



TO: The Honorable Trinidad Navarro
Delaware Insurance Commissioner

FROM: Brent Otto, FCAS, MAAA
Senior Vice President and Chief Actuary

DATE: July 31, 2026

RE: DCRB Filing No. 2602
Workers Compensation Residual Market Rate and Voluntary Market Loss Cost Filing
Proposed Effective December 1, 2026 (Selected Portions Effective June 1, 2027)

This actuarial memorandum discusses the analysis performed by the Delaware Compensation Rating Bureau, Inc. (DCRB) that results in proposed changes in Residual Market Rates, Voluntary Market Loss Costs, rating values, and supplementary rate information for Workers Compensation insurance in Delaware.

SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED FILING

This filing proposes an overall change in Residual Market Rates and Voluntary Market Loss Costs. The changes vary by class. Associated rating values will also be revised.

Indicated and Proposed Changes	
Residual Market Rates	Voluntary Market Loss Costs
-1.53%	-1.40%

Underlying losses continue to be adjusted to reflect Delaware law after House Bill 373 of 2014 (HB373) (a "post-HB373" basis). The full impact of HB373 contemplated in the law is reflected in this filing. This is discussed further in this memorandum's Technical Discussion and Supporting Information section.


The filing included several considerations related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Regarding the treatment of COVID-19 claims, the December 1, 2026 indication excluded COVID-19 claims from Policy Years prior to 2023. Also, the analysis took into consideration the unusual economic impacts due to the pandemic primarily during Calendar Year 2021. The primary factors influencing this decision were:

- 1.) COVID-19 claims are not a reliable predictor of future losses, given that COVID-19 is viewed as an unusual event that will not re-occur annually or regularly.
- 2.) While economic uncertainty due to the event has lessened, some uncertainty of ultimate costs still exists.
- 3.) This provides consistent handling between claims and economic impacts of the event by not allowing these items to impact the analysis unfairly.
- 4.) Pandemic considerations made in this filing are similar to ones made last year.

Four COVID-19 claims from Policy Year 2019 totaling \$998,109, 29 claims from Policy Year 2020 totaling \$100,168, three claims from Policy Year 2021 totaling \$18,504, and two claims from 2022 totaling \$90,917 were excluded from both Financial and Unit Statistical data. These claims were reported in Delaware Financial Call #15 as of December 31, 2025. Given the limited number and amount of these claims, the decision to include or exclude these claims in this year's filing is immaterial.

The filing included a couple COVID-19 economic-related adjustments due to the unusual nature of the economic shutdowns resulting in some abnormal data patterns that are not expected to continue into future periods. Namely, considerations for policy year weights and on-level adjustments for excess average wage predictions were made.

As shown by the drop in the employment level due to the pandemic in the graph below, Policy Years 2020 and 2021 are being abnormally skewed as a result of the economic shutdowns from the pandemic. Therefore, special considerations were necessary relating to a few pieces of the analysis.



Due to anomalies in Policy Year 2021 data, we continued to place 10% weight on that year, with the remaining weight split evenly between the other Policy Years (2022 through 2024) used in the indications. Since some of the effects related to the pandemic are expected to continue into the future (i.e., workplace trends that support telecommuting workers), that year continues to receive meaningful weight in the indications. The treatment of weights for the pandemic years used in the filing is intended to reflect future expectations and is consistent with the treatment used in last year's filing.

Like last year, consideration was given to adjust for the increase in SAWW when estimating the effect of the 2027 benefit level and frequency calculations due to the unusual jump related to inflationary effects and the shift in employment by sector. A logarithmic model was used to separate and estimate the differences between the typical wage trend, and the excess wage trend present during the pandemic.

The DCRB continues to employ the CPI-U trend in estimating future medical costs. This is done since there is a direct tie from the CPI-U to medical costs through the medical fee schedule, which is not yet fully reflected in the filing data used. While these should track given this correlation, the pandemic created a confounding effect that temporarily suppressed the effect of the medical increases.

The DCRB feels these adjustments are reasonable and necessary to limit the unusual nature of the pandemic from impacting the projection of future rate and loss cost levels in a manner inconsistent with future conditions and expectations.

The supporting exhibits and other attachments accompanying this actuarial memorandum comprise the balance of the filing and provide pertinent information regarding the proposed residual market rates, voluntary loss costs, rating values, supplementary rate information, and supporting information for this filing. An index of exhibits appears at the end of this memorandum.

ADHERENCE TO ACTUARIAL PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS OF PRACTICE

This filing has been developed using actuarial methods consistent with applicable actuarial principles and standards of practice. As developed, filed and distributed by the DCRB, rates and loss costs, represent estimates of future costs. These estimates rely on projections of loss experience (claim costs) to the prospective time period during which they will be in effect. That is, they are estimates of the costs of claims for workers compensation insurance policies to be in effect from December 1, 2026, to November 30, 2027. These claims' ultimate true value is uncertain and will not be known until they have all closed, several decades from now. As a result, estimates of future costs must be used. Adherence to actuarial principles and standards of practice ensures the reasonableness of the estimates, along with their compliance with regulatory requirements.

Four principles are provided in the Casualty Actuarial Society's Statement of Principles Regarding Property and Casualty Insurance Ratemaking. The fourth principle states:

"A rate is reasonable and not excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory if it is an actuarially sound estimate of the expected value of all future costs associated with an individual risk transfer."

Actuarial Standards of Practice (ASOPs) apply to this filing. These documents set forth the standards, including appropriate considerations, that guide an actuary to develop and present the methods and calculations in this filing. These include ASOPs regarding data quality (ASOP 23), credibility (ASOP 25), trend (ASOP 13), risk classification (ASOP 12), communications (ASOP 41), and unpaid claim estimates (ASOP 43) which states:

"The actuary should assess the reasonableness of the unpaid claim estimate, using appropriate indicators or tests that, in the actuary's professional judgment, provide a validation that the unpaid claim estimate is reasonable. The reasonableness of an unpaid claim estimate should be determined based on facts known to, and circumstances known to or reasonably foreseeable by, the actuary at the time of estimation."

