

# **Clustering in Ratemaking: with Application in Territories**

## **Clustering**

Ji Yao

Zurich Financial Services  
126 Hagley Road  
Birmingham, B16 9PF, UK  
Tel: 0044-(0)121 697 4416  
E-mail: ji.yao@uk.zurich.com

### **Abstract**

Clustering methods are briefly reviewed and their applications in insurance ratemaking are discussed in this paper. First, the reason for clustering and the consideration in choosing clustering methods in insurance ratemaking are discussed. Then clustering methods, including partitioning, hierarchical, density-based and grid-based methods, are reviewed and particularly the problem of applying these methods directly in insurance ratemaking is discussed. An exposure-adjusted hybrid (EAH) clustering method is proposed, which may alleviate some of these problems. Results from EAH approach are presented step by step using the UK motor data. The limitations and other considerations of clustering are followed in the end.

**Keywords:** Clustering, ratemaking, generalized linear modeling, territory analysis, data mining.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Clustering is the unsupervised classification of patterns into groups [1]. It is widely studied and applied in many area including computer science, biology, social science and statistics. A significant number of clustering methods were proposed in literature [1]-[6]. In the context of actuarial study, [7]-[9] studied possible application of clustering in insurance. As to the territory ratemaking, [10] considered the use of geographical information system. However, a thorough analysis of clustering in insurance ratemaking is not known to author.

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. First part of the paper is going to introduce basic idea of clustering and state-of-the-art clustering methods. However due to the large amount of methods, it is not intended to give a detailed review of every clustering methods in literature. Rather, the focus is on the key idea of each methods and, more importantly, their advantage and disadvantage when applied in insurance ratemaking.

In the second part, a clustering method called Exposure-Adjusted Hybrid (EAH) clustering method is proposed. The purpose of this section is not to advocate one certain clustering method, but to illustrate the general approach that could be taken in territory clustering. Because clustering is subjective, it is well recognized that most details should be modified to accommodate the feature of data-set and the purpose the clustering.

The remainder of this paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 introduces clustering and its application in insurance ratemaking. Section 3 reviews clustering methods and their applicability in insurance ratemaking. Section 4 proposes the EAH clustering method and illustrates this method step by step using UK motor data. Section 5 discusses some other considerations and conclusion is drawn in Section 6. Some useful references are listed in Section 7.

## 2. OVERVIEW OF CLUSTERING

### 2.1 Introduction of Clustering

The definition of clustering is not unique. Generally, *clustering* is the process of grouping a set of data objects into cluster or clusters so that data objects within a cluster have high similarity in comparison to one another, but are dissimilar to objects in other

## *Clustering in Ratemaking*

clusters [3]. Usually a *similarity measure* is defined and the clustering procedure is to optimize this measure locally or globally.

It is important to understand the difference between clustering and discriminant analysis. In discriminant analysis, we have a set of pre-classified samples, which could be used to train the algorithm to learn the description of each class. For example, we have a set of claims, some of which are fraud claims. These fraud cases are used to train the algorithm to find a rule that predict the probability of fraud claims in future cases. However, in the case of clustering, these pre-classified samples are not available. So all these rules have to be derived solely from data, indicating that clustering is subjective in nature.

With so many clustering methods available in literature [1]-[6], it is a very difficult task to choose the appropriate method. Two considerations are the purpose of clustering and the feature of dataset.

### **2.2 Purpose of Clustering in Insurance**

There are many reasons to use clustering in insurance ratemaking. First is for better understanding of data. After grouping data object into clusters, the feature of each cluster is clearer and more meaningful. For example, it is useful to cluster similar occupations and analyze their claim experience together.

Second is to reduce the volatility of data and to stable the rates over time. Because the amounts of data are usually limited over a certain period, historical data in each segment may show high volatility. In ratemaking, if analysis is only based on experience of each single segment, the resulting rates will be volatile as well. Appropriate clustering alleviates this problem.

