

RULES – IMPLEMENTATION

JANUARY 13, 2020

COMMERCIAL MULTIPLE LINE

LI-ML-2020-007

ILLINOIS COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY REVISED PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTOR REVISION TO BE IMPLEMENTED; EXCEL WORKBOOK NEWLY INCLUDED

KEY MESSAGE

Revised Commercial Package Policy package modification factors for an overall statewide change of +0.1% to be implemented.

BACKGROUND

In circular [LI-ML-2019-034](#), we provided you with information about the Commercial Package Policy modification factor experience review.

ISO ACTION

We are implementing ML-2019-RLA1, which presents a review of Commercial Package Policy modification factors experience. Refer to the attachment(s) for complete details.

IMPORTANT NOTE

Change in Format

This circular offers several enhancements for customers. In addition to the PDF version, exhibits and loss cost tables are now available in user-friendly Excel format rather than Word. Where possible, exhibits are linked together formulaically to clarify how calculations flow through the entire ratemaking process and to enable customers to test the effects of different assumptions on the results.

To facilitate this change, the filing has been restructured. All explanatory text, for all sections of the filing, appears first; all exhibits and tables are grouped together and appear thereafter. Exhibits have been relabeled (Exhibit A1, Exhibit A2, etc.).

We invite customers to share feedback on this revised format and suggestions for further enhancements by contacting the individuals listed in the Contact Information block.

EFFECTIVE DATE

We do not establish an effective date for Commercial Package Policy rules revisions in this state. Each insurer that elects to utilize this revision is responsible for determining its own effective date.

COMPANY ACTION

ISO has not filed this revision.

You must independently determine what revision to make and when to make any revision effective. If you decide to use all or any part of our revision, you are NOT required to file anything with the Insurance Department.

You must document your files in case the Insurance Department wishes to review the information at a later date. In all internal correspondence on this revision, you should refer to ISO Filing Number ML-2019-RLA1, NOT this circular number. Communications with the regulator concerning a filing affecting multiple lines of business (i.e., CL, PL, AL filing designation) should specify the line(s) of business that you are addressing.

RATING SOFTWARE IMPACT

No new attributes are being introduced with this revision.

POLICYHOLDER NOTIFICATION

If you decide to implement this revision, you should check all applicable laws for the state(s) to which this revision applies, to determine whether or not a specific policyholder notice requirement may apply. Please note that circular [LI-CL-2019-057](#) contains the ISO Guide To Renewals With Changed Conditions For Commercial Lines, which is available only as a guide to assist participating companies in complying with various conditional renewal statutes or regulations, for the major commercial lines of insurance serviced by ISO. The information in the Guide does not necessarily reflect all requirements or exceptions that may apply, and it is not intended as a substitute for your review of all applicable statutes and regulations concerning policyholder notification.

REVISION DISTRIBUTION

We will issue a Notice to Manualholders with an edition date of 7-20 (or the earliest possible subsequent date), along with any new and/or revised manual pages.

REFERENCE(S)

- [LI-CL-2019-057](#) (12/10/2019) Revised Lead Time Requirements Listing
- [LI-ML-2019-034](#) (10/02/2019) Commercial Package Policy Experience Reviewed By Staff

ATTACHMENT(S)

- Filing [ML-2019-RLA1](#)
- Excel Workbook

FILES AVAILABLE FOR DOWNLOAD

To download all files associated with this circular, including attachments in the full circular PDF and/or any additional files not included in the PDF, search for the circular number on [ISOnet Circulars](#). Then click the Word/Excel link under the Full Circular column on the Search Results screen.

Please note that in some instances, not all files listed in the Attachment(s) block (if applicable) are included in the PDF.

COPYRIGHT EXPLANATION

The material distributed by Insurance Services Office, Inc. is copyrighted. All rights reserved. Possession of these pages does not confer the right to print, reprint, publish, copy, sell, file, or use same in any manner without the written permission of the copyright owner. Permission is hereby granted to members, subscribers, and service purchasers to reprint, copy, or otherwise use the enclosed material for purposes of their own business use relating to that territory or line or kind of insurance, or subdivision thereof, for which they participate, provided that:

- (A) Where ISO copyrighted material is reprinted, copied, or otherwise used **as a whole**, it must reflect the copyright notice actually shown on such material.
- (B) Where ISO copyrighted material is reprinted, copied, or otherwise used **in part**, the following credit legend must appear at the bottom of each page so used:
Includes copyrighted material of Insurance Services Office, Inc., with its permission.