Unpaid claim estimates are discussed in this filing in the Loss Development section. While ASOP 43 specifies that it does not apply to "estimates developed solely for ratemaking purposes," the DCRB has nevertheless adhered to the spirit of this standard. The DCRB notes that the estimates

for unpaid claims included in the referenced filing are inherently uncertain. Uncertainty stems from a dependence on facts and circumstances that are unknown currently and other limitations, including the use of aggregate data and legislative uncertainties.

This filing relies on data provided by our member companies; however, in accordance with ASOP 23 Data Quality, the data has been reviewed for reasonableness and consistency. Some examples of review include but are not limited to: identifying and investigating questionable data from the 18 largest carrier groups in Delaware as well as in total for all carriers; comparing the current premium and loss data to the data used in the prior analysis; comparing loss development patterns and several reserving diagnostic triangles.

DISCUSSION OF THIS FILING’S METHODS, ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The proposed residual market rates, voluntary market loss costs, and minimum premiums by classification submitted in this filing reflect the DCRB’s actuarial analysis of all available experience data, enacted legislation, and other relevant factors to establish appropriate and lawful rating values for the policy period beginning December 1, 2026.

Delaware Workers Compensation Insurance Plan - Residual Market Rates

Delaware law requires that a “residual market plan” be filed with the Insurance Commissioner by the advisory organization. Residual market coverage is provided under the auspices of the Delaware Workers Compensation Insurance Plan (Plan). Employers unable to obtain workers compensation insurance in the voluntary market may apply to the Plan. An insurance carrier is then assigned to administer coverage for that employer, either as a servicing carrier, on behalf of the Plan, or on a direct assignment basis.

In this filing, as in filings since the inception of the surcharge program (discussed below in Exhibit 19), the expected amounts of the Plan surcharges are accounted for in the form of offsets to voluntary market loss costs. The average change in collectible rate level for the residual market, prior to the effect of Plan surcharges proposed in this filing, is a change of -1.53%.

The components of the proposed overall change in residual market rates are shown below with their impact on the filing indication.

Components of Indicated Change in Residual Market Rates		
	Component	Impact on Indication
1	Limited Medical Loss	-1.49%
2	Limited Medical Trend	-0.58%
3	Medical Excess Loss	-0.94%
	SUBTOTAL: MEDICAL LOSS	-2.97%
4	Limited Indemnity Loss	+0.19%
5	Limited Indemnity Trend	+0.68%
6	Indemnity Excess Loss	+0.74%
	SUBTOTAL: INDEMNITY LOSS	+1.62%
7	Loss Adjustment Expense	-0.65%
8	Loss-Based Assessments	+0.60%

9	July 1, 2027 Benefit Level Change	+0.05%
10	Underwriting Expense	-0.14%
	SUBTOTAL: OTHER	-0.13%
	OVERALL INDICATED RATE CHANGE	-1.53%
Note that the total results from converting the percentages to factors (e.g., -1.53% is 0.9847, in factor form) and calculating the product of the 10 factors.		

Voluntary Market Loss Costs

Since the enactment of House Bill 241 in 1993, Delaware law has applied a “loss cost” approach to pricing of workers compensation insurance written in the voluntary market. Under this system, the advisory organization (i.e. the DCRB) filings are limited to prospective loss costs, which reflect loss and loss adjustment expense, policy forms, uniform classification and experience rating plans and rules, and supporting information. Advisory organization filings specifically exclude provisions for profit and expenses other than loss adjustment expenses and loss-based assessments. Provisions for profit and expenses, other than loss adjustment expenses and loss-based assessments, are incorporated into voluntary market workers compensation rates by competitive filings made by each insurer. Insurer expense filings may adopt loss costs filed by the advisory organization, or the rates and supplementary information filed by another insurer, by reference, with or without deviation.

Consistent with past practice, in this filing, the DCRB has derived indicated changes in voluntary market loss costs directly from the proposed residual market rate change discussed above. This derivation is accomplished by removing from the rate proposal the combined effects of all provisions for profit and expenses, other than loss adjustment expenses and loss-based assessments. As a result, like the proposed changes in Plan rates, these revisions in overall voluntary market loss costs are based on statewide experience.

The relationship between collectible residual market rates and voluntary market loss costs is based on a loss cost multiplier (LCM) derived from industry underwriting expenses (Exhibit 11), including the underwriting profit provision from the internal rate of return analysis (Exhibit 9). Under Delaware law, loss adjustment expenses and loss-based assessments are included in the loss costs filed by the DCRB. The LCM is the reciprocal of the ratio of loss, loss adjustment expense, and loss-based assessments to premium. In the previous filing, the proposed LCM was 1.2958 ($= 1 \div 0.7717$).

The loss cost multiplier in this filing is 1.2942 ($= 1 \div 0.7727$). Exhibit 12, Page 12.1, Line (9), reflects this modification to the DCRB’s standard calculations. The table below provides the details.

Delaware Loss, Loss Adjustment Expense, Underwriting Expense and Profit		
Item	Current Provision as a Percent of Premium	Proposed Provision as a Percent of Premium
Loss	58.00	58.14
Loss Adjustment Expense	15.13	14.65
Commission	5.40	5.63
Other Acquisition	1.56	1.51
General Expenses	2.87	2.63

Premium Discount	7.94	8.06
State Premium Tax	2.00	2.00
Other State Taxes	0.29	0.29
Uncollectible Premium	4.07	4.39
Administrative Assessment *	4.04	4.48
Workers Compensation Fund	2.00	2.00
Underwriting Profit	-3.30	-3.78
Loss, LAE, Administrative Assessment	77.17	77.27
* Denotes loss-based assessment		

Using the proposed provision for loss, loss adjustment expense and loss-based assessments (the provision for loss costs), the indicated change in voluntary market loss costs is -1.40%, which is computed as follows:

$$0.9847 \times 0.7727 / 0.7717 = 0.9860$$

The proposed decrease in voluntary market loss costs is attributable to the same factors as those that impact residual market rates, except that the effects of expense provisions, other than loss adjustment expense and loss-based assessments, do not apply to loss costs.