Third is to reduce the number of levels in rating factor. For example, in ratemaking for vehicles, it is possible to have rates for each individual vehicle type, probably because enough historical data have been collected over a long period. However, this may be difficult to implement and usually similar vehicles will be clustered together.

Fourth is to make the rate are reasonable and smooth the rates. For example, in

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

territory ratemaking there may be marketing, regulative or statute limitation that adjacent territories should have similar rates. Some clustering methods may reduce the probability that the rate of one location is abruptly different to its neighbor area.

### **2.3 Nature of Insurance Dataset**

Nature of data is also critical in choosing clustering method. First, type of insurance data is usually numerical, such as claim frequency and severity. Some information that originally expressed in non-numerical format, such as postcode, can be translated into numerical format. However, in some cases such translation may be not possible; one example is occupations. The focus of this paper is on numerical data or data that could be translated numerical format.

Second, insurance data usually is multi-dimension; some are related to risk characteristics and some are related to the rating factors that need to be clustered. For example in territory clustering there may be one dimension of claim frequency and two dimensions of longitude and latitude. However, in most cases the dimension would not be too high. It is well understood that high-dimension clustering is very different to low-dimension [1]-[6]. The focus of this work is on low-dimension.

Third, the data usually have a large noise because of the uncertainty of insurance results. Ideally, we should use expected claim frequency or expected loss in clustering. However, only the observed claim experience is available for analysis. This uncertainty should be considered in designing the similarity measure.

Finally, the insurance data may be not well-separated and the change between clusters could be gradual. For example in territory clustering, the difference in risk characteristics between two adjacent areas usually is quite small. So the task is to find the boundaries where the difference is relatively large. This indicates that some methods that require data well-separated may be not suitable.

## **3. CLUSTERING METHODS**

There are many clustering methods in literature and detailed reviews are in [1]-[6]. In

## *Clustering in Ratemaking*

this section each method is briefly introduced and the focus is on its applicability in insurance ratemaking.

### **3.1 Partitioning Methods**

Broadly speaking, partitioning method organizes the data objects into required number of clusters that optimizes certain similarity measure. However it is usually narrowly defined as method that implemented by an iterative algorithm and the similarity measure is based on distance between data objects. In the context of insurance ratemaking, the distance could be the difference in claim frequency/severity, difference in the numerical rating factors, or combination of these two.

Generally, the algorithm of partitioning methods is

- i) Randomly choose initial data objects as center or represent of clusters;
- ii) Calculate the membership of each data object according to present center or represent of clusters;
- iii) Update the center or represent of clusters that optimizes the total similarity measure;
- iv) If there is change in center or represent of clusters, then go to step ii); otherwise stop.

There are different methods depends on how the similarity measure is chosen and how center or represent of cluster is defined.

#### **3.1.1 K-Means Method**

The center of cluster,  $m_i$ , is defined as the mean of each cluster  $C_i$ , that is,

$$m_i = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in C_i} \mathbf{x}$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  is data object and  $n_i$  is the number of data objects within cluster  $C_i$ . The total similarity measure is the squared-error function around the center of each cluster, i.e.

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in C_i} |\mathbf{x} - m_i|^2,$$

where  $k$  is the number of clusters.

This method is easy to understand and apply. The time complexity of this method is also lower than k-Medoids method. So generally it is one of the most popular clustering methods. However, it is very sensitive to noise and outliers, because the mean of data objects in each cluster is used to represent each cluster. This is a big problem for insurance data as outliers are always expected. It is also difficult to choose the appropriate number of clusters. This may be not critical because in insurance ratemaking, the number of cluster may be determined by other factors, such as IT limitation. The silhouette coefficient [1]-[4] is also introduced to solve this problem. The results of K-Means method tend to be sphere shape as squared-error function is used as similarity measure. This applies to most methods that use distance as similarity measure. This drawback is quite critical in territory clustering, as the nature cluster is not necessarily sphere shaped. This method works not very well when the density of data changes. Finally, the efficiency of this method is greatly affected by the initial setting and sometime it may only converge to a local optimal. In practice, this may be solved by running the program several times with different initial settings.

#### **3.1.2 K-Medoids Method**

This is similar to K-Means method but defines the most centrally located data object of cluster  $C_i$  as center of cluster to calculate the squared-error function. Because of this, this method is less sensitive to noise and outliers. However, the procedure to find the most centrally located object requires much higher run time than K-Means method [1]-[4]. This basic method is named Partition around Medoids (PAM) method. Clustering Large Application (CLARA) and Clustering Large Application based upon RANdomized search (CLARANS) were later proposed to reduce the time complexity [1]-[4]. However, these methods are still subject to other problems as K-Means method.

## *Clustering in Ratemaking*

### **3.1.3 Expectation Maximization (EM)**

Rather than representing each cluster by a point, this method represents each cluster by a probability distribution. In step i), each cluster is represented by a default probability distribution. In step ii), the probabilities of each data object belonging to every cluster  $C_i$  are calculated by the probability distribution representing cluster  $C_i$ . Then every data object is assigned to the cluster that gives highest probability. In step iii), the probability distribution is then re-calculated for each cluster based on new members of each cluster. If there is change in probability distribution that represents each cluster, then go to step ii); otherwise the iteration stops.

The time complexity of EM is lower than K-Medoids, but it has most of the problem K-Means suffers. What's more, the choice of probability distribution gives rise to more complexity.

## **3.2 Hierarchical Methods**

Hierarchical method creates a hierarchical decomposition of the given set of data objects forming a dendrogram - a tree which splits the dataset recursively into smaller subsets. So the number of cluster is not chosen at the early stage of analysis in this method.

### **3.2.1 AGglomerative NESting (AGNES) and DIvisia ANAlysis (DIANA)**

Both are earlier hierarchical clustering methods, where AGNES is bottom-up method and DIANA is top-down method. In AGNES, clustering starts from sub-clusters that each includes only one data objects. Then the distances between any two sub-clusters are calculated and the two nearest sub-clusters are combined. This is done recursively until all sub-clusters are merged into one cluster that includes all data objects. In DIANA, clustering starts from one cluster that includes all data objects. Then it iteratively chooses the appropriate border to split one cluster into two smaller sub-clusters that are least similar.

Slightly different from the object-to-object definition of similarity measure in partitioning methods, the similarity measure in hierarchical method should be cluster-to-

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

cluster. Different similarity measures of two clusters can be defined and common ones are

1. Min distance:  $d_{\min}(C_i, C_j) = \min_{p_i \in C_i, p_j \in C_j} d(p_i, p_j)$ , where  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  is similarity measure of two data objects  $p_i$ ,  $p_j$  and  $C_i$ ,  $C_j$  are two clusters;
2. Max distance:  $d_{\max}(C_i, C_j) = \max_{p_i \in C_i, p_j \in C_j} d(p_i, p_j)$ ;
3. Average distance:  $d_{\text{avg}}(C_i, C_j) = \frac{1}{n_i n_j} \sum_{p_i \in C_i, p_j \in C_j} d(p_i, p_j)$ , where  $n_i$  and  $n_j$  are size of cluster  $C_i$  and  $C_j$ , respectively.

The concept is easy to understand and apply. The resulting clusters are less sphere shaped than partitioning methods, but still have that tendency because distance is used as similarity measure. The number of cluster is also chosen at a later stage, which is better than partitioning methods. The performance regarding noise and outlier depends on the similarity measure chosen. However, the most critical problem of AGNES and DIANA methods is that the over-simplified similarity measure often gives erroneous clustering results, partly because hierarchical method is irreversible. Another problem is that the complexity of time, which depends on the number of data objects, is much higher than that of K-Means method.

#### **3.2.2 Balanced Iterative Reducing and Clustering using Hierarchies (BIRTH)**

The key idea is to compress the data objects into small sub-clusters in first stage and then perform clustering with these sub-clusters in the second stage. In the second stage, the AGNES or DIANA methods could be used, while in literature BIRTH is specifically named after the method that uses a tool called clustering feature (CF) tree [3].

