Exhibit 32 As Filed

# PENNSYLVANIA COMPENSATION RATING BUREAU NCCI Filing Memorandum

Attached is an NCCI Filing Memorandum (ITEM R-1395-2005 UPDATE TO RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS ).

The PCRB is filing the Table of Expected Loss Ranges as shown on page 5 of ITEM R-1395.

### FILING MEMORANDUM

#### ITEM R-1395—2005 UPDATE TO RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS PURPOSE

The purpose of this item is to update the Expected Loss Ranges and State Hazard Group Relativities in NCCI's *Retrospective Rating Plan Manual for Workers Compensation and Employers Liability Insurance*.

### BACKGROUND

Retrospective Rating is a plan for adjusting the risk premium of a policy according to the loss experience during the effective period of the policy. At the simplest level, an insured's retrospective premium is determined by the formula  $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{cL})\mathbf{t}$ , where

R	=	Retrospective Premium, subject to minimum and maximum amounts
В	II	Basic Premium
С	=	Loss Conversion Factor, generally reflecting Loss Adjustment Expenses
L	=	Actual Incurred Loss during the effective policy period
t	=	Tax Multiplier

The final retrospective premium, R, is not known until after the policy has expired and the actual losses are fully developed.

The basic premium contains provisions for the expenses of the carriers. It also includes a net insurance charge, which contains a charge to compensate for the possibility that R will exceed the maximum premium amount. Similarly, there is a savings resulting from the possibility that R will be less than the minimum premium amount. The net insurance charge is the difference between the charge for the maximum and the savings from the minimum.

#### **Expected Loss Ranges**

The Table of Insurance Charges contains the excess ratios needed to quantify the insurance charge and savings described above. The ratio of actual losses to expected losses, the entry ratio, is used to look up the values in the Table. The charges depend not only on the maximum and minimum subject losses, but also on the size of the insured. The variation in the loss ratios, hence the charges, of the larger employers that expect many losses should be much lower than the variation for smaller employers.

As inflation increases claim size, there is an apparent growth in size of the insured, measured in expected losses, but no *real* growth in the size of the insured, measured in the expected number of claims. To correct for the impact of loss size inflation, NCCI is proposing that the Table of Expected Loss Ranges be updated for the trend in average size of loss. The last time such an update was made was in 2004 (Item R-1388-2004—Update to Retrospective Rating Plan Parameters). The current Table of Expected Loss Ranges is based on a projected annual increase in severity of 6% from June 22, 2000 to July 1, 2005. We have since observed an actual annualized growth in severity of 10.6% from June 22, 2000 to March 5, 2002, and we project an annual growth in severity of 9% from March 5, 2002 to August 15, 2006. The new table incorporates both of these observed and projected changes in severity.

#### **State Hazard Group Relativities**

The enclosed materials are copyrighted materials of the National Council on Compensation Insurance, Inc. ("NCCI"). The use of these matrials may be governed by a separate contractual agreement between NCCI and its licensees such as an affiliation agreement between you and NCCI. Unless permitted by NCCI, you may not copy, create derivative works (by way of example, create or supplement your own works, databases, software, publications, manuals, or other materials), display, perform, or use the materials, in whole or in part, in any media. Such actions taken by you, or by your direction, may be in violation of federal copyright and other commercial laws. NCCI does not permit or acquiesce such use of its materials. In the event such use is contemplated or desired, please contact NCCI's Legal Department for permission.

# NATIONAL COUNCIL ON COMPENSATION INSURANCE, INC. (Applies in: AK, AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, KS, KY, LA, MD, ME, MO, MS, MT, NE, NH, NM, NV, OK, OR, RI, SC, SD, TN, UT, VT, VA, HI)

# FILING MEMORANDUM

### **ITEM R-1395—2005 UPDATE TO RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS**

The variation in the loss ratios of employers in the lower hazard groups should be smaller than the variation for employers in the higher hazard groups. The State Hazard Group Relativity Factors adjust for this difference by placing lower hazard group employers in a higher Expected Loss Size Range and higher hazard group employers in a lower Expected Loss Size Range than would otherwise be the case. This adjustment affects the column selection in the Table of Insurance Charges, which then impacts the basic premium portion of the retrospective policy premium.