It is important to note that the net effect of the proposed loss costs on ultimate prices for employers that will be insured in the voluntary market (the majority of insured risks) may differ significantly from employer to employer and from insurer to insurer. Workers compensation insurance prices for these employers will be a function of individual carrier decisions. Each carrier may elect to use DCRB's loss costs by reference, deviate from those loss costs, file independent loss costs, or use loss costs filed by another insurer by reference. In addition, employers may elect to switch to a different insurance carrier, further expanding the range of possible price changes that individual risks may experience. These factors influencing the ultimate price impact of the DCRB filing are inherent to any competitive pricing system.

Residual Market Surcharge, Exhibit 19

Experience of employers insured under the Plan has historically presented an aggregate loss ratio higher than that of employers insured in the voluntary market. As shown in Exhibit 19, the loss ratio for the accounts in the Plan is about 58% higher than the loss ratio for voluntary business for the 5-year period 2019-2023.

During the late 1980s and early 1990s, Delaware had seen persistent increases in the portion of the market insured in the Plan. In a previous response to these concerns, the DCRB filed, and the Insurance Commissioner approved, a Plan surcharge program in 1997 that incorporated the following features:

- Surcharges are limited to risks eligible for experience rating and only apply to risks with debit experience modifications (i.e., those employers with demonstrably higher than average experience).

- To avoid redundant or inequitable penalties, surcharges are applied only to the extent that each employer is not fully credible in the Experience Rating Plan. This procedure assesses larger proportional surcharges to small employers, who are largely protected from the effects of their own experience in the Experience Rating Plan but reduces surcharges applicable to larger employers whose premiums significantly respond to their own loss records.
- Surcharges are limited to the debit portion of each risk's experience modification. This limitation provides a smooth transition from non-rated to experience-rated risks and/or small experience rating credits to small experience rating debits.

The surcharge expressed as a factor to be applied to the standard premium is computed using the following formula:

$$0.50 \times (1.000 - \text{risk credibility in the Experience Rating Plan})$$

As noted above, Plan loss ratios continue to be higher than those of the voluntary market. The portion of the Delaware workers compensation market insured under the Plan declined from a high of approximately 20% in 2005 to a current low of about 4% in the last three years.

This filing retains the Plan surcharge program as a disincentive for employers to have their Delaware workers compensation insurance coverage placed in the Plan.

The DCRB estimates that the surcharge program will produce an average surcharge for subject risks of 14.0% of premium. Recognizing that some employers insured in the Plan do not qualify for experience rating and that other employers insured in the Plan qualify for experience rating but produce credit modifications, the surcharges produced by the proposed procedure would represent approximately 3.2% of total Plan premium.

The full amount of this surcharge premium is recognized in the calculation of proposed voluntary market loss costs for this filing. This approach reduces manual loss costs less than 1% and essentially produces three different benchmark loss cost levels underlying workers compensation insurance rates in Delaware. These different underlying loss cost levels are as defined below:

1. Plan risks subject to surcharges (highest level depending on individual risk experience)
2. Plan risks not subject to surcharges (based on statewide average experience)
3. Voluntary market risks (based on statewide average experience reduced by offset for surcharges applied to the first group above)

The Plan surcharge approach does not fully address the loss ratio difference between the residual and voluntary markets, however it is a practical, but limited step toward reducing Plan subsidies and providing meaningful disincentives for placement of employers in the Plan.

Delaware Construction Classification Premium Adjustment Program (DCCPAP), Exhibit 14

This filing proposes to update the reference to calendar quarter(s) used as the basis for determining qualifying wages for DCCPAP and update the table of qualifying wages underpinning that program consistent with recent changes in the Statewide Average Weekly Wage in Delaware.

Other Filing Provisions

In addition to proposed residual market rates, voluntary market loss costs, and residual market surcharges, this filing addresses other rating values, programs, rules, and procedures which are integral parts of the Delaware workers compensation insurance system. In general, the filing's

proposals simply reflect parametric changes in various rating values consistent with the most recent available Delaware experience. Detailed information supporting each of these proposals is provided elsewhere in this filing. Here is a brief synopsis of these other changes:

Item	Filing Exhibit(s)	Proposed Change	Purpose
DCCPAP Program – Effective June 1, 2027	14	Revise manual rating value offsets & wage table	Maintain revenue balance of the program
Minimum Premium (Residual Market)	11, 27	Update parameters	Update for wage inflation
Excess Loss Factors	17b, 17c	Update ELF's	Maintain accuracy of rating values based on current data
Excess Loss Premium Factors	17d, 17e	Update ELPF's	Maintain accuracy of rating values based on current data
Experience Rating Plan	13, 20, 21, 27	Update Rating Values	Maintain accuracy of rating values based on current data
Small Deductible Program	16	Revise existing premium credit and loss elimination ratio schedules	Maintain accuracy of rating values based on current data
Tax Multiplier	25	Update to tax multiplier	Maintain accuracy of rating values based on current data
Workplace Safety Program	29	Revise manual rating value offsets	Maintain revenue balance in the program
Merit Rating Plan	29	Revise manual rating value offsets	Maintain revenue balance in the program

TECHNICAL DISCUSSION AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Attached are exhibits and materials that provide technical support for the filing. In addition to the following discussion, each exhibit begins with one or more pages of explanatory and technical details for the calculations that it contains. To highlight some of the more important aspects of the DCRB's technical analysis, the following discussion will address each of the following topics:

- Treatment of legislative and regulatory changes
- Effects of large losses on the experience analysis
- Estimation of policy year ultimate loss and loss adjustment expense ratios

- Trend provisions: Frequency, Severity
- Determination of the permissible loss ratio for proposed residual market rates
- Considerations regarding the Experience Rating Plan

Unless otherwise stated, the discussion and exhibits use experience from financial data collected by the DCRB in its annual financial data calls. These are the major topics underlying the proposed changes in residual market rates and voluntary market loss costs.

Treatment of Legislative and Regulatory Changes

Four major legislative changes have impacted medical expenditures in Delaware: Senate Bill 1 of the 144th General Assembly (SB1), Senate Bill 238 of the 146th General Assembly (SB238), House Bill 175 of the 147th General Assembly (HB175), and House Bill 373 of the 147th General Assembly (HB373). The estimated impacts of each of these four laws were provided in previous DCRB filings. The underlying losses are adjusted to reflect Delaware law after the impacts of these four laws (a post-HB373 basis). The calculations underlying the adjustment of unlimited losses to a post-HB373 basis are in Exhibit 1 – Unlimited Losses. The adjustment of losses to a common baseline in Delaware law allows the analysis of the underlying loss development and loss trend on a basis that is neutral to changes in law. Two additional pieces of legislation, House Bill 166 of the 148th General Assembly (HB166) and Senate Bill 164 of the 153rd General Assembly (SB164), supplemented changes in these other bills. The DCRB expects de minimis impacts on medical expenditures from these two pieces of legislation; therefore, no specific legislative adjustments were included.

The law adjustment factors were developed separately for paid and incurred losses. The HB373 adjustment factors assume that payments were reduced consistent with the percentages stated in the law. The incurred factors also incorporate case adjustments to reflect the impact of HB373 as was done in past filings. Each reserve level change was distributed evenly over a 36-month period, beginning from the effective dates of the medical fee schedule changes in 2015 through 2017.

Additional details regarding legislative changes can be found in the Appendix at the end of this memorandum.

Effects of Large Losses on the Experience Analysis, Exhibit 1a

The analysis of residual market rates and voluntary market loss costs performed by the DCRB includes methods to reduce the impact of a small number of large claims in a given year. Starting in the December 1, 2004 filing, the DCRB has applied procedures that perform loss development and trend analyses on a “limited” basis and then account for the expectation that claims exceeding the selected limit will occur and be averaged over longer periods by adding an excess loss factor to the rate level analysis. This filing continues this approach.

Loss amounts are stated on a post-HB373 basis reflecting the benefit level and system provisions to the medical fee schedule completed on January 31, 2017. Loss development and trend analyses are conducted using losses at the post-HB373 level. The loss limit was also adjusted to be stated on a post-HB373 basis.

The methods and steps regarding loss limits and trends are outlined briefly below:

1. December 1, 2004, loss limit (\$1,043,461 on a post-HB373 basis) and the associated excess loss factor (0.0757) were taken as a key reference point for the determination of appropriate loss limitations for this filing.
2. Approved excess loss factor tables prior to December 1, 2004, were used to establish loss limitations consistent with an excess loss factor of 0.0757.
3. An annual trend rate was computed for the loss limits established in step 2 above.
4. Loss limits were interpolated for each policy period prior to December 1, 2004, based on the trend in loss limits through December 1, 2004.
5. Loss limitations consistent with an excess loss factor of 0.0757 for filings through December 1, 2025, were used to derive post-2004 annual trend rates. After a review of recent changes in loss limitations, an average annual change of 2.76% was selected for Policy Years 2017 and subsequent. The filing continued to reflect a selected average annual change of 4.61% for Policy Years 2005 through 2016 and 6.27% for Policy Years 1983 through 2004.
6. Loss limits were projected for each policy period after December 1, 2004, based on the trends in loss limits through December 1, 2026.
7. A series of loss limitations was selected for previous policy years consistent with the trend through December 1, 2004, applied retrospectively from that date and consistent with the trend from December 1, 2004, through December 1, 2025, applied prospectively from December 1, 2004, such that losses were capped at successively lower levels for older policy years, recognizing the impacts of wage and price inflation and potential changes in utilization over time. For policy years prior to 1984, a constant loss limitation of \$275,196 was applied.
8. Reported paid and case incurred losses were adjusted, as needed, to limit underlying loss data to the selected limitations by policy year. These can be found in Exhibit 1 – Limited Losses.
9. Loss development analysis was performed using the limited loss data produced above.
10. Trend analysis was accomplished by dividing the observed limited loss ratios into separate components for claim frequency and claim severity, and prospective trends were selected for each component.
11. A loss limitation was selected for the prospective rating period based on the post-2004 projections. This selection was \$2,003,421 on a post-HB373 basis.
12. The portion of losses to be removed from Delaware experience was determined based on the selected loss limitations.
13. Trended limited loss ratios were adjusted to an unlimited basis by application of an excess loss factor, from which point the rate level analysis could proceed in the usual fashion.
14. The limited losses process described above results in an Excess Loss Factor of 8.23% compared to 8.76% applied last year. The detail determination of this factor is described later in the memorandum.

Estimation of Policy Year Ultimate Loss and Loss Adjustment Expense Ratios, Exhibit 2 – Limited Losses

Much of the analytical effort required in workers compensation insurance ratemaking is devoted to evaluating loss experience from prior periods. Results of past experience form a vitally important base of information when developing the prospective estimates in this filing. Since workers compensation losses are often paid over an extended period after an accident occurs and a claim is filed, results of recent periods of experience must be estimated before ratemaking analysis based on those prior periods may proceed.


While the above is still true, the effects from the pandemic in recent years have made using past experience without additional considerations or adjustments inappropriate for some assumptions. This significant event has caused the experience from these years to be less indicative of future periods. The DCRB has considered estimating ultimate policy year loss and loss adjustment expense ratios at length in preparing this filing. In evaluating the results of the methods in this filing, information gleaned from the DCRB's Unit Statistical Plan data was also used.

For medical, the historical incurred tail method uses a 10-year excluding high and low average to reduce the effects of abnormal points, while for indemnity the 10-year average was selected. The Weibull Curve Fit method continued to be used as the second method with Exhibit 3, Page 3 showing curve fits for both indemnity and medical. In general, stability in the methods was observed with both the indemnity and medical tails being very similar to the selections last year. Stability is desired for any tail factor method, especially when using actual data points that can be volatile. The final incurred tail factor selections were the result of averaging the two methods, as shown in Exhibit 3, Page 1.

The tail factors for paid loss development are based on the incurred loss tail factors and a paid-to-incurred ratio or paid "bridge factor". A curve fit is performed on a broader set of data based on the paid-to-incurred ratio triangle to better determine the bridge factors for indemnity and medical losses (Exhibit 3, Pages 4 and 5). The curve fit projected paid-to-incurred ratios to the 50th report level, when virtually all the claims have been settled. Exhibit 3, Page 6 also graphically shows the two selected curve fits, and the resulting bridge factors based on the average of the points between the 20th and 50th reports. The bridge factors are then multiplied by the incurred tail factors to calculate the paid tail factors in Exhibit 3, Page 1.

Paid loss development factors are used through the 20th report and then developed to ultimate using the paid tail factor applied at the 20th report. The individual development factors for each report are accumulated into report-to-ultimate factors, shown in Exhibit 2 – Limited Losses as "Cum LDF". The product of the report-to-ultimate factors and the most recent valuation of paid loss or case incurred loss, as appropriate, produces estimates of ultimate loss for all policy years displayed. This produces estimates of ultimate loss for indemnity and medical on both an incurred and a paid basis. The resulting projected ultimate losses can be seen in Exhibit 2 – Limited Losses, Page 4 for indemnity and Page 8 for medical. The resulting projected ultimate loss ratios appear on Exhibit 2 – Limited Losses, Page 5 for indemnity and Page 9 for medical.

The DCRB continued to use a 4-year average of indemnity age-to-age development factors to estimate ultimate loss and loss adjustment expense ratios. For medical, a 4-year average was also selected rather than an 8-year average used previously to balance the volatility borne out of the reforms with older years to provide stability. Now that the newer years appear more stable themselves, it was determined that the 4-year average can once again be selected. This change resulted in approximately -1% change in the indication.



Premium and Indemnity On-Level factors are shown in Exhibit 6. These are used to adjust premium and indemnity losses to the same level enabling the adjustment of historical data to current levels for projecting future periods.

Claim closure rates, seen in Exhibit 7, have generally been increasing, though the most recent valuations show flatter or even a dip in results. Exhibit 7 also shows a review of the portion of reported losses paid at successive annual stages, from financial data, showing some signs of improvement.

Consistent with historical practices, estimates of ultimate indemnity and medical losses in the filing are based on the average of the case incurred loss development method and paid loss development.

In addition, the following approach is used to smooth fluctuations arising due to the limited volume of data available for the analysis:

- Use of 4-year averages for indemnity and medical when selecting loss development factors
- Smooth loss development factors using various mathematical models and curves fitted through the observed multi-year averages
- Use trend procedures which rely on multi-year averages rather than individual year ultimate loss and loss adjustment expense ratios

A comparison of results of loss development methods used in the filing may be seen on the enclosed Exhibit 2 – Limited Losses at the top of Page 5 for indemnity loss and at the top of Page 9 of the same exhibit for medical loss.

Trend Provisions, Exhibit 12

Each filing applies to a prospective time-period. Since historical data is used in the analysis, it is necessary to account for any anticipated changes in loss ratios between the end of the available data and the policy period to which the proposed rates will apply. This is known as “trend” analysis.

Since 2002, the DCRB has used a trend approach that separates policy year-loss ratio trends into frequency and severity components. Frequency is measured as indemnity claims per unit of expected loss at a constant DCRB rate level. The use of expected loss in the frequency calculation incorporates exposure trend but is not affected by loss cost changes.

Policy year-on-level ultimate loss ratios are adjusted to a series of severity ratios by removing the effects of actual observed changes in the frequency of indemnity claims. The resulting severity ratios represent the policy year loss ratios that would have applied if all years had the same claim frequency. The result is a series of indices of claim severity. Loss ratio trends can then be derived as the combined result of separately determined claim frequency and claim severity trends. The goal of both the frequency and severity trend analyses is to develop the best estimate of frequency and severity in the upcoming policy period.

Frequency

Frequency analysis is based on Unit Statistical Data as shown in Exhibit 4. The changes in claim frequency by policy year range from +3.7% to -13.9%, with seven of the ten years showing decreases. The average annual change over the 10 years is -5.0%. The newest data includes Policy Year 2024, which changed by +1.0% compared to Policy Year 2023. While there is variability in the year-to-year changes, overall frequency continues to decline.

The pandemic caused anomalous growth in wages for a few years. Expected losses were on-leveled to account for this excess wage growth. Since the wage trend is not wholly removed from the expected losses for DCRB’s frequency analysis, the expected losses for years prior to the pandemic were increased by factors to bring them to the same basis as the newer years, only allowing for the historical wage trend, which is expected to persist into the future, to have an effect. The results of the model used to determine both the normal and excess wage trends can be found on page 1 of Exhibit 4.

Claim counts have continued to be developed to an ultimate level. Exhibit 4, Page 2 shows the reported claim count development triangle and development factors. The statewide volume of data produces stable and consistent factor selections. There was limited development beyond the 5th report, so unity factors are used beyond that point.

Given the volatility in claim frequency data, several approaches to estimate the claim frequency trend were reviewed for this filing. A 7-point exponential trend selection used in previous filings was applied to the claim frequency data, resulting in a selected frequency trend of -6.0%, which is slightly higher than -6.2% selected in last year’s filing.