One advantage is that it greatly reduces the effective number of data objects that need to cluster and reduces the time complexity.

However, it still tends to have spherical shape clustering because similarity measure has the same definition as AGNES or DIANA.

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

#### **3.2.3 Clustering Using REpresentatives (CURE) and CHAMELEON**

The key idea of CURE is to use a fixed number of well-scattered data objects to represent each cluster and these selected data objects are shrunk towards their cluster centers at a specified rate. Then two clusters with closest ‘distance’ will be merged. The ‘distance’ can be defined in any way as in Section 3.2.1.

Compared with AGNES and DIANA, CURE is more robust to outliers and has a better performance when clusters have non-spherical shape. However, all parameters, such as number of representative data points of a cluster and shrinking speed, have a significant impact on the results, which makes this method difficult to understand and apply.

In CHAMELEON method, instead of distance, more sophisticated measures of similarity, which are *inter-connectivity* and *closeness*, are used. CHAMELEON also uses a special graph partitioning algorithm to recursively partition the whole data objects into many small unconnected sub-clusters.

CHAMELEON is more efficient than CURE in discovering arbitrarily-shaped clusters of varying density. However, the time complexity, which is on order of square of number of data objects, is quite high [1]-[4].

The ability of cluster arbitrarily-shaped clusters makes these two methods quite attractive in territory clustering. However both methods are complicate to apply and therefore not further developed in this paper.

## **3.3 Density-based Methods**

Most partitioning and hierarchical methods use the similarity measure based on distance. However, density could be used as similarity measure. An intuitive understanding of this method is that, for example, satellite towns around a big city can often be clustered with the big city while rural areas are clustered.

#### **3.3.1 Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Application with Noise (DBSCAN)**

This method defines the density of a data object as the number of data objects within a distance of this data object. If the density of a data object is high, which means that this

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

data object is very similar to its neighbors, it should be clustered with those neighbor data objects. This is exactly the basic idea in DBSCAN method. After calculating the density of every data objects, clusters are generated by several rules, of which the basic idea is to expand every cluster as far as the density of the neighbor data object is higher than a threshold. Outliers will be discarded and not grouped to any clusters.

The advantage of this method is that it could find arbitrary shape of clusters. However, the efficiency of this method largely depends on parameters chosen by user, so it requires high level of expertise to apply this method successfully. Also it works not very well for large or high-dimension dataset, because the time complexity is very high in finding all those neighbor data objects and any intermediate results are not an approximation to final results.

#### **3.3.2 Ordering Points To Identify the Clustering Structure (OPTICS)**

Rather than producing a clustering of data objects for certain chosen parameters as in DBSCAN, this method produces a cluster ordering for a wide range of parameter settings. The user then can do clustering interactively by using the cluster ordering results.

Other than finding arbitrary shape clusters, this method solves the problem of dependency on parameters as in DBSCAN. However, it still has other problems as DBSCAN does.

#### **3.3.3 DENsity-based CLUstEring (DENCLUE)**

This method is efficient for large dataset and high-dimension noisy dataset and it can also find arbitrary shape clusters, which makes it suitable for insurance ratemaking. However, there are many parameters to set and may be difficult to applied for non-expert. Detail of algorithm is discussed in [1]-[4].

### **3.4 Grid-based Methods**

These methods quantize the space into a finite number of cells which form a grid structure on which all of the operations for clustering are performed. The basic grid-based algorithm defines a set of grid-cells, assigns data objects to the appropriate grid cell

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

and computes the density of each cell. After cells with density below a certain threshold are eliminated, clusters are generated by combining adjacent groups of cells with similar density or minimizing a given objective function.

The advantage is fast processing time which is typically independent of the number of data objects and only dependent on the number of cells in each dimension of the quantized space. However, it usually has disadvantage that shape of cluster is limited by shape of grid. But this problem can be reasonably overcome by smaller grid, which becomes feasible because of rapid development of computer. So this is a promising clustering method for insurance ratemaking.

