

ESTIMATION OF FUTURE DISCRETIONARY BENEFITS IN TRADITIONAL LIFE INSURANCE

FLORIAN GACH & SIMON HOCHGERNER

ABSTRACT. In the context of traditional life insurance, the future discretionary benefits (FDB), which are a central item for Solvency II reporting, are generally calculated by computationally expensive Monte Carlo algorithms. We derive analytic formulas for lower and upper bounds for the FDB . This yields an estimation interval for the FDB , and the average of lower and upper bound is a simple estimator. These formulae are designed for real world applications, and we compare the results to publicly available reporting data.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.A. Market consistent valuation. Regulatory regimes increasingly require insurance companies to assign market consistent values to all items in their balance sheets. While market values for assets can often be obtained from data providers (“mark-to-market”) or inferred from well-established models (“mark-to-model”), no active (“deep and liquid”) market exists for trading insurance liabilities. Hence liabilities have to be valued by appropriately designed models.

Specifically, when future cash flows depend on economic scenarios and discretionary management rules (concerning, e.g., reinvestment, realization of unrealized gains, level of profit declarations) are involved, and, on top of that, there is a minimum guarantee rate, developing such a model is not an easy task. All of the foregoing difficulties are characteristics of traditional life insurance, and the corresponding market consistent valuation is a relatively novel problem in the realm of insurance mathematics. Existing literature concerning the market consistent valuation of insurance technical provisions includes [1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 5], as-well as references therein. In particular, [4, 6] follow the general idea of disentangling insurance cash flows into a hedgeable and a non-hedgeable part. The value of the hedgeable, or financial, cash flow then follows from methods of financial mathematics (“no-arbitrage pricing”), and the value of the non-hedgeable part is determined by actuarial techniques. We mention that [4, 6] study the problem of fair valuation from a general point of view, without regard to a specific regulatory regime.

In this paper, we take this approach one step further. To do so, we define “market consistent valuation” to be the calculation of the *best estimate* in the sense of Solvency II [12]. This is the regulatory framework that has been implemented per 1. January 2016 and is relevant for companies operating in the European Economic Area. In principle, the market consistent value corresponds to the sum of a best estimate and a risk margin. However, for life insurance liabilities, the risk margin is usually very small compared to the best estimate. We refer to the introduction of [7] for concrete numbers showing that the risk margin generally does not amount to more than 2% of the best estimate, whence we focus on the latter.

1.B. Description of results. In determining the best estimate of a traditional life insurance liability portfolio we can use two additional sources of information:

- (1) The best estimate, BE , is a sum of guaranteed benefits, GB , and future discretionary benefits, FDB . That is, $BE = GB + FDB$. The guaranteed benefits are certain at time of valuation, whence GB is a purely deterministic quantity that can be calculated by actuarial techniques. Moreover, Solvency II ([14]) requires that both, BE and FDB , are reported.
- (2) Cash flows follow from local generally accepted accounting principles (local GAAP).

AUSTRIAN FINANCIAL MARKET AUTHORITY (FMA), OTTO-WAGNER PLATZ 5, A-1090 VIENNA
E-mail address: `florian.gach@fma.gv.at`, `simon.hochgerner@fma.gv.at`.
Key words and phrases. Solvency II, Future Discretionary Benefits, Market Consistent Valuation.

In this context, certainty of guaranteed benefit cash flows is understood with respect to financial variables while actuarial assumptions (assumed to be independent of economic scenarios) are taken into account via their expected values. Thus there is an easy separation into guaranteed benefits, whose value follows from actuarial methods, and future discretionary benefits. The FDB cannot be calculated by a purely financial approach. This follows from Item (2) above and is a consequence of the fact that the profit sharing mechanism is (for many European markets such as Germany, France or Austria) dictated by book values and not by market values. (See [7, 8, 5].) However, the crucial observation is now that the accounting principles can be used to further unravel the future discretionary benefit cash flows into items of cascading magnitude.

Therefore, we rephrase the disentanglement approach as consisting of an actuarial part (for GB) and a financial part that depends on *book values* and *accounting flows* (for FDB). The second part is in general not hedgeable either and we cannot give an exact solution for FDB that involves anything less than a full Monte Carlo model of the balance sheet projection. However, by carefully analyzing the accounting flows that lead to the future discretionary benefits, we can identify those constituents of FDB which are of large, medium and small magnitude (compared to BE), respectively. The smallest items are then neglected, the medium items are approximated, and it turns out that the largest items can be expressed in terms of known balance sheet quantities (which do not involve the FDB).

As a result, we obtain analytical formulas for lower and upper bounds, LB and UB , such that

$$(4.36) \quad LB \leq FDB \leq UB.$$

The bounds are given by

$$(4.36) \quad LB := SF_0 + gph \cdot (LP_0 - GB + UG_0) - (1 - gph) \cdot SF_0 \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T P(0, t) F_0^{t-1} \\ - (1 - gph)gph(1 + \theta) \cdot LP_0 \cdot \sum_{t=2}^T F_0^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} P(t - s - 1, t) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{t-s-1}^+ \cdot 2^{-(t-s-1)/h}$$

$$(4.37) \quad UB := SF_0 + gph \cdot (LP_0 - GB + UG_0) + gph \cdot (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_0 \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T 2^{-(t-1)/h} \mathcal{O}_t^-$$

where SF_0 is the book value of the surplus fund, LP_0 refers to the local GAAP *life assurance provisions* (excluding SF_0), and UG_0 are the unrealized gains, all at valuation time $t = 0$. Further, gph is the *gross policy holder participation rate* (Section 8.C), $\theta = 5\%$ is the fixed fraction in Assumption 1.2, F_0^t is the prevailing forward rate curve and \mathcal{O}_t^\pm are the values (4.35) of certain caplets/floorlets. Finally, T is the projection horizon and h is the *liability half life* which is used as a proxy for the average time to maturity of contracts.

The formulas for LB and UB arise as a combination of estimating accounting flows as a function of financial variables, company specific information and generic management rules. The financial variables are the prevailing interest rate curve and implied volatility data. This caters to the intuition that, at the end of the day, accounting flows do depend on market movements *to a certain extent*. Secondly, the company specific information includes, for example, the average guaranteed interest rate, the average time to maturity of the asset and liability portfolios, and the value of unrealized gains associated to the relevant portfolio of assets. Thirdly, the management rules are chosen so as to reflect generic management decisions such as minimizing shareholder capital injections or providing a “reasonable” level of profit participation (in order to remain a competitive vendor in the life insurance market).

Theorem 4.2 is a statement about the value of the full liability portfolio. In particular, we do not assign fair values to individual contracts. In this context we note that it is not clear how to assign fair values to individual contracts in a market consistent full balance sheet approach. Indeed, the future discretionary benefits depend not only on individual contract features but also on properties of both the asset and liability portfolios: the FDB depends on the amount of available unrealized gains, UG_0 , and on the (book value of the) surplus fund, SF_0 , both viewed at valuation time, $t = 0$. The unrealized gains are the difference of market and book values of the full asset portfolio that covers local GAAP technical provisions, i.e. $UG_0 = MV_0 - BV_0$. Neither UG_0 nor SF_0 are assigned to individual contracts, and using any kind of theoretical proportional assignment will generally lead to a completely unrealistic duration gap between assets and liabilities. Consequently Solvency II

reporting also does not ask for best estimates of individual contracts (although for some lines of business – other than traditional life insurance – these may be provided).

The terminology “benefits” is slightly misleading in GB and in FDB . Both quantities contain also premia and costs. Nevertheless, we stick to the established Solvency II nomenclature.

For the purpose of this paper, the use of the guaranteed benefits has the added advantage that we do not need to set up an actuarial model and specify contract details. All these details are already contained in GB , and for our concrete applications in Section 5 to publicly available data of the German insurer Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG the guaranteed benefits are a given input.

We apply Theorem 4.2 with $gph = 75.5\%$, $T = 60$ and $h = 12$ to publicly available data of the German company Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG for the years 2017, 2018 and 2019. Table 1 is a snapshot of the results in Section 5.

YE	GB	FDB	\widehat{FDB}	LB	UB	Δ
2017	154.1	48.6	47.99	43.45	52.53	-0.30%
2018	158.8	46.2	46.71	41.74	51.67	0.25%
2019	195.2	47.4	49.93	43.95	55.90	1.04%

TABLE 1. Values are in billion euros. The items GB and FDB are the reported values. The estimated values are LB , UB and $\widehat{FDB} := (LB + UB)/2$. The difference $\Delta = \widehat{FDB} - FDB$ is in percent of $BE = GB + FDB$.

Once an actuarial model has been established to calculate GB , the bounds (4.36) and (4.37) yield an estimator, \widehat{BE} , and an estimation interval for the best estimate:

$$(1.1) \quad \widehat{BE} = (GB + \widehat{FDB}) \pm \delta, \quad \widehat{FDB} = (UB + LB)/2, \quad \delta = (UB - LB)/2$$

We reiterate that the actuarial calculation of GB is deterministic since guaranteed cash flows do not depend on financial variables. In Table 1 we have $\delta < 2.5\% \cdot BE$. The immateriality threshold for model uncertainties (such as leakage) is in practice often taken to be $\pm 1\% \cdot BE$. Thus a deterministic routine which yields a maximal error of $\pm 2.5\%$ seems quite remarkable. Nevertheless, the estimator (1.1) is only an approximation that relies on a set of assumptions and simplifications, and is therefore in general not a suitable substitute for a fully stochastic best estimate calculation. Possible applications of (1.1) are outlined in Section 6.D.

In order to derive the bounds (4.36) and (4.37), we analyze the local GAAP accounting flows that generate future discretionary benefits. Our main tool in this analysis is the no-leakage relation [7, Prop. 2.2], and this allows us to connect profit declarations to discretionary benefit cash flows. Then we separate the FDB into contributions of varying magnitude. This process is repeated until the contributions which cannot be easily computed are of sufficiently small magnitude (compared to BE) such that crude approximations are admissible without completely distorting the final result.

These approximations (and the determination of what is negligible) cannot be carried out in an abstract mathematical manner but have to be seen within the context of traditional life insurance business. Indeed, it is very easy to generate pathological examples where $FDB = 0$ or FDB is arbitrarily large; for the first consider the case where $gph = 0$ and $SF_0 = 0$, and for the second a shareholder that is willing to inject arbitrarily large amounts of capital to increase policy holder participation. Clearly, both these scenarios are unrealistic, and in order to derive meaningful bounds on the FDB one has to exclude such possibilities.

One of the main observations of this paper is that a set of generic management rules can be found such that, firstly, meaningful bounds follow and, secondly, these bounds are extreme within the set of meaningful bounds. By the second point we mean that the upper bound can be reduced by additional management actions, but not increased; likewise the lower bound can be increased, but not reduced.

Thus we have chosen the assumptions so that the bounds continue to hold for other (realistic) management rules. The main assumptions are as follows:

Assumption 1.1. Management rules are designed to prevent excessive shareholder injections.

This precludes the above mentioned possibility of the shareholder generating policyholder profits by capital injections. But we also interpret it to mean that there is no profit declaration target that is attained by realizing unrealized gains. In this sense our lower bound, LB , is minimal. If there were such a target, LB would have to increase. Conversely, we have not used this non-realization rule in the derivation of the upper bound, UB . Hence UB may be further decreased, but not increased, by assuming that negative gross surplus can be covered (to a certain extent) by releasing unrealized gains.

Assumption 1.2. (Cf. [7, A. 3.10]) Insurance companies are subject to market competition and thus inclined to declare profits to policy holder accounts. In technical terms: The surplus fund is bounded, due to management rules which hold for all scenarios, by a fraction of the technical reserves. That is, $SF_t \leq \theta \cdot LP_t$. In Section 5 we will assume $\theta = 5\%$.

In this assumption we distinguish between profit sharing and profit declaration. This distinction is important because profit sharing is, for traditional life insurance, mandatory. This is the process where a company shares a legally specified minimum of its net profits with the collective of policy holders. However, in the legally relevant meaning of the term, sharing does not necessarily imply that the policy holder will receive money from the company's surplus. Indeed, the company may decide at its own discretion how much of the *shared* profit is *declared* (or credited) to the policy holders' accounts and how much is *not declared*, i.e. "parked" in the surplus fund. Hypothetically, it would be possible for a company to park all of the shared profits in the surplus fund, and hence never pay any profit sharing benefits. Practically, this is not the case because of market competition (and, at least in some jurisdictions, tax incentives). A low fraction of declared profits is not good for the reputation and subsequently for the new business margin. Note that, tacitly, this argument relies on Solvency II's going concern hypothesis.

The purpose of the surplus fund, SF , is to obtain a smooth and steady stream of declarations. Hence, if the company's profit has increased, the declaration factor is likely to decrease while, if the profit has decreased, the factor may increase. See equation (2.11) for details. The result of this mechanism is the following:

Assumption 1.3. Management rules are designed to reduce variation of policy holder profit declarations.

Technically, we use this assumption to justify some of the approximations in Section 4 where the variation of the life assurance provisions, LP , is viewed as a secondary effect compared to the variation in the forward rate. These approximations are crude but reasonable at this point since the approximated quantities are already (at least) one order of magnitude smaller than BE .

1.C. Structure of the paper. Section 2 introduces the basic notions and terminology regarding the accounting model and the corresponding accounting flows (which are *not* cash flows).

The main statement of Section 3 is Theorem 3.15 which is an exact decomposition of the FDB in terms of quantities which are known (and large), quantities which are unknown and need to be approximated, and quantities which are sufficiently small to be neglected. To derive Theorem 3.15, we use the no-leakage principle (3.16) formulated systematically in [7, Prop. 2.2].

Section 4 contains the main result, i.e. Theorem 4.2 with the formulae for LB and UB .

In Section 5 we apply Theorem 4.2 to publicly available data of Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG for the years 2017, 2018 and 2019.

Section 6 draws conclusions.

Appendix 7 is a presentation of the gross surplus from the actuarial point of view. Finally, Appendix 8 is a collection of all the publicly available data, together with their sources, that are used in Section 5.

Acknowledgements. We thank our colleagues Wolfgang Herold and Sanela Omerovic for valuable comments and discussions.

Disclaimer. The opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Austrian Financial Market Authority.

2. THE ACCOUNTING MODEL

Consider a European insurance company which sells traditional life insurance. The company is subject to the Solvency II regulatory regime and therefore has to report, on a quarterly basis, the best estimate, BE , associated to its liabilities. In the reporting, the best estimate is split into two components, the guaranteed benefits GB and the future discretionary benefits FDB , i.e.

$$(2.2) \quad BE = GB + FDB.$$

This splitting is required by Solvency II ([13, Art. 25] and [14]).

2.A. Assumptions. Let us fix a yearly time grid $0, 1, \dots, T$ and remark that $t = 0$ is the valuation time while T corresponds to the run-off time of the liability portfolio. In practice T may be as large as 100 years.

Assumption 2.1. The end of projection, T , coincides with the time to run off of the liability portfolio.

Let

$$F_t^m$$

denote the simple forward rate at time t valid on the accrual period $[t + m, t + m + 1]$. If $m = 0$ we write $F_t^0 = F_t$. The initial forward curve is the set $(F_0^m)_{m=0}^{T-1}$. We assume further that we have chosen an arbitrage free interest rate model with respect to a risk neutral measure \mathbb{Q} (and a filtered probability space satisfying all the usual assumptions), and consequently denote the corresponding (stochastic) one-year forward rate at t by F_t . The associated discount factor, for $t \geq 1$, is $B_t = \prod_{s=0}^{t-1} (1 + F_s)^{-1}$, and we set $B_0 = 1$. Expected values are throughout understood to be with respect to \mathbb{Q} , $E[\cdot] = E_{\mathbb{Q}}[\cdot]$. The deterministic discount factor is denoted by $P(0, t) = E[B_t^{-1}]$.

According to Solvency II [12, 13], the best estimate is the expectation of all future cash flows which are related to existing business. These cash flows are benefits, bf_t , premium income, pr_t , and costs, co_t . The best estimate is thus

$$(2.3) \quad BE = E \left[\sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1} (bf_t + co_t - pr_t) \right]$$

The benefits can be further decomposed into guaranteed benefits, gb_t , and discretionary benefits, ph_t . That is,

$$(2.4) \quad bf_t = gb_t + ph_t,$$

and gb_t is independent of asset movements. Thus gb_t is a deterministic quantity and can be calculated by actuarial methods. It follows that

$$(2.5) \quad FDB = E \left[\sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1} ph_t \right].$$

Assumption 2.2. (Cf. [7, A. 2.1]) The liabilities (technical provisions under local GAAP) at time t are composed of two items:

- (1) life assurance provision, LP_t ;
- (2) surplus fund, SF_t .

These are book value items, and if L_t is the book value of the liabilities at t , then $L_t = LP_t + SF_t$. The life assurance provision is the sum of the individual life assurance provisions, that is,

$$(2.6) \quad LP_t = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} LP_t^x$$

where \mathcal{X} is the set of policies at valuation date 0. Hence $LP_t^x = 0$ if t is bigger than the maturity of x .

The surplus fund at time t , SF_t , comprises those profits that have not (yet) been declared to policyholders at time t . As opposed to LP_t , SF_t belongs to the collective of policyholders and cannot be attributed to individual contracts.

The book value of assets at time t is denoted by BV_t and their market value by MV_t . Unrealised gains or losses are defined as residual $UG_t = MV_t - BV_t$.

Assumption 2.3. (Cf. [7, A. 2.2]) The book value of assets is equal to the book value of liabilities,

$$(2.7) \quad BV_t = L_t = LP_t + SF_t.$$

For a discussion of why this assumption is, in fact, not restrictive see [7, Section 2.3].

Let

$$gs_t^*$$

denote the company's gross surplus at time t .

Assumption 2.4. (Cf. [7, A. 3.9]) The gross of tax policyholder profit participation rate gph is constant. This is the rate with which the policyholder participates in the company's gross surplus gs_t^* , if the latter is positive.

The profit participation in this assumption refers to sharing but does not say anything about profit declarations (see also the discussion following Assumption 1.2). The profit sharing mechanism in traditional life insurance means that a part of gs_t^* is declared to each one of the policy holders' accounts. This declaration, denoted by db_t^* only takes place when the surplus is positive and is therefore of the form

$$(2.8) \quad db_t^* = \theta_t \cdot gph \cdot (gs_t^*)_+$$

where θ_t is the fraction that is to be declared to the collective at t and $(gs_t^*)_+ = \max(gs_t^*, 0)$. We remark that θ_t depends on complex model rules such as future management actions.

Quantities with a star * denote accounting flows, as opposed to cash flows. Let

$$(2.9) \quad ph_t^* := gph \cdot (gs_t^*)_+$$

and note that this is an accounting flow (not a cash flow), whence it is not (immediately) paid out to policy holders but rather increases the book value of liabilities. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ let $x = x_+ - x_-$ be the decomposition into positive and negative parts. For further reference we observe that

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} PH^* &:= E \left[\sum B_t^{-1} ph_t^* \right] = gph \cdot E \left[\sum B_t^{-1} (gs_t^*)_+ \right] \\ &= gph \cdot E \left[\sum B_t^{-1} gs_t^* \right] + gph \cdot E \left[\sum B_t^{-1} (gs_t^*)_- \right] \\ &= gph \cdot (VIF + PH^* + TAX) + gph \cdot COG. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the splitting $gs_t^* = sh_t + ph_t^* + tax_t$, where sh_t and tax_t are the shareholder and tax cash flows, together with the definitions

$$VIF = E \left[\sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1} sh_t \right], \quad COG = E \left[\sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1} (sh_t)_- \right], \quad TAX = E \left[\sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1} tax_t \right].$$

Note that sh_t can be negative, which corresponds to the case of shareholder capital injections.

2.B. Projection of the surplus fund SF . Consider the surplus fund SF_{t-1} at $t-1$. Going one time step further, it is increased by allocating

$$(1 - \theta_t) \cdot gph \cdot (gs_t^*)_+$$

to the fund and decreased by declaring

$$\eta_t \cdot SF_{t-1}$$

to the policy holders' accounts. The fraction $\eta_t \in [0, 1]$ depends, just like θ_t , on modeling assumptions. We thus obtain an iterative evolution of the form

$$(2.11) \quad SF_t = SF_{t-1} + (1 - \theta_t) \cdot gph \cdot (gs_t^*)_+ - \eta_t \cdot SF_{t-1}$$

where SF_0 is known.

2.C. Projection of declared bonuses DB . Let DB_t be the sum of all profit declarations that have occurred at times $0 < s < t$ and belong to contracts $x \in \mathcal{X}$ which are active at t . We set

$$DB_0 = 0.$$

Passing from $t-1$ to t , DB_{t-1} is

- increased by declarations $\eta_t \cdot SF_{t-1}$ from the surplus fund,
- increased by direct policy holder declarations $\theta_t \cdot gph \cdot (gs_t^*)_+$,
- decreased by cash flows, ph_t , to policy holders whose contracts terminate at t , and
- decreased by accounting flows, $\chi_{t-1}DB_{t-1}$, with $0 \leq \chi_{t-1} \leq 1$ due to mortality or surrender. The fraction $\chi_{t-1}DB_{t-1}$ is freed up, in the sense that it is not attributed to specific contracts anymore and contributes to the annual gross surplus.

Therefore, we have the iterative relation

$$(2.12) \quad DB_t = DB_{t-1} + \eta_t \cdot SF_{t-1} + \theta_t \cdot gph \cdot (gs_t^*)_+ - ph_t - \chi_{t-1}DB_{t-1}.$$

Together with (2.11) this yields

$$(2.13) \quad DB_t = DB_{t-1} + SF_{t-1} - SF_t + ph_t^* - ph_t - \chi_{t-1}DB_{t-1}$$

where we use definition (2.9). Notice that the model dependent fractions θ_t and η_t disappear.

3. A GENERAL FORMULA FOR FUTURE DISCRETIONARY BENEFITS

The run off assumption 2.1 implies that all declarations are paid out at T , or earlier, i.e. $DB_T = 0 = DB_0$. Using (2.13), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} B_T^{-1}SF_T &= SF_0 + \sum_{t=1}^T \left(B_t^{-1}(DB_t + SF_t) - B_{t-1}^{-1}(DB_{t-1} + SF_{t-1}) \right) \\ &= SF_0 + \sum_{t=1}^T \left((B_t^{-1} - B_{t-1}^{-1})(DB_{t-1} + SF_{t-1}) + B_t^{-1}ph_t^* - B_t^{-1}ph_t - B_t^{-1}\chi_{t-1}DB_{t-1} \right) \\ &= SF_0 + \sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1}ph_t^* - \sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1}ph_t - \sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1}F_{t-1}(DB_{t-1} + SF_{t-1}) - \sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1}\chi_{t-1}DB_{t-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Definitions (2.5) and (2.10) imply that the expected values satisfy

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} FDB &= SF_0 + PH^* - E \left[\sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1}F_{t-1}(DB_{t-1} + SF_{t-1}) \right] \\ &\quad - E \left[B_T^{-1}SF_T \right] - E \left[\sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1}\chi_{t-1}DB_{t-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.1. *The value of future discretionary benefits, FDB , satisfies*

$$(3.15) \quad FDB = SF_0 + gph \cdot (LP_0 - GB + UG_0) + gph \cdot COG - I - II - III$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= E \left[B_T^{-1}SF_T \right] + gph \cdot E \left[B_T^{-1}UG_T \right] \\ II &:= (1 - gph)E \left[\sum_{t=2}^T B_t^{-1}\chi_{t-1}DB_{t-1} \right] \\ III &:= (1 - gph)E \left[\sum_{t=1}^T B_t^{-1}F_{t-1}(DB_{t-1} + SF_{t-1}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Equality (2.10) implies

$$PH^* = \frac{gph}{1-gph}(VIF + TAX + COG).$$

Hence we can use the no-leakage principle

$$(3.16) \quad BE + VIF + TAX = BV_0 + UG_0 - E[B_T^{-1}MV_T]$$

in [7, Prop. 2.2] to conclude

$$(3.17) \quad PH^* = \frac{gph}{1-gph} \left(BV_0 + UG_0 - GB - FDB - E[B_T^{-1}MV_T] + COG \right)$$

which, together with (3.14), $BV_0 - SF_0 = LP_0$ and using that $BV_T = SF_T$ at run-off time T , yields (3.15). \square

Remark 3.2. Terms *I*, *II* and *III* in the theorem turn out to be quantities that have to be subtracted from $SF_0 + gph \cdot (LP_0 + UG_0 - GB)$ because they are not assigned to policyholders. Term *III* results from the delay between the point in time when profits to policyholders originate as accounting flows and the point when these profits are actually paid out as cash flows. In fact:

- Term *I* is related to the policyholder share of assets that remain in the company after run-off of the liability portfolio;
- Term *II* is the tax and shareholder share in the gross surplus due to the fraction of declared future profits, DB_t , that is freed up because of mortality or policy holder behaviour.
- Term *III* captures the tax and shareholder shares in interests on allocated profits as well as on the surplus fund.

Remark 3.3. The estimation in this theorem regards the FDB as calculated with the stochastic cash flow model. In those EEA member states that have authorised Article 91(2) of Directive 2009/138/EC [12] the surplus fund (more exactly, the part that is not used to compensate losses) is not considered as a liability, and therefore not part of the technical reserves. Let SF_0^{SII} denote the part of the surplus fund that is not used to absorb losses (in the risk neutral average over all scenarios). This is deducted from the FDB to yield the reported future discretionary benefits, $FDB_{\text{rep}} = FDB - SF_0^{\text{SII}}$.

4. ANALYTICAL LOWER AND UPPER BOUNDS FOR FUTURE DISCRETIONARY BENEFITS

The model dependent quantities in Theorem 3.1 are *I*, *II*, *III* and COG . Calculating these explicitly is just as difficult as calculating the FDB . The purpose of this section is therefore to derive model independent and analytical bounds for these quantities. In doing so some quantities will be neglected and others will be approximated. The overall guiding principle in this approach is that errors below $1\% \cdot BE$ are immaterial.

4.A. Estimating *I*. Assumption 1.2 prevents the surplus fund from becoming arbitrarily large. In theory this would be possible, as there is no legal obligation to share the profits accumulated in the surplus fund. In reality the insurance market forces the companies to actually credit these profits to policyholders. Thus Assumption 1.2 is a realistic management rule.

The run-off assumption 2.1 now implies that Term *I* is negligible compared to the FDB . Thus we obtain the very simple estimate

$$(4.18) \quad I \cong 0.$$

4.B. Estimating *II*. The expression $\chi_t DB_t$ in Term *II* corresponds to the fraction of DB_t that is freed up each year due to policy holder mortality or behaviour (surrender or conversion to paid-up policy).

This fraction is converted into the gross surplus and makes up a part of the company's technical margin. See Appendix 7 for details. In Section 8.A the technical gains of the Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG are estimated to correspond to 0.77% of the technical reserves. Since the inherited reserves are a part of this, a reasonable estimate may be

$$(4.19) \quad \chi_t DB_t \lesssim 0.25\% \cdot LP_t.$$

In fact, this estimate seems rather generous since by definition DB_t starts at $DB_0 = 0$, whence the inherited fraction from DB_t will initially only make a very small contribution to the technical gains.

Assumption 4.1. (Cf. [7, A. 3.13]) The expected technical reserves, $E[LP_t]$, decrease geometrically as $E[LP_t] = LP_0 \cdot 2^{-t/h}$ with fixed $h > 0$. (See also [7, Assumption 3.13])

With $h = 12$, $T = 60$, $gph = 75.5\%$ as the average over Table 17 and the discount factors in Table 20, we thus obtain

$$(4.20) \quad II \leq 0.25\% \cdot 0.245\% \cdot \sum_{t=2}^T 2^{-t/h} P(0, t) \cdot LP_0 = 0.72\% \cdot BE.$$

Neglecting contributions smaller than $1\% \cdot BE$, this leads to the estimate

$$(4.21) \quad II \cong 0.$$

Since there is also a dependence on the interest rate curve we will show the result of estimate (4.20) for each of the years under consideration in Section 5.A.

4.C. Estimating III. The essential idea is to use equation (2.13) to obtain a recursive inequality relation which allows to estimate term III.

We first analyze the contributions to the gross surplus gs_t^* . Let K_{t-1} denote a deterministic spread which reflects technical gains and fixed coupon payments at time t and depends on unrealized gains of the asset portfolio at time $t-1$.

We assume κ_t to be a decreasing function which reflects the reduction of initial unrealized gains due to assets reaching their maturities. Thus κ_t depends on the duration of the portfolio. We set

$$(4.22) \quad \kappa_{t-1} = 2^{-(t-1)/d} - 2^{-t/d}$$

such that $UG_t \sim \kappa_t UG_0$. Here d is assumed to be smaller than the half-life h of the technical reserves to reflect the duration gap between assets and liabilities.

Notice that Assumption 2.3 implies that UG_0 consists of unrealized gains corresponding to the full book value $BV_0 = LP_0 + SF_0$.

Legislative requirements for traditional life insurance ([9] for Germany and [11] for Austria) imply that the policy holder collective participates, at each time step t , in the return on assets which cover $BV_{t-1} = LP_{t-1} + SF_{t-1}$ (Assumption 2.3). At the same time the company has to guarantee that gains are not below $\rho_t \cdot LP_{t-1}$, where ρ_t is the average technical interest rate at time t . Using equation (7.49) we therefore estimate

$$(4.23) \quad ph_t^* \leq gph \cdot \left(F_{t-1} + \frac{K_{t-1} - \rho_t}{1 + \theta} \right)_+ \cdot (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_{t-1} + gph \rho_t (DB_{t-1} + DB_{t-1}^{\leq 0}),$$

where

$$K_{t-1} = 2^{(t-1)/h} \kappa_{t-1} \frac{UG_0}{LP_0} + \gamma$$

and where γ and $DB_{t-1}^{\leq 0}$ are defined in Appendix 7.

Inequality (4.23) and equation (2.13) yield

$$\begin{aligned} DB_{t-1} + SF_{t-1} &= DB_{t-2} + SF_{t-2} + ph_{t-1}^* - ph_{t-1} - \chi_{t-1} DB_{t-2} \\ &\leq DB_{t-2} + SF_{t-2} + gph \cdot \left(F_{t-2} + \frac{K_{t-2} - \rho_{t-1}}{1 + \theta} \right)_+ \cdot (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_{t-2} \\ &\quad + gph \rho_{t-1} (DB_{t-2} + DB_{t-2}^{\leq 0}) - ph_{t-1} - \chi_{t-1} DB_{t-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Because $DB_0 = 0$ and SF_0 is known, we thus obtain a recursive inequality relation for $DB_t + SF_t$. Note that we do not need separate estimates for DB_t or SF_t . This is a very convenient feature since any splitting of $DB_t + SF_t$ into DB_t and SF_t would depend on management rules, compare with equation (2.11) for SF_t . On the other hand, as noted just below equation (2.13), the sum is independent of such choices.

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
DB_{t-1} + SF_{t-1} &\leq DB_{t-2} + SF_{t-2} \\
&\quad + gph \cdot \left(F_{t-2} + \frac{K_{t-2} - \rho_{t-1}}{1 + \theta} \right)_+ \cdot (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_{t-2} \\
&\quad + gph \rho_{t-1} (DB_{t-2} + DB_{t-2}^{\leq 0}) - ph_{t-1} - \chi_{t-1} DB_{t-2} \\
&\leq DB_{t-3} + SF_{t-3} \\
&\quad + gph \cdot \left(F_{t-3} + \frac{K_{t-3} - \rho_{t-2}}{1 + \theta} \right)_+ \cdot (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_{t-3} \\
&\quad + gph \cdot \left(F_{t-2} + \frac{K_{t-2} - \rho_{t-1}}{1 + \theta} \right)_+ \cdot (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_{t-2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{s=0}^1 \left(gph \cdot \rho_{t-s-1} (DB_{t-s-2} + DB_{t-s-2}^{\leq 0}) - ph_{t-s-1} - \chi_{t-s-2} DB_{t-s-2} \right) \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&\leq SF_0 + gph \cdot (1 + \theta) \cdot \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} \left(F_{t-2-s} + \frac{K_{t-2-s} - \rho_{t-1-s}}{1 + \theta} \right)_+ \cdot LP_{t-2-s} \\
&\quad + \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} \left(gph \rho_{t-s-1} (DB_{t-s-2} + DB_{t-s-2}^{\leq 0}) - ph_{t-s-1} - \chi_{t-s-2} DB_{t-s-2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.24) \quad F_{t-1} B_t^{-1} (DB_{t-1} + SF_{t-1}) &\leq (B_{t-1}^{-1} - B_t^{-1}) \cdot SF_0 \\
&\quad + gph(1 + \theta) \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} B_{t-s-1} (B_{t-1}^{-1} - B_t^{-1}) B_{t-1-s}^{-1} \left(F_{t-2-s} + \frac{K_{t-2-s} - \rho_{t-1-s}}{1 + \theta} \right)_+ \cdot LP_{t-2-s} \\
&\quad + (B_{t-1}^{-1} - B_t^{-1}) \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} \left(gph \cdot \rho_{t-s-1} (DB_{t-s-2} + DB_{t-s-2}^{\leq 0}) - ph_{t-s-1} - \chi_{t-s-2} DB_{t-s-2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

The quantity

$$\left(F_{t-1} - \frac{\rho_t - K_{t-1}}{1 + \theta} \right)_+$$

is the payoff of a caplet option with strike $(\rho_t - K_{t-1})/(1 + \theta)$, maturity $t - 1$ and settlement date t . Its value (price) at valuation time $t = 0$ is

$$(4.25) \quad \mathcal{O}_t^+ := E \left[B_t^{-1} \left(F_{t-1} - \frac{\rho_t - K_{t-1}}{1 + \theta} \right)_+ \right].$$

Let $P(s, t) = E[B_s B_t^{-1}]$ for $s \leq t$. Assumption 1.3 says that the coefficient of variation of LP_t can be neglected in comparison to that of F_{t-1} . We therefore approximate LP in (4.24) by its expectation. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.26) \quad &E \left[B_{t-s-1} (B_{t-1}^{-1} - B_t^{-1}) \cdot B_{t-1-s}^{-1} \left(F_{t-2-s} + \frac{K_{t-2-s} - \rho_{t-1-s}}{1 + \theta} \right)_+ \cdot LP_{t-2-s} \right] \\
&\cong \left(P(t-s-1, t-1) - P(t-s-1, t) \right) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{t-s-1}^+ \cdot E \left[LP_{t-2-s} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where $E[LP]$ is calculated according to Assumption 4.1.

Remark 4.1. In (4.26) we have also simplified

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left[B_{t-s-1}(B_{t-1}^{-1} - B_t^{-1}) \cdot B_{t-1-s}^{-1} \left(F_{t-2-s} + \frac{K_{t-2-s} - \rho_{t-1-s}}{1+\theta}\right)_+\right] \\ & \cong \left(P(t-s-1, t-1) - P(t-s-1, t)\right) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{t-s-1}^+ \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively one could also evaluate the expectation of the left hand side of (4.26) as

$$E\left[\left(B_{t-1}^{-1} - B_t^{-1}\right) \cdot \left(F_{t-2-s} + \frac{K_{t-2-s} - \rho_{t-1-s}}{1+\theta}\right)_+\right] \cdot E\left[LP_{t-2-s}\right],$$

and use a Monte Carlo routine for the first factor and Assumption 4.1 for the second. The path dependent payoff $(F_{t-2-s} + \frac{K_{t-2-s} - \rho_{t-1-s}}{1+\theta})_+$ viewed at settlement times $t-1$ and t is that of a deferred caplet. An analytic, but approximate, pricing formula for $E[(B_{t-1}^{-1} - B_t^{-1}) \cdot (F_{t-2-s} + \frac{K_{t-2-s} - \rho_{t-1-s}}{1+\theta})_+]$ is derived in [3, Sec. 13.4.1] by using a drift freezing technique. From an actuarial perspective the interpretation as a deferred caplet is more accurate. However, for our purposes the simplicity of evaluating \mathcal{O}^+ via the Black formula outweighs the disadvantage of the slightly crude approximation (4.26). In any case, the approximation error that arises at this point is not that of a discounted caplet versus a deferred caplet, but that of a difference of a differently discounted caplet versus a difference of deferred caplets.

The parameter h is the number of years for the portfolio to reduce to half of its size. The difference $h-d > 0$ reflects the duration gap between assets and liabilities. We remark that the spread, K_t , can now be explicitly specified as

$$(4.27) \quad K_{t-1} = \gamma + \left(2^{-(t-1)/d} - 2^{-t/d}\right) 2^{(t-1)/h} \cdot \frac{UG_0}{LP_0}.$$

Owing to Assumption 4.1 and estimate (4.24) we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.28) \quad III & \leq (1 - gph) \cdot SF_0 \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T P(0, t) F_0^{t-1} \\ & \quad + (1 - gph)gph(1 + \theta) \cdot LP_0 \\ & \quad \cdot \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} \left(P(t-s-1, t-1) - P(t-s-1, t)\right) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{t-s-1}^+ \cdot 2^{-(t-s-1)/h} \\ & \quad - \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

where ε is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} (4.29) \quad \varepsilon & := \varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- \\ \varepsilon_+ & := (1 - gph)E\left[\sum_{t=2}^T \left(B_{t-1}^{-1} - B_t^{-1}\right) \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} \left(ph_{t-s-1} + \chi_{t-s-2} DB_{t-s-2}\right)\right] \\ \varepsilon_- & := gph(1 - gph)E\left[\sum_{t=2}^T \left(B_{t-1}^{-1} - B_t^{-1}\right) \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} \left(\rho_{t-s-1}(DB_{t-s-2} + DB_{t-s-2}^{\leq 0})\right)\right] \end{aligned}$$

4.D. Estimating ε . The negative part of ε , i.e. ε_- depends on the initial declared profits, $DB^{\leq 0}$, and the technical interest rate, ρ , while the positive part, ε_+ , does not. Hence, if $DB^{\leq 0}$ or ρ were to become arbitrarily large, ε would become arbitrarily negative, and from a mathematical point of view there is no argument to preclude this possibility. However, a realistic model of an insurance company does not need to allow for pathologically high technical rates or initial profits. In this section we use this observation to argue that $0 \lesssim \varepsilon$.

Assumption 4.2. On average, the total declared profits are a constant fraction of the technical reserves. That is, $E[DB_t + DB_t^{\leq 0}] = \sigma E[LP_t]$ for a constant $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$.

Typical values for T , gph , σ , ρ and $P(0, t-1) - P(0, t)$ are 60, 75 % (Table 17), 20 %, 2.5 % and Table 20, respectively. A quick inspection following Assumptions 1.3, 4.1 and 4.2 now suggests that ε_- should be of the order

$$(4.30) \quad \varepsilon_- / LP_0 \sim 25 \% \cdot 75 \% \cdot 2.5 \% \cdot 20 \% \cdot \sum_{t=2}^T (P(0, t-1) - P(0, t)) \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} 2^{-(t-s-2)/10} \sim 1.20 \%$$

This may be slightly larger than the immateriality threshold of $1 \% \cdot BE$. Further, since the estimate (4.30) uses many assumptions which are difficult to justify rigorously, we should check that ε is at least positive for a range of reasonably conservative values.

To this end, let $ph_t = \psi_{t-1} DB_{t-1}$ and assume that $DB_t = c(t) \cdot \sigma \cdot LP_t$ where

$$c(t) = \begin{cases} t/2h & t < 2h \\ 1 & t \geq 2h \end{cases}$$

In conjunction with Assumption 4.2 this captures the fact that $DB_0 = 0$ and $DB_t^{\leq 0}$ is expected to converge to something negligible as t increases.

We obtain the following estimator for a lower bound of ε :

$$(4.31) \quad \hat{\varepsilon} = (1 - gph) \sum_{t=2}^T \left(P(0, t-1) - P(0, t) \right) \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} \left((\psi\sigma + \chi)c(t-s-2) - gph \cdot \rho\sigma \right) \cdot 2^{-(t-s-2)/h} \cdot LP_0$$

where the time dependence in ψ_t , χ_t and ρ_t has been omitted. The assumption $\psi = 3 \%$ is very conservative since the pay-out fraction is expected to increase over time for a run-off portfolio, and larger ψ contributes positively to $\hat{\varepsilon}$. Therefore, $\hat{\varepsilon}$ need not be a sharp lower bound for ε . But this is not necessary since positive values are allowed.

In the concrete examples in Section 5 we check that (4.31) is indeed small or positive ($\hat{\varepsilon}/BE \geq -1 \%$) for $\sigma = 20 \%$, $\psi = 3 \%$, $\chi = 0.25 \%$ (as in estimate (4.19)) and the given value for ρ .

This gives a posteriori justification, both in the mathematical and economic sense, to omitting ε in (4.28). The resulting estimate for III is

$$(4.32) \quad \begin{aligned} III &\leq (1 - gph) \cdot SF_0 \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T P(0, t) F_0^{t-1} \\ &\quad + (1 - gph) gph (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_0 \\ &\quad \cdot \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} \left(P(t-s-1, t-1) - P(t-s-1, t) \right) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{t-s-1}^+ \cdot 2^{-(t-s-1)/h} \end{aligned}$$

This estimate should always be used in conjunction with the verification that (4.31) is positive (or sufficiently small). In concrete applications, insurance companies could use their known (range of) values for h , χ , ψ_t and σ .

4.E. Estimating COG. To estimate COG , notice that

$$COG = \sum_{t=1}^T E \left[B_t^{-1} (gs_t^*)_- \right] \cong \sum_{t=1}^T E \left[B_t^{-1} \left(F_{t-1} + S_t + \frac{K_{t-1} - \rho_t}{1 + \theta} \right)_- \cdot LP_{t-1} \right]$$

where $S_t \geq 0$ is a spread, at time t , that can be generated at the company's discretion by realizing unrealized gains. Indeed, here we use Assumption 1.1.

Therefore, invoking Assumptions 1.3 and 4.1 again, we find

$$(4.33) \quad COG = \sum_{t=1}^T E \left[B_t^{-1} (gs_t^*)_- \right] \leq \sum_{t=1}^T E \left[B_t^{-1} \left(F_{t-1} + \frac{K_{t-1} - \rho_t}{1 + \theta} \right)_- \right] \cdot 2^{-(t-1)/h} \cdot (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_0.$$

The expression

$$(4.34) \quad \mathcal{O}_t^- := E \left[B_t^{-1} \left(F_{t-1} - \frac{\rho_t - K_{t-1}}{1 + \theta} \right) \right]$$

is the value of a floorlet with strike $(\rho_t - K_{t-1})/(1 + \theta)$, maturity $t - 1$ and settlement date t .

4.F. Estimating FDB . To evaluate \mathcal{O}_t^+ and \mathcal{O}_t^- , we use the Black formulas associated to the normal model. If interest rates are positive one may also use the log-normal model ([2, 3]). In Section 5 we are interested in the years 2017, 2018 and 2019 where rates are negative at the short end. The normal Black formulas are

$$(4.35) \quad \mathcal{O}_t^\pm = P(0, t) \cdot \left(\pm (F_0^{t-1} - \frac{\rho_t - K_{t-1}}{1 + \theta}) \Phi(\pm d) + IV_t \sqrt{t} \phi(\pm d) \right)$$

where Φ and ϕ are the normal cumulative distribution and density functions, respectively. Further,

$$d = \frac{(1 + \theta)F_0^{t-1} - \rho_t + K_{t-1}}{(1 + \theta)IV_t \sqrt{t}}$$

and IV_t is the caplet implied volatility.

Let

$$(4.36) \quad \begin{aligned} LB := & SF_0 + gph \cdot (LP_0 - GB + UG_0) - (1 - gph) \cdot SF_0 \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T P(0, t) F_0^{t-1} \\ & - (1 - gph)gph(1 + \theta) \cdot LP_0 \cdot \sum_{t=2}^T F_0^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} P(t - s - 1, t) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{t-s-1}^+ \cdot 2^{-(t-s-1)/h} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(4.37) \quad UB := SF_0 + gph \cdot (LP_0 - GB + UG_0) + gph \cdot (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_0 \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T 2^{-(t-1)/h} \mathcal{O}_t^-.$$

Assume it has been verified that (4.31) is positive or negligible. Together with Theorem 3.1, the respective estimates (4.18), (4.21), (4.32) and (4.33) for I , II , III and COG yield:

Theorem 4.2. *The value of future discretionary benefits, FDB , is bounded from below and above as*

$$LB \leq FDB \leq UB.$$

Remark 4.3. In line with Remark 3.3, if Article 91 of [12] has been ratified by the local jurisdiction, then (the part not used for loss absorption of) SF_0 has to be subtracted from the future discretionary benefits to obtain the reported value, $FDB_{\text{rep}} = FDB - SF_0^{\text{SII}}$; this part is denoted by SF_0^{SII} and satisfies . Thus we restate Theorem 4.2 as

$$(4.38) \quad LB - SF_0 \leq FDB_{\text{rep}} \leq UB - SF_0.$$

In the restatement we use SF_0 instead of SF_0^{SII} since the only the former is a model independent quantity. For the lower bound this is clearly admissible since $SF_0^{\text{SII}} \leq SF_0$. For the upper bound one could also retain UB instead of $UB - SF_0$. However, our assumptions leading to UB are already quite generous so that the deduction seems reasonable. In Table 12 the values of the surplus fund, SF_0 , and the Solvency II values of the surplus fund, SF_0^{SII} , as used in the example of Section 5 are given. The differences are quite small.

Remark 4.4. When $gph = 0$ then $UB = SF_0$. This makes sense since SF_0 already belongs to the collective of policy holders. Thus no additional profits are shared and, in particular, the policy holders also do not receive the unrealized gains proportional to SF_0 , whence only the book value remains to be paid out.

Likewise, when $gph = 0$ we have $LB = (1 - \sum_{t=1}^T P(0, t) F_0^{t-1}) SF_0$, that is, the lower bound for FDB is given by the amount of depreciation that arises because SF_0 is not paid out at $t = 0$ but at later times, at the rate of decrease, determined by h , of the liability portfolio, and the corresponding loss of order $1 - gph = 1$ in interest rate margin incurred by the policy holders.

Conversely, when $gph = 1$ we have $LB = SF_0 + LP_0 - GB + UG_0$. In this case all future profits go to the policy holders with absolute certainty, and the value of these profits must be equal to the difference of the full initial market value, $LP_0 + SF_0 + UG_0$, and the already guaranteed benefits, GB . That is, $LB = FDB \leq UB = LB + (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_0 \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T 2^{-(t-1)/h} \mathcal{O}_t^-$.

5. APPLICATION TO REPORTED VALUES

We apply the results of the previous section to publicly available data from the Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG and publicly accessible market data (average technical gains, discount rates, etc.). The relevant data is collected in Appendix 8. Since Germany has ratified Article 91 of [12], we apply Theorem 4.2 in the form of estimates (4.38).¹

Unfortunately interest rate implied volatilities are not publicly available. Therefore, we fix an artificial volatility structure that approximately reflects the correct behavior (Section 5.A) and provide sensitivities with respect to this choice (Section 5.B). The results below are generated with respect to the following volatility structure:

$$IV_t = \begin{cases} 10 + 2(t-1) & 1 \leq t \leq 20 \\ 50 & t > 20 \end{cases}$$

5.A. Base case. The results for the base case are shown in Tables 2 and 3, in absolute numbers and normalized as a percentage of $BE = GB + FDB$, respectively. The chosen parameters are as follows:

$$(5.39) \quad T = 60, \quad \theta = 5\%, \quad d = 8, \quad h = 12, \quad gph = 75.5;$$

YE	ρ	γ	LP_0	SF_0	UG_0	GB	FDB	\widehat{FDB}	LB	UB
2017	2.63	0.77	179.4	10.4	41.4	154.1	48.6	47.99	43.45	52.53
2018	2.52	0.77	190.2	11.0	32.8	158.8	46.2	46.71	41.74	51.67
2019	2.38	0.77	208.1	11.5	54.0	195.2	47.4	49.93	43.95	55.90

TABLE 2. Values are in billion euros, except for ρ and γ which are percentage rates.

YE	LP_0	SF_0	UG_0	GB	FDB	\widehat{FDB}	LB	UB	δ	Δ	II	$\widehat{\varepsilon}$
2017	88.51	5.13	20.42	76.02	23.98	23.67	21.44	25.91	2.24	-0.30	0.67	-0.13
2018	92.78	5.37	16.00	77.46	22.54	22.78	20.36	25.21	2.42	0.25	0.70	-0.10
2019	85.78	4.74	22.26	80.46	19.54	20.58	18.12	23.04	2.47	1.04	0.72	0.01

TABLE 3. Values are in percent of $BE = 100\%$. The terms II and $\widehat{\varepsilon}$ are calculated with (4.20) and (4.31), respectively. Further, $\Delta = \widehat{FDB} - FDB$ and $\delta = (UB - LB)/2$, also in percent of BE .

5.B. Sensitivity: volatility $\pm 50\%$. The values obtained by reducing the implied volatilities by 50% are presented in Table 4. In line with Assumption 1.3, this may equally be viewed as the base case. Indeed, management actions are usually designed to reduce variation in the gross surplus and in profit declarations, and thus one can make the argument that the FDB will not be subject to the full market volatility. In this sense Table 4 may actually be a more realistic base case scenario than Table 2.

¹The formulas have been implemented in *R*. The code can be provided upon request.

YE	FDB	\widehat{FDB}	LB	UB	δ	Δ
2017	23.98	23.32	21.58	25.05	1.74	-0.66
2018	22.54	22.36	20.53	24.19	1.83	-0.17
2019	19.54	19.96	18.37	21.56	1.60	0.42

TABLE 4. Values are in percent of $BE = 100\%$. Sensitivity: $50\% \cdot IV_t$.

Table 5 shows the effect of a relative increase in implied volatilities by 50%. Note that the estimation uncertainty δ increases.

YE	FDB	\widehat{FDB}	LB	UB	δ	Δ
2017	23.98	24.29	21.18	27.40	3.11	0.31
2018	22.54	23.46	20.08	26.83	3.38	0.92
2019	19.54	21.43	17.78	25.07	3.64	1.89

TABLE 5. Values are in percent of $BE = 100\%$. Sensitivity: $150\% \cdot IV_t$.

5.C. **Sensitivity: technical interest rate $\pm 10\%$.** Tables 6 and 7 show the effects of a relative decrease and increase of the technical interest rate by 10%.

YE	FDB	\widehat{FDB}	LB	UB	δ	Δ
2017	23.98	23.43	21.14	25.72	2.29	-0.55
2018	22.54	22.30	20.04	24.56	2.27	-0.24
2019	19.54	20.42	18.01	22.84	2.42	0.88

TABLE 6. Values are in percent of $BE = 100\%$. Sensitivity: $90\% \cdot \rho$.

YE	FDB	\widehat{FDB}	LB	UB	δ	Δ
2017	23.98	24.15	21.77	26.53	2.38	0.17
2018	22.54	23.34	20.65	26.04	2.70	0.81
2019	19.54	20.83	18.28	23.39	2.56	1.29

TABLE 7. Values are in percent of $BE = 100\%$. Sensitivity: $110\% \cdot \rho$.

5.D. **Sensitivity: $h \pm 2$.** Tables 8 and 9 show the effects of choosing $h = 10$ and $h = 14$, respectively.

YE	FDB	\widehat{FDB}	LB	UB	δ	Δ
2017	23.98	23.59	21.64	25.55	1.96	-0.38
2018	22.54	22.70	20.60	24.79	2.10	0.16
2019	19.54	20.43	18.36	22.50	2.07	0.89

TABLE 8. Values are in percent of $BE = 100\%$. Sensitivity: $h = 10$.

YE	FDB	\widehat{FDB}	LB	UB	δ	Δ
2017	23.98	23.76	21.24	26.28	2.27	-0.22
2018	22.54	22.87	20.14	25.59	2.73	0.33
2019	19.54	20.76	17.91	23.61	2.85	1.22

TABLE 9. Values are in percent of $BE = 100\%$. Sensitivity: $h = 14$.

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.A. Concerning the estimation error in LB . An exact calculation of ε requires a Monte Carlo evaluation of (4.29), and this is just as difficult as numerically calculating the FDB . This means that, with respect to finding a lower bound, all of the difficulties of the FDB calculation are transferred to the computation of ε . This transfer is a three step process:

- (1) Express FDB in terms of $I \cong 0$, $II \cong 0$ and III , as in (3.15).
- (2) Find an estimate for III , as in (4.28).
- (3) Find an estimate for ε .

Then it turns out that general actuarial arguments imply that ε is positive or very small (i.e. $\varepsilon \geq -1\% \cdot BE$). Hence it can be omitted from (4.28).

6.B. Concerning LB and UB . The upper and lower bounds in Theorem 4.2 depend only on four kinds of quantities:

- (1) Balance sheet items SF_0 , LP_0 and UG_0 . These are known at valuation time and clearly model independent.
- (2) The value of guaranteed cash flows, GB : This value has to be calculated, but is a deterministic quantity (with respect to financial variables) and therefore independent of all model choices or management rules. Further, being deterministic, it is scenario-independent and can therefore be calculated with respect to the initial yield curve.
- (3) Company specific information such as the average technical interest rate (ρ), the expected amount of technical gains (γ), time to maturities of assets (d) and liabilities (h), the bound on the surplus fund (θ), and the gross policy holder participation (gph).
- (4) Interest rate related quantities: F_0^t , \mathcal{O}_t^- and \mathcal{O}_t^+ . The first follows directly from the yield curve at valuation time and the latter two can be either inferred from known option prices or calculated analytically via Black's formula ([2]).

Since the upper and lower bounds depend on the optionalities \mathcal{O}_t^- and \mathcal{O}_t^+ , respectively, it follows that the estimation interval $[UB, LB]$ widens as the interest rate volatility increases. Thus the usefulness of the bounds $LB \leq FDB \leq UB$ will deteriorate with increasing volatility level. This is consistent with the intuition that the quality of any closed formula approximation of a stochastic quantity should depend on the magnitude of the variance.

6.C. Comparison with the lower bound formula in [7]. We have already presented an analytic lower bound formula for the FDB in [7, Prop. 3.4]. This previous lower bound, \widetilde{LB} , differs from LB in Theorem 4.2 in the following aspects:

- (1) The starting point for the derivation of \widetilde{LB} is a single contract picture. This is then subsequently generalized to a realistic liability portfolio consisting of multiple contracts. But this generalization uses additional assumptions and suffers also from the defect that the attribution of non-contract specific balance sheet items is not well-defined (without yet additional assumptions). The non-contract specific balance sheet items are the surplus fund, SF_t and the unrealized gains, UG_t . These shortcomings are removed by the present approach.

- (2) The formula for \widetilde{LB} involves a cross financing term, F . This term is estimated by ad-hoc expert judgement. In the present context, the cross financing is included in the terms I , II and III , and these are estimated by a careful analysis of the accounting flows (Section 4.C). A consequence of this analysis is that the estimate (4.32) for III also depends on interest rate volatility, as should be expected, whereas the formula for F was volatility-independent.

Furthermore, we now also have estimate (4.37) for an upper bound of the FDB . This is completely new and yields the simple estimator

$$\widehat{FDB} = (LB + UB)/2$$

for the FDB , which is useful whenever $(UB - LB)/BE$ is not too large.

6.D. Possible applications. The bounds LB and UB in Theorem 4.2 can be readily applied to real world data, as we have shown in Section 5. Immediate practical applications therefore include the following:

- (1) Internal validation: companies may use LB and UB to validate their FDB calculations, and thus their valuation models.
- (2) External validation by parent companies: holdings may wish to validate the valuation models in their subsidiaries.
- (3) External validation by supervisors or auditors.

Clearly, the validation of the best estimate will be most effective when the control via Theorem 4.2 is paired with a statistical analysis of the second order assumptions leading to GB and a verification that the contract specific features, which give rise to the guaranteed benefit cash flows, are correctly implemented.

7. APPENDIX: ACTUARIAL APPROXIMATION OF GROSS SURPLUS

The aim of this appendix is to derive the approximate formula (7.49) from an actuarial point of view.