Severity

In estimating claim severity trends, exponential trend models are applied to the policy year severity ratios produced by the loss development methods discussed above. Indemnity and medical ratios were treated separately, and for each method, the exponential models were reviewed over various time periods.

For indemnity benefits, a 7-point exponential trend model was applied, which gave a severity trend of 0.0%, based on Policy Years 2018 to 2024. When combined with the frequency trend, the resulting indemnity loss ratio trend is -6.0% per year.

Indemnity loss ratios for this filing were then trended to December 1, 2027, the midpoint of the prospective rating period, by applying the claim frequency and claim severity trends to each of the most recent four policy year loss and loss adjustment expense ratios. The final projected indemnity loss and loss adjustment expense ratio, 0.3740, is based on the selected policy year weights of 10% placed on 2021, and 30% on the years 2022, 2023 and 2024. The abnormally low policy year 2021 is clearly impacted by the pandemic, and future loss ratios are expected to be relatively higher in the future, and more similar to those observed in 2022 through 2024.

The same claim frequency trend analysis described above was used for medical benefits. While claim frequency is measured only on indemnity claims, most medical benefit dollars are attributable to indemnity cases. This approach is consistent with prior filings.

Consistent with last year's filing, an average of the historical severity loss trend and CPI-U trend fit were used for medical. The trends were selected using a 7-point exponential trend fit and the results from the CPI-U 7-point fit. This resulted in a selected annual trend rate of +2.1%, which is lower than last year's selection at 2.7%. When combined with the frequency trend, the resulting medical loss ratio trend is -4.1% per year.

Including CPI-U trend data in the medical severity trends is necessary since the historical data does not fully reflect future costs related to the economic shifts from the pandemic. Higher medical fee schedules tied directly to the CPI-U will impact future periods differently from the patterns contained in the historical filing data. The CPI-U (rolling 12-month average from December to November) is the basis for the annual changes in the medical fee schedule starting on January 31, 2018, after the 3-year reform period concluded. Since the filing relates to a prospective period starting 12/1/2026, these cost changes need to be considered. The selection recognizes that only about 50% of the medical payments are driven by the fee schedule, while the other 50% are from individually negotiated contracts, making an average of the two methods reasonable.

Medical loss ratios for this filing were then trended to December 1, 2027, the midpoint of the prospective rating period, by applying the claim frequency and claim severity trends to each of the most recent four policy year loss and loss adjustment expense ratios. The final projected medical loss and loss adjustment expense ratio, 0.2756, is based on the selected Policy Year weights of 10% placed on 2021 and 30% on 2022, 2023, and 2024 as discussed above.

Determination of the Permissible Loss Ratio for Proposed Residual Market Rates, Exhibit 9

It is common in preparing workers compensation rate filings to use methods that explicitly recognize investment income in concert with anticipated cash flows, benefit costs and expense needs. The actual methods used differ from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. The DCRB's approach has been to directly compute a permissible loss and loss adjustment expense ratio consistent with an independently established target rate of return. This is the same approach as has been used in previous annual filings.

The prospective determination of an appropriate overall rate of return, which workers compensation insurers should be entitled to earn given the risk they assume in underwriting this line of business, is accomplished by a variety of economic analyses which are generally based on expected returns for businesses subject to risk levels comparable to that of underwriting workers compensation insurance. These methodologies proceed by establishing a set of total

cash flows representing the various transactions related to the underwriting of workers compensation insurance. These cash flows include the expected patterns for the receipt of premiums, payment of losses and expenses, use of tax credits and/or payment of tax obligations, use of debt and maintenance of surplus funds in support of the business. Expense levels to which expense cash flows apply are determined based on historical experience.

Estimates of the probable investment results that an insurer who underwrites workers compensation insurance may expect to achieve were made by reviewing existing insurer investment portfolios and prevailing investment returns on various forms of investments. Applying these estimates to the previously established cash flows allows an explicit presentation of the effects of investment income throughout a book of workers compensation policies and an estimate of the value of that income to the insurer.

Based on the set of cash flows determined to apply to prospective policies and the estimated parameters of investment yields, federal tax laws, etc., these methods model all expected cash flows over the entire period during which payments attributable to a given policy period are expected to continue. For any given loss provision in rates, the present value of these cash flows can then be consolidated and compared to the target rate of return. The loss provision accomplishing a balance between the expected and target rates of return then becomes the basis for the permissible loss ratio. Within the Internal Rate of Return (IRR) Model used by the DCRB, the loss provision includes a provision for amounts generally related to losses such as loss adjustment expense and loss-based assessments.

This filing recognizes investment income on reserve and surplus funds and the cost of debt capital in determining the overall expected return for carriers from writing workers compensation business in Delaware.

The model includes debt capital as part of the weighted average cost of capital. The primary reasons supporting this are:

1. Debt capital is part of the statutory surplus.
2. Insurance company debt/capital ratios have risen over the past 20 years.
3. The inclusion of debt capital is a common industry best practice.

The analysis supporting this filing uses a similar IRR model to previous filings. This filing indicates a needed underwriting profit provision of -3.78% compared to last year's underwriting profit provision of -3.30%. This difference is driven by the continued increase in investment yields over the past few years.

For this filing, an independent economic consultant was again retained to perform the above-described analyses. Results of this work are presented in complete detail in Exhibit 9.

Additional expense provisions are shown in Exhibit 8, and the expense loading is shown in Exhibit 11.

Experience Rating Plan

The Experience Rating Plan (ERP) provides a prospective means of recognizing differences in loss potential between employers. This recognition is accomplished by means of a comparison of each qualifying employer's loss and exposure experience over a specified period (experience period) to the average experience of all employers engaged in similar businesses.

