 0.20 |
| | |

Cost – Benefit Analysis

- Should compare costs and benefits of loss control
- Identifying costs and benefits
 - Example: Safer work environment
 - What are the costs?
 - What are the benefits?

Cost – Benefit Analysis - Example

- Example:
 - Average Loss Severity = \$20,000.
 - Total number of employees = 5,000

| Safety | Annual Accident | Expected Accident | Total Expected Accident Costs |
|-------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| Expenditure | Frequency per Employee | Costs per Employee | Academi Costs |
| 0 | 0.100 | | |
| 500,000 | 0.080 | | |
| 1,000,000 | 0.070 | | |
| 1,500,000 | 0.066 | | |
| 2,000,000 | 0.063 | | |
| | | | |

Identifying Costs and Benefits in Practice

- Benefits of loss control can be difficult to estimate
- Can use historical data on your own firm
- Use industry data
 - Hire consultants, brokers
- Get estimates of insurance premium reductions
 - Brokers and insurers

Valuing Life

- Loss control decision may change the probability of death
- How do you value a life?
 - One approach: Use wage differentials for jobs with different probabilities of death
 - (actual studies are more complex)
 Estimates: ~\$5MM, range is \$4-9MM

| | |
|--|------|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Valuing Life • How do you value a life? • Example: Job 1 has .0002 higher probability of death on the job per year • Job 1 has \$1,000 wage premium per year, holding all else equal Employees willing to receive \$1,000 for a .0002 increased chance of dying. • \$1,000 = .0002 x (Value of Life) • → Value of Life = 1,000/.0002 = \$5 million Diversification by Segregating Assets • No segregation: • 1 plant worth \$100 million, • Probability of complete loss = 0.05 • Expected direct loss = Diversification by Segregating Assets • Segregation: • 2 plants each worth \$50 million, • Probability of complete loss at each plant = 0.05 • Outcome at each plant are independent of the other • What is the probability distr for total losses: • Expected direct loss =

Diversification by Segregating Assets • Now assume an indirect loss equal to \$10 million occurs if a \$100 million direct loss occurs • No segregation → expected indirect loss = • Segregation -> expected indirect loss = • Main Point: diversification that reduces probability of high losses, can reduce expected indirect losses Risk Transfer Contractual transfer agreements - transfers risk to another party $\bullet \ \underline{ \ \ Hold\ harmless\ agreements} \ - \ transfer\ of\ risk\ through\ a\ contract$ <u>Limited Liability</u> – provided to the owners of certain types of business organizational forms Loss Financing - 1 • Insurance: • Transfer of risk to an insurer for a premium Appropriate when loss-frequency is low, but potential severity is high • Also has financial advantages: Tax Issues Moral Hazard and Deductibles

Loss Financing - 2 • Risk Assumption • Deliberate decision: Not always a choice Funded Risk assumption. • Or not: • Ignorance?

Loss Financing - 3

- What is self-insurance?
 - Why do companies self-insure?
 - Save money
 - Better control
 - Loss prevention incentives

 - Improved claims settlement
 Profitability and investment earnings
 - Difference between self-insurance and risk assumption

Captive Insurance Companies

- A method of self-insuring
- A company formed to write insurance for a parent company
- Motives for starting a captive
 - Save the overhead and profits of the insurance company
 - Earn investment income on the premium
 - Tax advantages

Government Safety Programs • Examples: • OSHA • EPA CPSC • Why have safety regulations? • Firms may not consider all benefits of loss control if workers or customers are not fully informed • Avoids duplication of expenditures on safety research Government and Loss Control • Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (OSHA) • Consumer Product Safety Act of 1972 (CPSA) • Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) (Superfund) • Food and Drug Administration (FDA) • The Clean Air Act • The Water Pollution Control Act **Government Safety Regulations** · Estimated costs and benefits of safety regulation (source: K. Viscusi, Pricing Environmental Risks, 1992) Cost per life saved (1984\$ mill.) Regulation Passed Agency Unvented space heaters 1980 CPSC \$0.10 Passive restraints/belts 1984 NHTSA \$0.30 Crane suspended personnel platform 1988 OSHA \$1.20 Grain dust 1987 OSHA \$5.30 Uranium mill tailings (inactive) 1983 EPA \$27.60 Asbestos 1989 EPA \$104.20 Arsenic/low-arsenic copper 1986 EPA \$764.00

Formaldehyde

1987 OSHA

\$72,000.00

Government Safety Regulations

• Estimated costs and benefits of safety regulation (source: K. Viscusi, Pricing Environmental Risks, 1992)

| | | | Cost per life saved |
|------|--------|--------|---------------------|
| | Passed | Agency | (1984\$ mill.) |
| 1989 | EPA | | \$104.20 |
| | 1986 | EPA | \$764.00 |
| | 1987 | OSHA | \$72,000.00 |

| Remember: Review and Upd | ate |
|--------------------------|-----|
|--------------------------|-----|

- Regularly review and update the process
- New assets or disposal of assets
- Valuation changes
- New products and processes, materials
- New personnel
- Law changes

Regulation Asbestos

Arsenic/low-arsenic copper Formaldehyde

- Currency fluctuations
- New contractual relationships

| | | |
|------|--|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |