## Longevity risk: past, present and future

Xiaoming Liu

Department of Statistical & Actuarial Sciences Western University

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

### Longevity risk: past, present and future

Xiaoming Liu

Department of Statistical & Actuarial Sciences Western University (former University of Western Ontario)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

### Longevity risk: past, present and future

Xiaoming Liu

Department of Statistical & Actuarial Sciences Western University (former University of Western Ontario) London, Ontario, Canada

July 19-21, 2012, Qingdao

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# London, Ontario, Canada



# Western U., London, Ontario, Canada



# Outline

#### Past: The Meaning of Longevity Risk

Present: Stochastic Mortality Modelling

Time Series Models Affine-Type Diffusion Models Subordinated Markov Mortality Model

Future: Risk Management of Longevity Risk

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# Historical Sweden Male Mortality Data



# Mortality Changes at Different Ages



# Actuarial Perspective on Mortality Study

- Actuaries play a special role in ensuring adequate funds available to make the payments for insured products and social security systems.
- Actuarial calculation normally requires very long-term mortality prediction, say 60 years and above.
- Prospects of longer life are viewed as a positive change for individuals and as a substantial social achievement but unforeseen development could lead to unexpected spending and result in insolvency.
- The main challenge is not the longevity but instead the uncertainty contained in future mortality change.
- Stochastic mortality model is needed for prediction and pricing of mortality/longevity related products.

# Model Selection Criteria

- Tractability: simple, transparent, easy to understand, tractable, etc.
- Meaningfulness: positive, biologically meaningful, consistent with historical data, etc.
- Applicability:
  - Parameter estimates should be robust relative to the period of data and range of ages employed.
  - Forecast levels of uncertainty and central trajectories should be plausible and consistent with historical trends and variability in mortality data.
  - It should be possible to use the model to generate sample paths and calculate prediction intervals.
  - At least for some countries, the model should incorporate a stochastic cohort effect.
  - The model should have a non-trivial correlation structure over age and time.

# Stochastic Mortality Models

Different type of stochastic mortality models have been proposed since 1992.

- Time series models
  - The Lee-Carter model (Lee and Carter, 1992)
  - The Cairns-Blake-Dowd model (Cairns, Blake and Dowd, 2006)
- Affine-type diffusion models
  - Dahl, M. (2004), Biffis (2005), etc
  - Luciano and Vigna (2006), Non-mean reverting process
  - More: Milevsky and Promislow (2001), Ballotta and Haberman (2006), Liu, Mamon and Gao (2011)
- Markovian mortality models
  - The phase-type mortality model (Lin and Liu, 2007)
  - The subordinated Markov mortality model (Liu and Lin, 2012)

# The Lee-Carter (LC) Model

• Let  $m_{xt}$  be the central mortality rate at age x in year t.

The Lee-Carter model (1992)

$$\log m_{xt} = a_x + b_x k_t + \epsilon_{xt},$$
  

$$k_t = k_{t-1} + c + \xi_t, \quad \text{with i.i.d } \xi_t \sim N(0, \sigma^2).$$

Parameters interpretation

- $a_x$  is the general age shape of the  $log(m_{xt})$
- $b_x$  indicates the age response to the impact of  $k_t$
- k<sub>t</sub> is a hidden stochastic process capturing the fluctuations in mortality random change
- Parameter estimation methods:
  - SVD method applied to  $log(m_{xt})$ , Lee and Carter (1992)
  - MLE method applied to (D<sub>xt</sub>, ETR<sub>xt</sub>), Brouhns, Denuit and Vermunt (2002)

# Applying the LC Model to Sweden Male Mortality Data



# Applying the LC Model to Sweden Male Mortality Data



# Applying the LC Model to Sweden Male Mortality Data



# The Fitted Lee-Carter Parameters Using MLE method



# LC Prediction

- Now we have obtained a<sub>x</sub>, b<sub>x</sub> and the model for k<sub>t</sub> using the data from year 0 to t<sub>0</sub>.
- $a_x$  and  $b_x$  will be treated as constants.
- The value of k<sub>t</sub> at time t<sub>0</sub> + n, given the data available up to t<sub>0</sub>, is predicted as follows:

$$\hat{k}_{t_0+n} = k_{t_0} + n \cdot \hat{c} + \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j$$

The future mortality rates and other variables, such as the life expectancy at birth e<sub>0</sub>(t), can all be calculated.

$$m_{xt} = \exp(a_x + b_x \hat{k}_t)$$

$${}_n p_x = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} p_{x+j} = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \exp(-m_{x+j,j})$$

$$S(x, s, t) = \frac{t p_x}{s p_x} \quad \text{for } s < t.$$

# Survivor fan chart for 65-year old males in 2003 from cbdmodel.com



# Advantages and Disadvantages of the LC model

- Simple, transparent, easy to use
- Fit to the historical data well
- Can be used for pricing and reserving calculation
- ► No explicit formula, simulation needed.
- Objective extrapolation, no need for expert opinion.

# Affine-Type Diffusion Models—One Example

Our model is built on the filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}, Q)$ , where Q is a risk-neutral measure and  $\mathcal{F}_t$  is the joint filtration generated by  $r_t$  and  $\mu_t$ .

• The short rate process  $r_t$  follows a Vasicek model

$$dr_t = a(b - r_t)dt + \sigma dW_t^1,$$

where a, b and  $\sigma$  are positive constants and  $W_t^1$  is a standard Brownian motion.

► The force of mortality µ<sub>t</sub> follows a non-mean reverting process, justified in Luciano and Vigna (2006)

$$d\mu_t = c\mu_t dt + \xi dZ_t,$$

where c and  $\xi$  are positive constants and  $Z_t$  is a standard Brownian motion correlated with  $W_t^1$  so that

$$dW_t^1 dZ_t = \rho dt.$$

In other words,  $Z_t = \rho W_t^1 + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} W_t^2$ , where  $W_t^2$  is a standard Brownian motion independent of  $W_{t_{eff}}^1$ .

### No-Arbitrage Evaluation Approach

- We adopt the No-Arbitrage approach for the evaluation of life annuity contract and GAOs.
- ▶ For a life aged x at time 0, under the Q measure:

$$M(T, T+n) = \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} r_{u} du} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \geq T+n\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{T} \right]$$
  
$$= \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \geq T\}} \cdot \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} r_{u} du} e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} \mu_{v} dv} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{T} \right],$$
  
$$a_{x}(T) = \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \geq T\}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} r_{u} du} e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} \mu_{v} dv} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{T} \right],$$
  
$$c(t, T) = \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{t}^{T} r_{u} du} \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \geq T\}} (a_{x}(T) - \mathcal{K})^{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right]$$

$$= \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \geq t\}} \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{t}^{T} r_{u} du} e^{-\int_{t}^{T} \mu_{v} dv} (a_{x}(T) - K)^{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right].$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

### No-Arbitrage Evaluation Approach

- We adopt the No-Arbitrage approach for the evaluation of life annuity contract and GAOs.
- ▶ For a life aged x at time 0, under the Q measure:

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{M}(T,T+n) &= \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} r_{u} du} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \geq T+n\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{T} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \geq T\}} \cdot \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} r_{u} du} e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} \mu_{v} dv} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{T} \right], \\ a_{x}(T) &= \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \geq T\}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} r_{u} du} e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} \mu_{v} dv} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{T} \right], \\ c(t,T) &= \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{t}^{T} r_{u} du} \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \geq T\}} (a_{x}(T) - K)^{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \geq t\}} \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{t}^{T} r_{u} du} e^{-\int_{t}^{T} \mu_{v} dv} (a_{x}(T) - K)^{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right]. \end{split}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

# Liu, Mamon and Gao (2011)

"A comonotonicity-based valuation method for annuity-linked contracts"

 Use the change of numéraire technique twice to simplify the expression.

$$M(T, T+n) = \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \ge T\}} \cdot \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} r_{u} du} e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} \mu_{v} dv} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{T} \right],$$
  

$$M(T, T+n) = \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \ge T\}} B(T, T+n) \mathbf{E}^{\widetilde{Q}} \left[ e^{-\int_{T}^{T+n} \mu(v) dv} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right]$$
  

$$a_{X}(T) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta(T, T+n) e^{-(A(T,T+n)r_{T}+\widetilde{G}(T,T+n)\mu_{T})}$$
  

$$c(t, T) = \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau \ge t\}} \mathbf{E}^{Q} \left[ e^{-\int_{t}^{T} r_{u} du} e^{-\int_{t}^{T} \mu_{v} dv} (a_{X}(T) - K)^{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right]$$
  

$$= M(t, T) \underbrace{\mathbf{E}^{\widehat{Q}} \left[ (a_{X}(T) - K)^{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right]}$$

To derive its comonotonic bounds  ${\tt rest}$   ${\tt rest}$ 

# Advantages and Disadvantages of Affine-type models

- Mathematical tractability
- Well-developed methodology available to be used
- Lack of biological or empirical data evidence to support the use of this type of models.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# Subordinated Markov Mortality Model

 Lin, X. S. and Liu, X. (2007), Markov aging process and phase-type law of mortality, North American Actuarial Journal 11, 92 – 109.

- Markov Aging Process and Phase-type Mortality Model
  - reflects the historic mortality experience;
  - is tractable mathematically, utilizing matrix analytic techniques.
  - has biological interpretation.

# Subordinated Markov Mortality Model (cont.)

- Use a subordinating stochastic process (time-change) to incorporate stochastic mortality such that the stochastic model
  - has desirable properties: longevity risk is reflected in the model and confidence bands of future mortality rates are of banana-shape;

remains mathematically tractable.

# Subordinated Markov Mortality Model (cont.)

- Use a subordinating stochastic process (time-change) to incorporate stochastic mortality such that the stochastic model
  - has desirable properties: longevity risk is reflected in the model and confidence bands of future mortality rates are of banana-shape;
  - remains mathematically tractable.
- Add risk loading parameters to the model for the pricing of mortality linked securities so that
  - we can calibrate the model to market information;
  - the price of basic mortality-linked securities (caplets and floorlets) has a closed form.

# Subordinated Markov Mortality Model (cont.)

- Use a subordinating stochastic process (time-change) to incorporate stochastic mortality such that the stochastic model
  - has desirable properties: longevity risk is reflected in the model and confidence bands of future mortality rates are of banana-shape;
  - remains mathematically tractable.
- Add risk loading parameters to the model for the pricing of mortality linked securities so that
  - we can calibrate the model to market information;
  - the price of basic mortality-linked securities (caplets and floorlets) has a closed form.
- Liu, X. and Lin, X.S. (2012), A Subordinated Markov Model for Stochastic Mortality, *European Actuarial Journal* 2(1): 105-127

# The Baseline Model

- ► Assume the aging process of life (x) follows a finite-state continuous-time Markov process {J<sub>t</sub>; t ≥ 0}.
- The state space of the Markov process is assumed to consist of a set of transient states E = {1, 2, ··· , n} that represent chronological health statuses before death and a single absorbing state Δ representing the death.



### The Baseline Model

The intensity matrix for the transient states is thus given by

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda_1 & \lambda_1' & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_2 & \lambda_2' & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\lambda_3 & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -\lambda_n \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_i' + q_i.$$

 λ<sub>i</sub>' > 0 denotes the aging rate from status i to status i + 1, q<sub>i</sub> > 0 denotes the death rate of the life given that the life is at status i.