The State Hazard Group Relativities should be updated regularly due to changes in the circumstances (changes in state statutory benefit levels, inflation, etc.) underlying each state's severity.

### PROPOSAL

It is proposed that NCCI's *Retrospective Rating Plan Manual* be amended as contained in the attached exhibits.

#### **Expected Loss Ranges**

This filing updates the Table of Expected Loss Ranges for entry into the Table of Insurance Charges. The proposed ranges are found in Exhibit 2.

#### **State Hazard Group Relativities**

This filing also updates the State Hazard Group Relativities of NCCI's *Retrospective Rating Plan Manual* for each state. Exhibit 1 provides a description of the development of the relativities. As explained in the exhibit, individual state severities, as well as countrywide severities, are used in the calculation of the relativities.

The proposed relativities are found in Exhibit 3.

# IMPACT Expected Loss Ranges

The proposed Expected Loss Ranges are necessary to maintain the aggregate expected balance between the retrospectively rated premium and the guaranteed cost premium. If these ranges were not updated, there would be a natural slippage caused by inflation over time because risks would have an apparent growth in size as seen by increasing expected losses, but no real growth in size as seen by their expected number of claims.

### State Hazard Group Relativities

Retrospective rating should produce premium that is equitably distributed to all insured employers, but on average close to the guaranteed cost in the approved rate. The object of this change is to maintain the aggregate expected balance, but the impact will vary slightly for individual insured employers. Thus, insurance charges and premiums will be higher for some insureds and lower for others. For most of the insured employers electing retrospective rating, the impact on final premium from these changes will be quite small.

The improved equitability from this change will result in slightly lower average insurance charges for some states, and slightly higher for others. However, the statewide impact will be negligible. The program is designed to be revenue-neutral countrywide.

The enclosed materials are copyrighted materials of the National Council on Compensation Insurance, Inc. ("NCCI"). The use of these matrials may be governed by a separate contractual agreement between NCCI and its licensees such as an affiliation agreement between you and NCCI. Unless permitted by NCCI, you may not copy, create derivative works (by way of example, create or supplement your own works, databases, software, publications, manuals, or other materials), display, perform, or use the materials, in whole or in part, in any media. Such actions taken by you, or by your direction, may be in violation of federal copyright and other commercial laws. NCCI does not permit or acquiesce such use of its materials. In the event such use is contemplated or desired, please contact NCCI's Legal Department for permission.

# NATIONAL COUNCIL ON COMPENSATION INSURANCE, INC. (Applies in: AK, AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, KS, KY, LA, MD, ME, MO, MS, MT, NE, NH, NM, NV, OK, OR, RI, SC, SD, TN, UT, VT, VA, HI)

#### FILING MEMORANDUM

#### ITEM R-1395—2005 UPDATE TO RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS IMPLEMENTATION

Exhibit 1 displays an example of the calculation of the development of State Hazard Group Relativities. Exhibits 2 and 3 detail the changes made to NCCI's *Retrospective Rating Plan Manual*.

In all states, **except** Hawaii and Virginia, this item will be implemented effective 12:01 a.m. on October 1, 2005 applicable to new and renewal business only.

In Hawaii, effective date is determined upon regulatory approval of the individual carrier's election to adopt this change.

In Virginia, this item will be implemented for policies effective on or after 12:01 a.m. October 1, 2005.