7.A. The gross surplus. To this end, we first write out the gross surplus in detail (where we assume premiums, costs and benefits to be paid at time t):

$$(7.40) \quad gs_t^* = -\Delta V_t - \Delta DB_t - \Delta DB_{t-1} + cf_{assets,t}^* + pr_t - co_t - bf_t + S_t,$$

where: $\Delta V_t = V_t - V_{t-1}$ is the difference of mathematical reserve at t and $t-1$; $cf_{assets,t}^* = cf_{assets,t} + BV_t - BV_{t-1}$ is the accounting flow of assets before application of management rules; $cf_{assets,t}$ denotes the cash flow of all assets from time $t-1$ to t before application of management rules; $S_t \geq 0$ is a fraction of the unrealized gains that can be realized by management rules according to the company's discretion; $\Delta DB_t := -ph_t - \chi_{t-1}DB_{t-1}$ is the difference of DB_t and DB_{t-1} in (2.13) if $\eta_t = 0$ and $\theta_t = 0$, as is the case with regard to the calculation of the gross surplus; and $\Delta DB_t^{\leq 0} := DB_t^{\leq 0} - DB_{t-1}^{\leq 0} = -ph_t^{\leq 0} - \chi_{t-1}^{\leq 0}DB_{t-1}^{\leq 0}$. The last quantity is defined as $DB_t^{\leq 0} := LP_t - V_t - DB_t$. At valuation time $t = 0$, $DB_0^{\leq 0} = LP_0 - V_0$ is equal to the accumulated profits that have been shared with the policy holders and that have been set aside as part of the technical reserves LP_0 . The benefits, bf_t , are the sum of all benefits paid out at t , including ph_t and $ph_t^{\leq 0}$. We can thus rewrite (7.40) as

$$\begin{aligned} gs_t^* &= S_t + cf_{assets,t}^* - \rho_t V_{t-1} \\ &\quad + (\text{cost margin}) \\ &\quad + (\text{mortality margin}) \\ &\quad + (\text{surrender margin}) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, if first and second order assumptions coincide, then $gs_t^* = 0$. The sum

$$(\text{cost margin}) + (\text{mortality margin}) + (\text{surrender margin})$$

is generally referred to as the *technical gains*. As opposed to the interest rate gains, $S_t + cf_{assets,t}^* - \rho_t V_{t-1}$, the technical gains are a relatively stable source of income.

7.B. Approximations. Since technical gains are supposed to be stable and independent of interest rate movements, we approximate

$$(7.41) \quad (\text{technical gains}) \sim \gamma \cdot LP_{t-1}$$

where γ is assumed to be constant. See also Section 8.A for a concrete estimation of γ .

We further approximate the interest margin as

$$(7.42) \quad \begin{aligned} cf_{assets,t}^* &= cf_{assets,t} + BV_t - BV_{t-1} \\ &= cf_{assets,t} + MV_t - MV_{t-1} + UG_{t-1} - UG_t \\ &\sim F_{t-1}MV_{t-1} + UG_{t-1} - UG_t \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.43) \quad = F_{t-1}BV_{t-1} + (1 + F_{t-1})UG_{t-1} - UG_t$$

$$(7.44) \quad \sim F_{t-1}BV_{t-1} + \kappa_{t-1}UG_0$$

$$(7.44) \quad \sim F_{t-1}BV_{t-1} + 2^{(t-1)/h} \kappa_{t-1} \frac{UG_0}{LP_0} \cdot LP_{t-1},$$

where we have used the definition of κ_{t-1} in (4.22) and, leaning on Assumption 4.1, that $LP_{t-1} \sim 2^{-(t-1)/h} \cdot LP_0$. The approximation (7.43) and definition (4.22) make sense since we want to capture the effect of the income due to unrealized gains and, on average, most of this income is expected to come from the initial position UG_0 . In a risk neutral projection, assets do not generate unrealized gains on average. However, along individual scenarios unrealized gains or losses do arise; these are omitted in the above approximation. Moreover, since most of the portfolio is expected to be invested in fixed income instruments, the additional income due to unrealized gains is expected to be predominantly generated by assets progressing towards their maturities and the corresponding convergence of market and book values.

Therefore, from Assumption 1.2 we obtain

$$(7.45) \quad gs_t^* \sim (1 + \theta) \cdot F_{t-1} \cdot LP_{t-1} + S_t + \rho_t \cdot (DB_{t-1} + DB_{t-1}^{\leq 0}) + \kappa_{t-1} \cdot UG_0 - (\rho_t - \gamma) \cdot LP_{t-1}$$

7.C. Estimations. Assumption 1.1, which implies that unrealized gains are not realized to generate additional surplus, thus yields

$$(7.46) \quad (gs_t^*)_+ \leq \left((1 + \theta)F_{t-1}LP_{t-1} + \kappa_{t-1}UG_0 - (\rho_t - \gamma)LP_{t-1} \right)_+ + \rho_t(DB_{t-1} + DB_{t-1}^{\leq 0})$$

and

$$(7.47) \quad (gs_t^*)_- \sim \left((1 + \theta) \cdot F_{t-1} \cdot LP_{t-1} + S_t + \rho_t \cdot (DB_{t-1} + DB_{t-1}^{\leq 0}) \right. \\ \left. + \kappa_{t-1} \cdot UG_0 - \rho_t \cdot LP_{t-1} \right)_-$$

$$(7.48) \quad \leq \left((1 + \theta)F_{t-1}LP_{t-1} + \kappa_{t-1}UG_0 - (\rho_t - \gamma)LP_{t-1} \right)_-$$

since $S_t \geq 0$ and $(\rho_t - \gamma) \cdot (DB_{t-1} + DB_{t-1}^{\leq 0}) \geq 0$.

With Assumption 4.1 we thus find

$$(7.49) \quad ph_t^* = gph \cdot (gs_t^*)_+ \leq gph \cdot (1 + \theta) \cdot LP_{t-1} \cdot \left(F_{t-1} - \frac{\rho_t - 2^{(t-1)/h} \kappa_{t-1} \frac{UG_0}{LP_0} - \gamma}{1 + \theta} \right)_+ \\ + gph \cdot \rho_t \cdot (DB_{t-1} + DB_{t-1}^{\leq 0}).$$

8. APPENDIX: PUBLIC DATA

8.A. Estimating technical gains from market data. For the German life insurance market, the factor γ in (7.41) can be determined from Tables 130 and 141 in [23]. The relevant items are stated below:

Item	Value as of 2017	Value as of 2018	Value as of 2019
Überschuss ^a	8.3	9.9	11.3
Direktgutschrift ^b	2.3	2.1	2.1
Zuführung zur RfB ^c	6.4	8.1	9.3
Kapitalanlageergebnis 1 b) ^d	3.5	5.2	6.1
Bilanzposten 6 brutto ^e	991.4	1011.1	1069.1
Bilanzposten a) 6 brutto ^f	109.1	101.7	124.8

TABLE 10. BaFin: public data for 2017-2019. Values are in billion euros.

^agross surplus net of direct policy holder declarations

^bdirect policy holder declarations

^cshare of gross surplus allocated to the surplus fund

^dassets - interest margin

^eTabelle 130, Versicherungstechnische Rückstellungen - selbst abgeschlossenes Geschäft - brutto (technical provisions for direct business, gross of reinsurance)

^fTabelle 130, Versicherungstechnische Rückstellungen - soweit das Anlagerisiko vom Versicherungsnehmer getragen wird - brutto (technical provisions, gross of reinsurance, of those contracts where the investment risk is carried by the policyholder)

In fact,

$$(8.50) \quad \gamma = \frac{\text{Überschuss} + \text{Direktgutschrift} - \text{Kapitalanlageergebnis 1 b)}}{\text{Bilanzposten 6 brutto} - \text{Bilanzposten a) 6 brutto}}$$

We obtain:

	Value as of 2017	Value as of 2018	Value as of 2019
γ	0.80 %	0.74 %	0.78 %

TABLE 11. Values of γ for 2017-2019.

For the estimation of Term III we fix $\gamma = 0.77\%$ as the average of the values in Table 11.

8.B. Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG: publicly reported values. The data in Table 12 is taken from the publicly available reports for the accounting years 2017-2019. For the relevant references see Table 13; and for explanations of the symbols see Table 14.

Symbol	Value as of 2017	Value as of 2018	Value as of 2019
L_0	189.8	201.2	219.6
UG_0	41.4	32.8	54.0
SF_0	10.4	11.0	11.5
Solvency II value of SF_0	10.9	10.5	11.3
GB	154.1	158.8	195.2
FDB	48.6	46.2	47.4

TABLE 12. Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG: public data for 2017-2019. Values are in billion euros.

The value of UG_0 is already scaled to L_0 , which is in line with Assumption 2.3. The reason behind this scaling is that according to [9, § 3] only the fraction of the capital gains, corresponding to the assets scaled to cover the average value of liabilities in the accounting year under consideration, contribute to the gross surplus.

As for L_0 , we adjust the local GAAP value of life insurance with profit participation for necessary regrouping of business, as explained in [18, p. 52], [21, p. 46], [22, p. 46] for the different accounting years 2017–2019.

Symbol	Source for 2017	Source for 2018	Source for 2019
L_0	[18, p. 46, 52]	[21, p. 42, 46]	[22, p. 42, 46]
UG_0	[17, p. 46]	[19, p. 42]	[20, p. 46]
SF_0	[17, p. 55]	[19, p. 51]	[20, p. 55]
Solvency II value of SF_0	[18, p. 52]	[21, p. 46]	[22, p. 46]
GB	[18, p. 46]	[21, p. 42]	[22, p. 42]
FDB	[18, p. 46]	[21, p. 42]	[22, p. 42]

TABLE 13. Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG: references for the data in Table 12.

Symbol	Technical term
L_0	Versicherung mit Überschussbeteiligung
UG_0	Stille Reserven der einzubeziehenden Kapitalanlagen
SF_0	Rückstellung für Beitragsrückerstattung abzüglich festgelegte, aber noch nicht zugeteilte Teile
Solvency II value of SF_0	Überschussfonds
GB	Bester Schätzwert: Wert für garantierte Leistungen
FDB	Bester Schätzwert: zukünftige Überschussbeteiligung

TABLE 14. Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG: technical terms used in any of the sources provided in Table 13.