The performance of the ERP is reviewed as part of its analysis supporting each annual rating value filing submitted to the Department of Insurance. Fluctuations in plan results, in particular movement in the average experience modification produced by the plan, are measured and accounted for in the derivation of proposed changes in manual rates and loss costs. This approach allows the ERP to reallocate premium obligations among insureds based on the merits of individual past experience, however does not either increase or reduce the total amount of premium indicated by the DCRB's filings of residual market rates and voluntary market loss costs.

Based on the Collectible Premium Ratios used to derive manual rating values for purposes of this filing on the most recent three completed available years of Market Profile data as shown in Exhibit 20; this approach is used to support the proposed collectible rate and loss cost changes and to provide more current recognition of the probable impact of experience rating for the upcoming rating period.

Determination of Class Specific Rates and Temporary Staffing Classes

Exhibit 15 provides an overview of the classification loss cost formulae used in preparation of this filing. These procedures are consistent with previously submitted and approved methods. Exhibit 32 calculates temporary staffing rates based on the methodology presented in DCRB Filing No. 2012.

Excess Loss Load

Exhibit 18 details the calculations for the excess loss load applied to ultimate limited losses, which incorporates three actuarially accepted methods to appropriately reflect developed losses above the selected limitations. The three methods, Excess Loss Factors (ELF) method, and the implied and direct excess loss development methods, have equal weight applied to each for determining the excess loss load. The implied excess method uses the developed and trended limited and unlimited losses shown in the filing. To appropriately delineate the two datasets, limited and unlimited severity trends were used respectively. The unlimited severity trends can be found in *Exhibit 2 - Unlimited*. The difference between these sets of losses gets the implied excess losses that were then compared to premium to calculate an excess loss ratio.

For the direct development method, excess losses were used to determine link ratios and longer averages at each development period were used to fit a curve for the first 19 points. A tail was calculated using the Weibull method, similar to what is used in the limited loss development process. Exhibit 18, Page 1, shows the results of all three methods and the weighted selection to premium of 5.83%. Moving to equal weights for the three methods had an impact of +0.7-points compared to the weights employed in the last filing.

Excess Loss (Pure Premium) Factors

The loss cost filings typically include rating values for various rating plans affected by the size of loss for individual claims or occurrences. Limitations applicable to the amount(s) of loss can be used in computing a retrospective premium. This filing continued to use the same Hazard Groups. Other portions of this analysis facilitate the application of standard tables to Delaware business.

Exhibit 17a shows empirical distributions of Delaware losses by claim size. These distributions are derived from three years of experience. To determine the final excess loss factors, separate

analyses of claim frequency and loss severity were performed, and a lognormal distribution was used to estimate claim severity and claim frequency for each type of injury. To produce the final loss distributions and excess loss factors, actual data (claim counts and dollars of loss) for limits below \$250,000 were combined with fitted counts and dollars above \$250,000 and reaccumulated. The resulting excess loss factors by loss limitation and empirical Hazard Group relativities are also presented in Exhibit 17b.

Exhibit 17b-e shows the derivation of excess loss (pure premium) factors from the loss distributions produced in Exhibit 17a. They were then off-balanced based on the results of the final selected excess loss load utilizing the other excess projection methods to be consistent with this result. Average claim size by hazard group and type of injury were used, together with incurred loss weights by type of injury within each hazard group, to derive excess loss factors at selected size-of-loss limits by hazard group for Hazard Groups A through G. Exhibit 17 c and 17e are comparable to 17b and 17d, respectively, but they include an adjustment to account for ALAE.

Changes to the Delaware Workplace Safety Program

DCRB Filing No. 2601 details a change to the Delaware Workplace Safety Program in response to SB 248 of 2026. The proposal doubles the impact from this program, so employers who demonstrate adherence to the plan's guidelines will receive a larger credit. To estimate the effect of this change for prospective business, a factor of 1.333 has been applied to the calculated impact from the plan seen in Exhibit 29. The legislation doubled the credit, so the 1.333 accounts for the 4 months that the DWSP change will apply within this filing.

3-Decimal Precision

In congruence with the rest of the countrywide workers compensation industry, rates, loss costs and expected loss rates are moving to 3-decimal precision. The effect from this is the allowance of low loss cost classes to be able to adjust more granularly, as opposed to the prior, 2-decimal precision, which would cause some class values to be "trapped" as a single penny would be too large of a change in some cases. A simple example is shown in the table below revealing how these loss costs can get stuck and not properly update on account of the indicated change.

Hypothetical Class	Rate	% Change
Current	0.05	NA
Indicated Change	NA	-1.53%
Unrounded LC	0.049235	-1.53%
2-Decimal LC	0.05	0.00%
3-Decimal LC	0.049	-2.00%

As shown, the actual indication attempts to pull this hypothetical class down, but this can still result in no change when rounded to 2-decimals. This can be further exacerbated for high premium classes, as the balancing approach utilizes exposure-based rates, and moving some classes by a penny (0.01) can be hard to counter-balance. By moving towards greater precision, this effectively allows more accurate results on a class-by-class basis and removes potential subsidies.

CLOSING COMMENTS AND QUALIFICATIONS

DCRB Filing No. 2602 fully and fairly reflects the most recent experience available in the Delaware indications. Together with all initial and continuing effects of SB1, SB238, HB175 and HB373, the methods and selections balance overall stability and responsiveness of the workers compensation system. The DCRB respectfully requests a timely review of this filing, allowing implementation on a new and renewal basis **effective December 1, 2026**. A timely review will allow adequate advance notice of final residual market rates, voluntary market loss costs and related rating values for all participants in the Delaware marketplace. Toward that objective, the DCRB will be pleased to answer any questions or provide any available supplementary information which you, your staff, and consultants, reviewing this filing on your behalf may require.

This filing has been developed by and under the direction of Brent Otto, FCAS, MAAA. He meets the Qualification Standards of the American Academy of Actuaries to provide the actuarial opinion in this filing.

Please direct all questions to:

Brent Otto
Senior Vice President & Chief Actuary
botto@dcrb.com
215-320-4451

APPENDIX – LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

The following is a summary of the recent major legislative changes in Delaware.