# **Estimated aging related parameters**

 

 Table 1: Estimated aging related parameters for Swedish cohorts of year 1811, 1861, and 1911

	Parameters					
Year	$\overline{\lambda}$	b	a	$[i_1,i_2]$	q	p
1811	2.5657	3.1504e-03	1.9888e-03	[42, 99]	9.3157e-09	3
1861	2.4794	4.4825e-03	1.9033e-03	[42, 89]	2.6351e-13	5
1911	2.3707	9.0987e-04	2.8939e-03	[33, 70]	1.8872e-15	6

# Fitted curves on Sweden cohort 1811 to 1911



### The Baseline Model

Let T(x) denote the time till absorption (death) of the Markov process. T(x) has a phase-type distribution with phase-type representation (α, Λ) of order n.

• The survival function of T(x) is

$$S_0(t) = \alpha e^{\mathbf{\Lambda} t} \mathbf{e}, \ t > 0.$$

• The survival function of T(x+s) is

$$rac{S_0(t+s)}{S_0(s)} = lpha_s e^{\mathbf{\Lambda} t} \mathbf{e}, t>0,$$

where

$$\alpha_s = \frac{\alpha \, e^{\Lambda s}}{\alpha e^{\Lambda s} \mathbf{e}}.$$

# The Baseline Model

Let T(x) denote the time till absorption (death) of the Markov process. T(x) has a phase-type distribution with phase-type representation (α, Λ) of order n.

• The survival function of T(x) is

$$S_0(t) = \alpha e^{\mathbf{\Lambda} t} \mathbf{e}, \ t > 0.$$

• The survival function of T(x+s) is

$$rac{S_0(t+s)}{S_0(s)} = lpha_s e^{\mathbf{\Lambda} t} \mathbf{e}, t>0,$$

where

$$\alpha_s = \frac{\alpha \, e^{\Lambda s}}{\alpha e^{\Lambda s} \mathbf{e}}.$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Note: Survival distribution is a deterministic function.

# Gamma Process and Subordinated Aging Process

- The gamma subordinating process:
  - γ<sub>0</sub> = 0;
  - it has independent increments, i.e., for any partition  $0 \le t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n$ , the random variables
    - $\gamma_{t_1} \gamma_{t_0}, \cdots, \gamma_{t_n} \gamma_{t_{n-1}}$  are mutually independent; and
  - ► the increment \(\gamma\_{t+s} \gamma\_t\) has a gamma distribution with mean s and variance \(\nu s\), for any s, t ≥ 0.
- The aging process J<sub>t</sub> is subordinated by the gamma process and the resulting aging process Z<sub>t</sub> is now a subordinated Markov process

$$Z_t = J_{\gamma_t}.$$

# Gamma Process and Subordinated Aging Process

- The gamma subordinating process:
  - γ<sub>0</sub> = 0;
  - it has independent increments, i.e., for any partition  $0 \le t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n$ , the random variables
    - $\gamma_{t_1} \gamma_{t_0}, \cdots, \gamma_{t_n} \gamma_{t_{n-1}}$  are mutually independent; and
  - ► the increment \(\gamma\_{t+s} \gamma\_t\) has a gamma distribution with mean s and variance \(\nu s\), for any s, t ≥ 0.
- ► The aging process J<sub>t</sub> is subordinated by the gamma process and the resulting aging process Z<sub>t</sub> is now a subordinated Markov process

$$Z_t=J_{\gamma_t}.$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

 Interpretation: Allow aging process be altered by external factors randomly

# Survival Index

With the model, we have

$$S(t) = S_0(\gamma_t) = \alpha e^{\mathbf{\Lambda} \gamma_t} \mathbf{e}, \quad t > 0.$$

- ► The new survival function S(t) is a stochastic process and is referred to as the survival index for the cohort under consideration.
- Thus the new mortality model is a stochastic mortality model.