STING, WaveCluster and CLIQUE are three advanced grid-based methods, which are different in how information about data objects is stored in each grid or what cluster principle is used. STING explores statistical information; WaveCluster uses wavelet transform to store the information while CLIQUE discovers sub-cluster using Apriori principle [1]-[4].

### **3.5 Kernel and Spectral Methods**

Both are relatively new methods. Although they are originated from different background, recently study indicates that there is possible connection between these two methods [5], [6].

The key idea of kernel method is to map the data into high dimension space called *feature space*, so that non-linear feature in the low-dimension space becomes linear in the feature space. The conventional clustering methods introduced in previous sections are then applied in the feature space.

The main tools for spectral clustering methods are graph Laplacian matrices [6] and associated eigenvectors, which are widely studied in spectral graph theory. The original data is first transformed into the *similarity matrix*, which is defined as the matrix of similarity measure, and its eigenvectors. Then the conventional clustering methods, such as K-Means method, are applied on the similarity matrix or eigenvectors.

Although claimed easy to implement [6], it actually not that easy to use for non-expert.

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

What's more, it seems to give no more advantage than other methods in the context of insurance ratemaking. So these two methods are not further discussed.

## **4. EXPOSURE-ADJUSTED HYBRID (EAH) CLUSERING METHOD**

The choice of clustering method depends on the feature of the data and purpose of clustering. Most of the methods introduced in Section 3 could be used in appropriate situation. However, in insurance ratemaking, another consideration is that the method is easy to understand and use. Based on this philosophy, this paper is focused on how to modify the partitioning and hierarchical methods to accommodate the need of insurance ratemaking.

The proposed Exposure-Adjusted Hybrid (EAH) method is a combination of the partitioning and hierarchical methods. This method also adjusts the similarity measure by exposure to take account of the volatility of insurance data. The whole procedure, which has been customized to territory clustering, is as follows:

1. Use Generalized Linear Model (GLM) technique to model the claim experience;
2. Calculate residual of GLM results as the pure effect of territory;
3. Use partitioning method to generate small sub-clusters that contain highly similar data points;
4. Use hierarchical method to derive the dendrogram clustering tree;
5. Choose appropriate number of clusters and get corresponding clusters;
6. Repeat steps 3-5 with different initial setting to find relatively consistent pattern in clusters;
7. Use territory clustering result to re-run GLM and compare the results with that of Step 1. If there is large difference in resulting relativities from GLM, then starts again from Step 1; otherwise stops.

#### **4.1 Comments on EAH Method**

The purpose of steps 1 and 2 is to calculate the “pure” effect of territory. Because of the correlation between rating factors, the effect of territory cannot be calculated by simple one-way analysis. A common approach is to use the Generalized Linear Model (GLM) [11]. However, as the output from territory clustering usually will be fed into GLM again to calculate the final relativities, there are two possible approaches:

Approach One: Include all rating factors other than territory in the first GLM and consider the residual as the pure effect of territory. Do the clustering analysis and have the resulting clusters fed into second GLM, which including all rating factors.

Approach Two: Include all rating factors, including a high level group of territory in the first GLM and consider the residual as the pure effect of territory. Do the clustering analysis and have the resulting cluster fed into second GLM.

The problem with Approach One is that the relativities of other rating factors will change between the first and the second GLM because the second GLM includes a new rating factor. Approach Two has the same problem although to a less extent. In both case, it is necessary to compare the relativities of all the other rating factors between the two GLM. If it changes significantly the whole procedure should be repeated from Step 1, and this iteration stops when the relativities don’t change much between the first and the second GLM. Because in most cases Approach Two has less number of iterations, it is better to take this approach if possible.

Steps 3 to 6 are the clustering procedure. It could be replaced by any other methods in Section 3. However, whichever methods are used, the definition of measure similarity must be modified to accommodate the feature of insurance data. Usually, each data point has at least two types of data: one is the measure of geographical information and the other is the measure of claim potential/risk characteristics. The most common measure for geographical information is Euclidean distance:

$$g(x_i, y_i, x_j, y_j) = (x_i - x_j)^2 + (y_i - y_j)^2,$$

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

where  $(x_i, y_i)$  is longitude and latitude of data object  $i$  and  $(x_j, y_j)$  is those of data object  $j$ . However, because of the curvature of the Earth's surface, some other definitions could be used. One such formula is the Haversine formula, which gives the shortest distance over the Earth's surface between two locations.

As for the claim potential/risk characteristics, claim frequency, severity or burning cost can be used. However, since the claim severity can be quite volatile in most cases, claim frequency is commonly used. The similarity measure can be defined as Euclidean distance  $(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2$  where  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  are claim frequency. However, while Euclidean distance should be calculated by the expected claim frequency, only actual claim frequency is available for analysis. The uncertainty of the data must be considered in the definition of similarity measure. One solution is that, if it is assumed that every risk in both territories have same variance  $\sigma^2$ , then the observed actual claim frequency  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  are approximately normal distributed with variance  $\sigma^2/E_1$  and  $\sigma^2/E_2$ , where  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are exposures in each territory, respectively. This assumption could be justified by the Central Limit Theorem. So the variance of  $\mu_1 - \mu_2$  is  $\sigma^2/E_1 + \sigma^2/E_2$ , which is used to adjust the Euclidean distance

$$f(\mu_1, E_1, \mu_2, E_2) = -\frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{(1/E_1 + 1/E_2)},$$

where  $\sigma^2$  is dropped as it will be merged into the weight parameter introduced next.

Another question is how to combine the two measures. The solution proposed in this paper is to use the weighed sum of two similarity measure:

$$g(\cdot) + w \cdot f(\cdot)$$

This weight  $w$  has to be chosen tentatively and subjectively.

In step 3, the number of small sub-clusters is chosen by user. Because of the high time complexity of hierarchical clustering method in step 4, this number cannot be too high.

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

On the other hand, if the number of small sub-cluster is too low, the performance of EAH method will deteriorate to partitioning method. Number around hundreds could be used but it also depends on clustering purposed and feature of dataset.

The choice of number of clusters in step 5 is also largely subjective and usually affected by other consideration, such as IT limitation or market practice. However, the general rule is not to put the threshold at the place where there is only small change in similarity measure. This will be illustrated later in case study.

## **4.2 Case Study**

In this case study we consider the territory clustering for ratemaking in motor insurance. The data we have are the geographical information in form of postcode, other rating factors, exposures and actual claim number.

In UK, it is a normal practice to use postcode as a rating factor. The postcode is in hierarchical structure and there are totally about 2 million postcodes. This amount is too large to analyze, so the data is first aggregated at postcode district level, which has about 2900 districts. All these postcode districts are then translated into longitude and latitude.

The difference between GLM predicted claim frequency and the actual claim frequency is the residual that will be clustered. This is plotted in Fig. 1. The color of black and blue shows the area where actual claim frequency is worse than predicted and the color of green and yellow shows where actual claim frequency is better. Other colors mean that actual frequency is similar to GLM prediction. Although overlapping, it is quite clear that there are clusters: London area and Midlands are worst risk while North and Wales are much better.

## *Clustering in Ratemaking*




Fig. 1 Residual of GLM results that will be clustered

### **4.2.1 Results of K-Means Method**

The K-Means method is first applied. The results are plotted in Fig. 2-5 for different setting. In all cases 10 clusters are generated. Fig. 2 plots the clustering results for weighting

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

parameter  $w=1$  and Fig. 3 gives the result for the same weighting parameter  $w=1$  but different initial settings. Although similar in the south, the results are significantly different in the north. It is very difficult to determine which one is better by looking at the initial dataset in Fig. 1.




Fig. 2. Results of K-Means clustering method with  $w=1$ .

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*




Fig. 3 Results of K-Means clustering method with  $w=1$  and different initial setting from Fig. 2.

Result of  $w=0.1$  is plotted in Fig. 4 and  $w=10$  is in Fig. 5 and they have same initial settings as Fig. 2. The larger is the parameter  $w$ , the more weight is put on the similarity measure in claim experience and the less weight is put on the geographical closeness. Fig.

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

4 shows a much clearer border than Fig. 2, while Fig. 5 shows more overlapping. Probably, the result in Fig. 5 is not acceptable, but the choice between Fig. 2 and Fig. 4 is quite subjective.




Fig. 4. Results of K-Means clustering method with  $w = 0.1$ .

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*




Fig. 5. Results of K-Means clustering method with  $w=10$ .

These results highlight some features of K-Means methods. The sensitivity to initial settings is a big problem and the choice of parameters is also difficult. However, the dependence on parameters may be not a big problem as Fig. 2 looks very similar to Fig. 4.

## *Clustering in Ratemaking*

### **4.2.2 Results of EAH Method**

Then the results from each steps of the EAH method are presented. In step 3, 200 small sub-clusters are generated. The output of center of each cluster is shown in Fig. 6.




Fig. 6. Output from step 3 of 200 small clusters.

In step 4 of hierarchical clustering method AGNES, the average distance defined in Section 3.2 is used in the weighted similarity measure proposed in Section 4.1. The resulting dendrogram is shown in Fig. 7, where the numbers of sub-clusters are not shown on x-axis because they are too many to be shown in a readable format. The y-axis is the value of similarity measure that two sub-clusters are merged, which is termed

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

*merging point.* The first 20 merging points are listed in Table 1. The first value is 29.0071, which means that if any two clusters with similarity measure less than 29.0071 can be merged there will be only one cluster. Similarly, if any two clusters with similarity measure less than 4 can be merged, then there will be 8 cluster (because 4 is between 3.8875 and 4.7887).




Fig.7 Dendrogram of clustering

In step 5, the number of clusters has to be chosen based on the dendrogram output. The general idea is not to put the threshold at the place where change in similarity measure is small. This is because, if the change in similarity measure is quite small, such as gap between Number 10 and 11, 12 and 13 or 13 and 14 in Table 1, it is not very clear which two sub-clusters should be merged, making the results less reliable. Based on this rule, it is better to have 8 or 12 clusters in this case. The result of 12 clusters is plotted in Fig. 8.

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

Table 1. First 20 merging points.

Number	Similarity Measure	Change in Similarity Measure
1	29.0071	16.0212
2	12.9859	1.805
3	11.1809	1.7825
4	9.3984	0.9691
5	8.4293	3.3747
6	5.0546	0.2659
7	4.7887	0.9012
8	3.8875	0.2687
9	3.6188	0.2026
10	3.4162	0.0561
11	3.3601	0.7895
12	2.5706	0.0205
13	2.5501	0.0402
14	2.5099	0.3665
15	2.1434	0.1108
16	2.0326	0.0013
17	2.0313	0.034
18	1.9973	0.177
19	1.8203	0.1282
20	1.6921	0.2814

The whole procedure could be re-run from step 3 with different initial settings in the K-Means method. Another possible result is plotted in Fig. 9. There is still apparent difference between Fig. 8 and Fig. 9, which means that this method still converges to local optimal. However, the difference is much smaller than that between Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 in this case.

*Clustering in Ratemaking*




Fig.8 Clustering result by EAH method with 12 clusters




Fig. 9 Clustering result by EAH method with 12 clusters using different initial setting  
to Fig. 8

## 5. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

In this section some other considerations in clustering are introduced and briefly explained. One common problem is the existence of obstacle and constraint in clustering.

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

For example, in Fig. 9 the two circled areas are not adjacent because of the gulf. However, when distance is used to define similarity measure, they are very close. One solution is to introduce a distance function that includes this information: for example, distance between any two points cross the gulf doubles the normal Euclidean distance. There are other methods in [1]-[4].