The average technical interest rate, ρ , of the Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG can be derived from the distribution of the technical reserves over the guaranteed interest rates, with the following results:

	Value as of 2017	Value as of 2018	Value as of 2019
ρ	2.63 %	2.52 %	2.38 %

TABLE 15. Values of ρ for 2017-2019.

The respective values can be found in [17, p. 34], [19, p. 33], and [20, p. 37]. For the base case calculations in Section 5.A we use the corresponding (time independent) values. In reality slightly smaller rates may be more appropriate since the level of guarantee rates is expected to decline over time. A sensitivity which shows the effect of a 10 % reduction in ρ is provided in Section 5.C.

8.C. **Estimating gph .** The net policy holder shares, nph for the accounting years 2017-2019 can be obtained via

$$(8.51) \quad nph = \frac{\text{Zuführung zur RfB} + \text{Direktgutschrift}}{\text{Bruttoüberschuss}}.$$

from the values collected in the table below (see [17, p. 9], [19, p. 9], and [20, p. 8] for accounting years 2017-2019).

Item	Value as of 2017	Value as of 2018	Value as of 2019
Bruttoüberschuss	2.6	3.1	3.6
Zuführung zur RfB	2.0	2.3	2.9
Direktgutschrift	0.1	0.1	0.2

TABLE 16. Values are in billion euros.

The gross policy holder share, gph is calculated from nph according to the relation

$$(8.52) \quad gph = \frac{(1 - \tau)nph}{1 - \tau \cdot nph}.$$

Applying the German tax rate of $\tau = 29.9\%$ [10, p. 16] yields the following table:

Item	Value as of 2017	Value as of 2018	Value as of 2019
nph	80.8 %	77.9 %	85.6 %
gph	74.7 %	71.2 %	80.6 %

TABLE 17. Values of gph for 2017-2019.

For the estimation of Term III we fix $gph = 75.5\%$ as the average of the values in Table 17.

8.D. **Discount rates.** The following are the publicly available EIOPA discount rates for 2017, 2018 and 2019.

t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$
1	1.003	11	0.902	21	0.740	31	0.534	41	0.362	51	0.241
2	1.004	12	0.885	22	0.720	32	0.514	42	0.348	52	0.232
3	1.001	13	0.868	23	0.700	33	0.495	43	0.334	53	0.222
4	0.996	14	0.850	24	0.679	34	0.477	44	0.321	54	0.214
5	0.988	15	0.834	25	0.658	35	0.459	45	0.308	55	0.205
6	0.977	16	0.819	26	0.637	36	0.441	46	0.296	56	0.197
7	0.965	17	0.804	27	0.616	37	0.424	47	0.284	57	0.189
8	0.951	18	0.790	28	0.595	38	0.408	48	0.273	58	0.181
9	0.936	19	0.774	29	0.574	39	0.392	49	0.262	59	0.174
10	0.920	20	0.758	30	0.554	40	0.377	50	0.252	60	0.167

TABLE 18. Euro discount rates as of 31.12.2017. The rates are with volatility adjustment. Source: [16]

t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$
1	1.001	11	0.890	21	0.722	31	0.525	41	0.360	51	0.244
2	1.001	12	0.872	22	0.703	32	0.506	42	0.347	52	0.234
3	0.998	13	0.853	23	0.684	33	0.488	43	0.334	53	0.225
4	0.992	14	0.835	24	0.664	34	0.470	44	0.321	54	0.217
5	0.983	15	0.818	25	0.644	35	0.453	45	0.309	55	0.208
6	0.972	16	0.803	26	0.623	36	0.436	46	0.297	56	0.200
7	0.958	17	0.788	27	0.603	37	0.420	47	0.285	57	0.192
8	0.943	18	0.773	28	0.583	38	0.405	48	0.274	58	0.185
9	0.926	19	0.757	29	0.563	39	0.389	49	0.264	59	0.178
10	0.908	20	0.740	30	0.544	40	0.375	50	0.254	60	0.171

TABLE 19. Euro discount rates as of 31.12.2018. The rates are with volatility adjustment. Source: [16]

t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$	t	$P_{0,t}$
1	1.004	11	0.975	21	0.878	31	0.665	41	0.466	51	0.320
2	1.006	12	0.967	22	0.861	32	0.643	42	0.449	52	0.308
3	1.008	13	0.957	23	0.842	33	0.621	43	0.432	53	0.296
4	1.009	14	0.947	24	0.821	34	0.600	44	0.416	54	0.285
5	1.008	15	0.937	25	0.800	35	0.579	45	0.401	55	0.275
6	1.006	16	0.929	26	0.778	36	0.559	46	0.386	56	0.264
7	1.001	17	0.922	27	0.755	37	0.539	47	0.372	57	0.254
8	0.996	18	0.914	28	0.733	38	0.520	48	0.358	58	0.245
9	0.990	19	0.904	29	0.710	39	0.501	49	0.345	59	0.236
10	0.982	20	0.893	30	0.687	40	0.483	50	0.332	60	0.227

TABLE 20. Euro discount rates as of 31.12.2019. The rates are with volatility adjustment. Source: [16]

REFERENCES

- [1] Albrecher, H., Bauer, D., Embrechts, P. et al. Asset-liability management for long-term insurance business. *Eur. Actuar. J.* **8**, 9–25 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13385-018-0167-5>
- [2] F. Black, *The pricing of commodity contracts*, *J. Financial Economics* **3** (1976), pp. 167-179. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X\(76\)90024-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90024-6)
- [3] D. Brigo, F. Mercurio, *Interest rate models – theory and practice*, Springer 2006.
- [4] J. Dhaene, B. Stassen, K. Barigou, D. Linders, Z. Chen, *Fair valuation of insurance liabilities: Merging actuarial judgement and market-consistency*, *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **76** (2017), pp 14-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.insmatheco.2017.06.003>.
- [5] D. Dorobantu, Y. Salhi, P.-E. Théron, *Modelling Net Carrying Amount of Shares for Market Consistent Valuation of Life Insurance Liabilities*, *Meth. Comput. Appl. Probab.* **22**, pp. 711–745 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11009-019-09729-1>
- [6] H. Engsner, M. Lindholm, F. Lindskog, *Insurance valuation: A computable multi-period cost-of-capital approach*, *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **72** (2017), pp. 250-264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.insmatheco.2016.12.002>
- [7] S. Hochgerner, F. Gach, *Analytical validation formulas for best estimate calculation in traditional life insurance*, *Eur. Actuar. J.* **9**, pp. 423–443 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13385-019-00212-2>
- [8] J. Vedani, N. El Karoui, S. Loisel, J.-L. Prigent, *Market inconsistencies of market-consistent European life insurance economic valuations: pitfalls and practical solutions*, *Eur. Actuar. J.* **7** (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13385-016-0141-z>
- [9] Bundesministerium der Finanzen (BMF), Verordnung über die Mindestbeitragsrückerstattung in der Lebensversicherung.
- [10] Bundesministerium der Finanzen (BMF), *Die wichtigsten Steuern im internationalen Vergleich* (2019).
- [11] Verordnung der Finanzmarktaufsichtsbehörde (FMA) über die Gewinnbeteiligung in der Lebensversicherung.
- [12] Directive 2009/138/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 on the taking-up and pursuit of the business of Insurance and Reinsurance (Solvency II).
- [13] Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/35 of 10 October 2014 supplementing Directive 2009/138/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the taking-up and pursuit of the business of Insurance and Reinsurance (Solvency II).
- [14] Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/2450 of 2 December 2015 laying down implementing technical standards with regard to the templates for the submission of information to the supervisory authorities according to Directive 2009/138/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council
- [15] Bundesgesetz über den Betrieb und die Beaufsichtigung der Vertragsversicherung (Versicherungsaufsichtsgesetz 2016 – VAG 2016)
- [16] Risk-free interest rate term structure: <https://eiopa.europa.eu/regulation-supervision/insurance/solvency-ii-technical-information>
- [17] Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG (2017) Geschäftsbericht. <https://www.allianzdeutschland.de/geschaeftsberichte-der-allianz-deutschland>. Accessed 4 Sep 2020.
- [18] Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG (2017) Bericht über Solvabilität und Finanzlage. <https://www.allianzdeutschland.de/berichte-ueber-solvabilitaet-und-finanzlage>. Accessed 4 Sep 2020.
- [19] Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG (2018) Geschäftsbericht. <https://www.allianzdeutschland.de/geschaeftsberichte-der-allianz-deutschland>. Accessed 4 Sep 2020.
- [20] Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG (2019) Geschäftsbericht. <https://www.allianzdeutschland.de/geschaeftsberichte-der-allianz-deutschland>. Accessed 4 Sep 2020.
- [21] Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG (2018) Bericht über Solvabilität und Finanzlage. <https://www.allianzdeutschland.de/berichte-ueber-solvabilitaet-und-finanzlage>. Accessed 4 Sep 2020.
- [22] Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG (2019) Bericht über Solvabilität und Finanzlage. <https://www.allianzdeutschland.de/berichte-ueber-solvabilitaet-und-finanzlage>. Accessed 4 Sep 2020.

- [23] Bundesanstalt für Finanzdienstleistungsaufsicht (2019) Statistik der BaFin - Erstversicherungsunternehmen - Lebensversicherung. https://www.bafin.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Statistik/Erstversicherer/dl_st_19_erstvu_lv_va_xls.xlsx?__blob=publicationFile