### Term Structure of Mortality

For 0 ≤ s ≤ t, let P(s, t) be the survival function of a life aged x at time 0 to be alive from time s to time t that is measured at time s. {P(s, t); 0 ≤ s ≤ t} is commonly referred to as the term structure of stochastic mortality.

$$P(s,t) = \frac{1}{S(s)} E[S(t)|\mathcal{F}_s],$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_t, t \ge 0$ , is the filtration generated by S(t). • We have shown

$$P(s,t) = \alpha_{\gamma_s} e^{\tilde{\Lambda}(t-s)} \mathbf{e}, \ 0 \le s \le t.$$

As a special case, the term structure at time 0 is given by

$$P(0,t) = \alpha e^{\tilde{\Lambda}t} \mathbf{e}, t \ge 0$$

# Explicit Expression of Term Structure of Mortality

Suppose that the eigenvalues  $-\lambda_1, \dots, -\lambda_n$  of the intensity matrix  $\Lambda$  are distinct. Let  $\mathbf{h_1}, \dots, \mathbf{h_n}$  and  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n$  be their corresponding right and left eigenvectors such that  $\nu_i \mathbf{h_i} = 1$ . It is known that  $\nu_i \mathbf{h_j} = 0, i \neq j, i, j = 1, \dots, n$ . Then, P(s, t) has the phase-type representation  $(\alpha_{\gamma_s}, \tilde{\Lambda})$ , where

$$lpha_{\gamma_s} = rac{lpha \, e^{oldsymbol{\Lambda} \gamma_s}}{lpha e^{oldsymbol{\Lambda} \gamma_s} oldsymbol{e}},$$

and

$$\mathbf{ ilde{\Lambda}} = -\sum_{i=1}^n ilde{\lambda}_i \, \mathbf{h_i} \, oldsymbol{
u_i},$$

with  $\tilde{\lambda}_i$  being given by

$$\tilde{\lambda_i} = \frac{1}{\nu} \ln(1 + \nu \lambda_i).$$

Variance of Survival Index

The variance of S(t) is given by

$$Var[S(t)] = (\alpha \otimes \alpha) \left[ e^{\left( \widetilde{\Lambda \oplus \Lambda} \right) t} - e^{\left( \widetilde{\Lambda} \oplus \widetilde{\Lambda} \right) t} \right] (\mathbf{e} \otimes \mathbf{e}).$$

# Matrix analytic methodology

• Denote 
$$\mathbf{D} = diag(-\lambda_1, \cdots, -\lambda_n)$$
, then

$$\mathbf{D} \oplus \mathbf{D} = diag(\mathbf{D} - \lambda_1 \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{D} - \lambda_2 \mathbf{I}, \cdots, \mathbf{D} - \lambda_n \mathbf{I}),$$

the Kronecker sum of **D** to itself, is diagonal with diagonal entries  $-\zeta_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n^2$ , where  $\zeta_{i+j} = \lambda_i + \lambda_j$ ,  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ . • Denote  $\widetilde{\mathbf{D} \oplus \mathbf{D}} = diag(-\tilde{\zeta}_1, \dots, -\tilde{\zeta}_{n^2})$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{A}} = (\mathbf{H} \otimes \mathbf{H}) \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{D} \oplus \mathbf{D}}\right) (\mathbf{H} \otimes \mathbf{H})^{-1}$ ,

where  $\mathbf{H} = (\mathbf{h}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{h}_n)$  and  $\otimes$  is the symbol for the Kronecker product.

# Variance function $Var[S(t)], t \ge 0$ , for $\nu = 0.5, 1$ and 2



◆□ > ◆□ > ◆三 > ◆三 > 三 のへの

Term structure P(0, t) with one- $\sigma$  confidence intervals, based on  $\nu = 1$ 



◆□ > ◆□ > ◆豆 > ◆豆 > ̄豆 = のへで

## Interpretation of Parameter $\nu$

- ► The curve of the term structure P(0, t), t ≥ 0, exhibits a twisted upward shift as the value of ν increases.
- ► The variance function Var[S(t)], t ≥ 0, increases as v gets larger.
- As a result, parameter ν may be interpreted as the level of longevity risk or the longevity parameter.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Development of Stochastic Mortality Modelling

From 4 talks in IME2006 to 4 sessions in IME2012.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Future: Risk Management of Longevity Risk

Could be my next year's topic at CICIRM.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