Whether to use claim frequency, severity or burning cost is also interesting. As explained in Section 4, there is strong argument to use claim frequency. However, in case when claim severity is different between territories, it may be more reasonable to use claim severity or burning cost. In such situation, the variance adjustment to the Euclidean distance could be different and it could also affect the magnitude of weighting parameter  $w$ .

Finally, checking the effectiveness of clustering is also difficulty. As illustrated in the case study, it is very difficult to compare the results from different clustering methods or same method with different initial settings. One solution is to repeat the clustering procedure by a large number of times and find the consistent pattern. Another is to check with external information, such as industry benchmarks. The third option is to split the data into half and half, using half data to do clustering analysis and the other half to test whether the same pattern appears.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS**

Clustering is an important tool in data mining for insurance ratemaking. However, the choice of clustering methods is a difficult task because there are a large number of clustering methods in literature and there is no conclusion which method is always best. The philosophy suggested in this paper is to use as simple method as possible, as far as there is no critical drawback.

Broad review of clustering methods shows that partitioning methods without proper modifications are not suitable for insurance ratemaking. Hierarchical methods have much better performance but limited by high time complexity in calculation, so they struggle with large dataset. Advanced methods could improve the efficiency of

### *Clustering in Ratemaking*

clustering but may be difficult to understand and apply. So from a practical point view, emphasis in this paper is on modifying the partitioning and hierarchical methods to accommodate the need of insurance ratemaking.

In the proposed exposure-adjusted hybrid (EAH) clustering method, the exposure-adjusted similarity measure is used to take account of the uncertainty of insurance data and the K-Means method is applied first to generate sub-clusters to reduce the time used in the hierarchical methods. Case study results show that this method could alleviate some problems of basic partitioning and hierarchical methods.

By its unsupervised nature of clustering, there is no definitely best clustering method; other methods introduced in this paper could give reasonable solution in appropriate situations. However, it is hoped that various considerations mentioned in this paper could give some help to practical users of clustering in insurance ratemaking.

## **REFERENCES**

- [1] A.K. Jain, M.N. Murty, and P.J. Flynn, “Data clustering: a review,” *ACM Comput. Surveys*. v31 i3. 264-323.
- [2] R. Xu, and D. Wunsch, I.I., “Survey of clustering algorithms,” *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks*. v16 i3. 645-678.
- [3] J. Han, M. Kamber, and A.K.H. Tung, , “Spatial clustering methods in data mining: a survey.” In: Miller, H., Han, J. (Eds.), *Geographic Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, Taylor and Francis, London.
- [4] P. Berkhin, “Survey of clustering data mining techniques,” Technical Report, Accrue Software, 2002.
- [5] M. Filippone, F. Camastra, F. Masulli, S. Rovetta, “A survey of kernel and spectral methods for clustering,” *Pattern Recognition* Vol. 41(1): 176-190 (2008).
- [6] V. Luxburg, U., “A Tutorial on Spectral Clustering,”. *Statistics and Computing*, Vol. 17 , Issue 4 (December 2007), 395 - 416
- [7] R. Pelessoni, L. Picech, “Some applications of unsupervised neural networks in rate making procedure”, 1998 General Insurance Convention & ASTIN Colloquium,

*Clustering in Ratemaking*

549-567.

- [8] R. Sanche, K. Lonergan, “Variable reduction for predictive modeling with clustering,” Casualty Actuarial Society Forum, Winter 2006, 89-100.
- [9] L. Guo, “Appling Data Mining Techniques in Property/Casualty Insurance,” Casualty Actuarial Society Forum, Winter 2003, 1-25.
- [10] S. Christopherson and D. L. Werland, “Using a Geographic Information System to Identify Territory Boundaries,” Casualty Actuarial Society Forum, Winter 1996, 191-212.
- [11] D. Anderson, S. Feldblum, C. Modlin, D. Schirmacher, E. Schirmacher, and N. Thandi, “A Practitioner’s Guide to Generalized Linear Models,” Casualty Actuarial Society Discussion Paper Program, 2004, 1-116