The enclosed materials are copyrighted materials of the National Council on Compensation Insurance, Inc. ("NCCI"). The use of these matrials may be governed by a separate contractual agreement between NCCI and its licensees such as an affiliation agreement between you and NCCI. Unless permitted by NCCI, you may not copy, create derivative works (by way of example, create or supplement your own works, databases, software, publications, manuals, or other materials), display, perform, or use the materials, in whole or in part, in any media. Such actions taken by you, or by your direction, may be in violation of federal copyright and other commercial laws. NCCI does not permit or acquiesce such use of its materials. In the event such use is contemplated or desired, please contact NCCI's Legal Department for permission.

# FILING MEMORANDUM

### ITEM R-1395—2005 UPDATE TO RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS

### EXHIBIT 1

# DEVELOPMENT OF STATE HAZARD GROUP RELATIVITIES

**Step 1.** Individual state severities are calculated for each hazard group.

**Step 2.** The severities are weighted with the countrywide severities by hazard group using a credibility that varies by state. For this purpose, we regard 155,000 claims as fully credible, and use the square root rule to compute partial credibilities.

**Step 3.** Credibility weighted severities for each state hazard group are produced. A new countrywide average severity is calculated by taking the weighted average of the formula state severities using claim counts as weights.

**Step 4.** The relativities are calculated by dividing the countrywide severity by the individual state hazard group severities.

# Example: State X

<u>Step 1</u>	Hazard Group	State X	<b>Countrywide</b>	
Severities	1 2 3 4	26,850 30,062 48,785 72,951	31,845 36,628 55,055 84,145	
Step 2	Claim Count	57,351		
	Credibility = (57	,351 / 155,000	$)^{0.5} = 0.61$	
Step 3	Hazard Group	State X		
Cred. Wtd. Severities	1 2 3 4	28,798 32,623 51,230 77,317	= 0.61 x 26,850 + 0.39 x 31,845	
	Countrywide Overall: 44,	457		
Step 4	Hazard Group	State X		
Relativities	1 2 3 4	1.54 1.36 0.87 0.57	= 44,457 / 28,798	

Note: The underlying data source for the above calculations is NCCI's **Pre-URE Workers Compensation** Statistical Plan and **URE Workers Compensation Statistical Plan**, excluding medical-only claims. NCCI's **Pre-URE Workers Compensation Statistical Plan** and **URE Workers Compensation Statistical Plan** data for each state is adjusted accordingly, as reflected in the data underlying the Excess Loss Factor (ELF) calculation.

© 2005 National Council on Compensation Insurance, Inc.