Senate Bill 1, 144th GA

SB1 was signed into law on January 17, 2007. This was a landmark piece of legislation, creating several features of the health care payment system in Delaware. It included the following notable components:

- Established a Health Care Advisory Panel
- Provided for a health care payment system intended to control health care costs in connection with workers compensation
- Provided for the establishment of health care practice guidelines
- Provided for the development of certification standards for health care providers treating employees in the workers compensation system
- Provided for the adoption of forms and a consistent and uniform reporting system among employees, employers, insurance carriers, and health care providers
- Adopted standards for billing and payment of health care services
- Required contractors and other parties doing substantial work within Delaware to adequately insure their employees for workers compensation under the laws of Delaware
- Authorized payment of indemnity benefits or health care benefits without prejudice against the right to later contest the employer's obligation to pay the expense in question
- Established new procedures for attorney fees in workers compensation matters
- Clarified the obligations of independent contractors and subcontractors with respect to maintaining workers compensation insurance
- Clarified the calculation of wage rates, especially in cases where employees had limited work histories
- Implemented procedures for the collection of data relevant to workers compensation including injury reports, mandatory insurance requirements and health care treatments and costs

Senate Bill 238, 146th GA

SB238 was signed into law on August 7, 2012, and revised procedures used to determine payments to hospitals and ambulatory surgery centers for services provided to workers compensation claimants. SB238 made technical improvements to the changes in SB1.

House Bill 175, 147th GA

HB175 was signed into law on June 27, 2013, arising from work done by the Workers Compensation Task Force created by House Joint Resolution 3.

House Bill 373, 147th GA

HB373 was signed into law on July 15, 2014, and included the following notable components:

- A 33% reduction in medical expenditures phased in over a three-year period (20%, 5%, and 8%) effective 1/31/2015, 1/31/2016, and 1/31/2017 respectively.
- Imposed caps expressed as percentages of Medicare per-procedure reimbursements beginning on January 31, 2017

- Revised certain procedures pertaining to the position of Ratepayer Advocate

House Bill 166, 148th GA

HB166 was signed into law on July 27, 2015, and included the following provisions:

- Defined “health care provider” for purposes of §2301
- Allowed recognition of savings other than fee schedule changes in accomplishing the reductions in medical expenditures required by HB373
- Modified procedures applicable to the reimbursement for medical treatment and procedures performed outside Delaware
- Authorized the Workers Compensation Oversight Panel to adopt rules requiring electronic medical billing and payment processes and to standardize documentation required for billing adjudication
- Provided for the certification of healthcare providers not licensed by Delaware
- Made the utilization review program applicable to health care providers regardless of whether such providers are certified under §2322D

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

Item	Description
Exhibit 1 – Limited Losses	Table I – Summary of Financial Call Data
Exhibit 1a	Excess Loss Ratios and Loss Limitations
Exhibit 1b	Table I – Reported Losses in Excess of Loss Limitations
Exhibit 2 – Limited Losses	Paid and Incurred Loss Development and Trend
Exhibit 2a – Limited Losses	Paid and Incurred Loss Development Triangles
Exhibit 2b – Limited Losses	Graphs of Selected Loss Development Projections
Exhibit 2c	Policy Year Loss Ratio Summary
Exhibit 3	Tail Factors and Paid Bridge Factors for Loss Development
Exhibit 4	Claim Frequencies
Exhibit 5	Graphs of Ultimate and Trended Experience Components
Exhibit 6	Premium and Indemnity On-Level Factors
Exhibit 7	Closed Claim Ratios, Payout Ratios and Average Claim Costs
Exhibit 8	Expense Study
Exhibit 9	Internal Rate of Return Model
Exhibit 10	Effect of 7/1/27 Benefit Change
Exhibit 11	Expense Loading
Exhibit 12	Indicated Residual Market Rate Change
Exhibit 13	Experience Rating Plan
Exhibit 14	Delaware Construction Classification Premium Adjustment Program
Exhibit 15	Rate and Loss Cost Formulae
Exhibit 16	Small Deductible Program
Exhibit 17a	Empirical Delaware Loss Distribution
Exhibit 17b	Excess Loss (Pure Premium) Factors
Exhibit 17c	Excess Loss Pure Premium Factors Adjusted to Include ALAE
Exhibit 17d	Excess Loss Premium Factors
Exhibit 17e	Excess Loss Premium Factors Adjusted to Include ALAE
Exhibit 18	Excess Loss Load
Exhibit 19	Delaware Insurance Plan
Exhibit 20	Review of Experience Rating Plan Parameters
Exhibit 21	Table B
Exhibit 22a	Table II – Unit Statistical Data
Exhibit 22b	Table III – Unit Statistical Data

Item	Description
Exhibit 22c	Table IV – Unit Statistical Data
Exhibit 25	Tax Multiplier
Exhibit 27	Manual Rates, Loss Costs and Expected Loss Rates
Exhibit 28	Other Supporting Classification Exhibits
Class Book	Calculations for Each Class
Exhibit 29	Delaware Workplace Safety Program & Merit Rating Program
Exhibit 30	Distribution of Residual Market Rate Changes and Classifications with Proposed Capped Changes
Exhibit 31a	Summary of Indicated and Proposed Residual Market Rates by Class Code
Exhibit 31b	Summary of Indicated and Proposed Residual Market Rates by Percentage Change
Exhibit 32	Temporary Staffing Rates
Exhibit 1 – Unlimited Losses	Table I – Summary of Financial Call Data
Exhibit 2 – Unlimited Losses	Paid and Incurred Loss Development and Trend
Exhibit 2a – Unlimited Losses	Paid and Incurred Loss Development Triangles
Exhibit 2b – Unlimited Losses	Graphs of Selected Loss Development Projections
Filing Forms	State-Specific Requirements Property & Casualty Transmittal Document Rate/Rule Filing Schedule