R-1395 Page 5

# ITEM R-1395—2005 UPDATE TO RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS

# EXHIBIT 2 RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN MANUAL 2005 EXPECTED LOSS RANGES EFFECTIVE 10/01/05

# 2005—TABLE OF EXPECTED LOSS RANGES

Expected			Expecte	d	Expected		
Loss	Loss Range		Loss	Range	Loss	Range	
Group	Rounded	Values	Group	Rounded Values	Group	Rounded	Values
95 94 93 92 91	835 — 1,304 — 1,931 — 2,550 — 3,371 —	1,303 1,930 2,549 3,370 4,384	65 64 63 62 61	70,026 — 75,631 75,632 — 81,686 81,687 — 88,225 88,226 — 95,287 95,288 — 102,915	35 34 33 32 31	873,373 — 980,597 — 1,100,989 — 1,255,460 — 1,443,071 —	980,596 1,100,988 1,255,459 1,443,070 1,658,718
90 89 88 87 86	4,385 — 5,295 — 6,391 — 7,419 — 8,611 —	5,294 6,390 7,418 8,610 9,987	60 59 58 57 56	102,916 — 111,175 111,176 — 120,208 120,209 — 129,789 129,790 — 139,840 139,841 — 150,672	29 28 27	1,658,719 — 1,906,595 — 2,266,396 — 2,710,116 — 3,240,714 —	1,906,594 2,266,395 2,710,115 3,240,713 3,995,127
85 84 83 82 81	9,988 — 11,296 — 12,770 — 14,421 — 16,046 —	11,295 12,769 14,420 16,045 17,852	55 54 53 52 51	150,673 — 162,344 162,345 — 175,536 175,537 — 189,854 189,855 — 205,344 205,345 — 222,091	24 23 22	3,995,128 — 5,083,916 — 6,469,431 — 8,266,796 — 10,578,148 —	5,083,915 6,469,430 8,266,795 10,578,147 13,535,740
80 79 78 77 76	17,853 — 19,860 — 22,096 — 24,383 — 26,844 —	19,859 22,095 24,382 26,843 29,555	50 49 48 47 46	222,092 — 239,659 239,660 — 258,575 258,576 — 279,120 279,121 — 303,668 303,669 — 330,373	5 19 18 8 17	13,535,741 — 17,320,262 — 22,162,912 — 30,401,011 — 44,962,850 —	17,320,261 22,162,911 30,401,010 44,962,849 66,499,700
75 74 73 72 71	29,556 — 32,479 — 35,559 — 38,929 — 42,625 —	32,478 35,558 38,928 42,624 46,526	45 44 43 42 41	330,374 — 359,428 359,429 — 392,777 392,778 — 429,782 429,783 — 470,277 470,278 — 518,422	2 14 2 13 7 12	66,499,701 — 98,352,527 — 145,462,604— 215,138,028— 336,773,185—	98,352,526 145,462,603 215,138,027 336,773,184 532,910,055
70 69 68 67 66	46,527 — 50,753 — 55,356 — 60,019 — 64,829 —	50,752 55,355 60,018 64,828 70,025	40 39 38 37 36	518,423 — 572,907 572,908 — 633,119 633,120 — 699,659 699,660 — 777,867 777,868 — 873,372	9	532,910,05 <del>6  </del> 843,277,141	843,277,140 & over

# FILING MEMORANDUM

# ITEM R-1395—2005 UPDATE TO RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN PARAMETERS

# **EXHIBIT 3**

#### RETROSPECTIVE RATING PLAN MANUAL STATE HAZARD GROUP RELATIVITIES FFFFCTIVE 10/01/05

	EFFECTIVE 10/01/05 Hazard Group						
State	I	II		IV			
AK	1.35	1.18	0.79	0.51			
AL	1.10	0.97	0.64	0.41			
AR	1.56	1.37	0.91	0.60			
AZ	1.24	1.09	0.73	0.48			
со	1.34	1.17	0.78	0.50			
СТ	1.38	1.22	0.81	0.53			
DC	1.34	1.17	0.78	0.50			
FL	1.38	1.23	0.72	0.46			
GA	1.22	1.09	0.74	0.49			
HI	1.68	1.48	1.00	0.66			
IA	1.57	1.39	0.94	0.62			
ID	1.47	1.31	0.90	0.60			
IL	1.24	1.13	0.78	0.54			
IN	1.66	1.50	1.05	0.72			
KS	1.52	1.35	0.91	0.60			
KY	1.02	0.89	0.59	0.38			
LA	1.16	1.02	0.69	0.45			
MD	1.30	1.16	0.78	0.52			
ME	1.35	1.20	0.81	0.53			
MI	1.55	1.43	0.90	0.61			
MO	1.59	1.42	0.96	0.63			
MS	1.39	1.23	0.83	0.55			
MT	1.20	1.08	0.69	0.44			
NC	1.03	0.91	0.61	0.41			
NE	1.39	1.22	0.81	0.53			
NH	1.38	1.22	0.82	0.54			
NM	1.50	1.31	0.88	0.58			
NV	1.44	1.24	0.80	0.51			
ОК	1.36	1.24	0.80	0.56			
OR	1.62	1.41	0.92	0.59			
RI	1.77	1.55	1.04	0.68			
SC	1.18	1.06	0.69	0.46			
SD	1.50	1.31	0.86	0.56			
TN	1.13	1.01	0.68	0.46			
UT	1.59	1.40	0.94	0.61			
VA	1.21	1.08	0.73	0.48			
VT	1.34	1.19	0.80	0.52			
WI	1.83	1.68	1.11	0.75			