DATA QUALITY

Statistical plan data reported to ISO is first processed through a system of rigorous automated data verification procedures so that only valid data would be used for ratemaking. Subsequent to this initial data submission review, additional analyses on the statistical plan data involving an even more customized data review for this line were performed by staff. During these processes, various data records were excluded from the review. The ISO staff responsible for this circular also reviewed the data for reasonableness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ACTUARIAL QUALIFICATIONS

The American Academy of Actuaries' "Qualification Standards for Actuaries Issuing Statements of Actuarial Opinion in the United States" requires that an actuary issuing a Statement of Actuarial Opinion should include an acknowledgment with the opinion that he/she has met the qualification standards of the AAA. ISO considers this rule revision a Statement of Actuarial Opinion; therefore, we are including the following acknowledgment:

I, Rimma Maasbach, am an Actuarial Consultant in Actuarial Operations for ISO, and I, Bei Zhou, am an Actuarial Product Director for Commercial Property for ISO. We are jointly responsible for the content of this Statement of Actuarial Opinion. We are both members of the American Academy of Actuaries and we meet the Qualification Standards of the American Academy of Actuaries to render the actuarial opinion contained herein.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have any questions concerning:

- The actuarial content of this circular, please contact:

Jeff Lee

Actuarial Operations

201-469-4152

Jeff.Lee@verisk.com

propertyactuarial@verisk.com

- The non-actuarial content of this circular, please contact:
Alexander Esau
Production Operations, Compliance and Product Services
201-469-2717
productionoperations@verisk.com
- Other issues for this circular, please contact Customer Support:
E-mail: info@verisk.com
Phone: 800-888-4476

Callers outside the United States, Canada, and the Caribbean may contact us using our global toll-free number (International Access Code + 800 48977489). For information on all ISO products, visit us at www.verisk.com/iso. To keep abreast of the latest Insurance Lines Services updates, view www.verisk.com/ils.

ILLINOIS
ADVISORY PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTOR REVIEW
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
ML-2019-RLA1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE

This document:

- presents a review of advisory Package Modification Factors (PMFs). PMFs are relativity factors used to adjust monoline loss costs as appropriate for multiline risks.
 - provides the analyses used to derive these advisory PMFs.
-

PMF CHANGES

The proposed Commercial Package Policy (CPP) Package Modification Factor changes are:

<u>Type of Policy</u>	<u>Property</u>	<u>Liability</u>	<u>Prop. & Liab. Total</u>
Motel/Hotel	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Apartment	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Office	-4.6%	+4.4%	+2.1%
Mercantile	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Institutional	-8.1%	+9.4%	-4.8%
Services	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Indust./Proc.	-6.8%	+2.6%	-1.9%
Contractors	<u>-2.0%</u>	<u>+4.2%</u>	<u>+3.8%</u>
Statewide	-3.7%	+3.0%	+0.1%

INDICATED
VS. CAPPED

Indicated PMF changes are based on standard ISO methodology. Differences between indicated and capped PMF changes are caused by rounding each indicated PMF to the nearest one percent and applying an upper cap of 1.00, where necessary.

ILLINOIS
ADVISORY PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTOR REVIEW
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
ML-2019-RLA1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HISTORICAL
SOURCE DATA

The data used in this review is from ISO reporting companies for:

- Basic Group I: five fiscal accident years ending 09/30/18.
 - Basic Group II: ten fiscal accident years ending 09/30/18.
 - Special Causes of Loss: five fiscal accident years ending 09/30/18.
 - Crime: calendar year ending 06/30/16.
 - Inland Marine: five calendar accident years ending 12/31/16.
 - Fidelity: policy year ending 12/31/15.
 - Owners, Landlords, and Tenants: five fiscal accident years ending 09/30/18.
 - Manufacturers and Contractors: five fiscal accident years ending 09/30/18.
 - Products: three calendar accident years ending 12/31/17.
 - Local Products and Completed Operations: three calendar accident years ending 12/31/17.
-

PRIOR ISO
REVISIONS

The latest revisions in this state are:

<u>Filing</u>	ML-16-RLA1	ML-15-RLA1	ML-14-RLA1
<u>Dates</u>			
Implemented	5/1/2017	9/1/2016	10/1/2014
<u>Changes</u>			
Indicated	+3.0%	+3.7%	+3.9%
Filed	+3.0%	+3.7%	+3.9%
Implemented	+3.0%	+3.7%	+3.9%

ILLINOIS
ADVISORY PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTOR REVIEW
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
ML-2019-RLA1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ADJUSTMENTS
TO REPORTED
EXPERIENCE

Standard actuarial procedures have been used in the reviews underlying the calculation of the PMFs, including adjusting the fire and liability losses to ultimate settlement level and, for all coverages, reflecting all loss adjustment expenses and trend. Specific procedures vary by subline.

TEN LARGEST
GROUPS IN
ISO DATA BASE

Insurers are listed in descending order based on the percent of statewide written premium volume from Annual Statement Page 15 for the year ending 12/31/18 for the Annual Statement Line of Business (ASLOB) indicated.

COMMERCIAL MULTI PERIL (ASLOB 51 & 52)

1. Travelers Indemnity Company
 2. Country Mutual Insurance Company
 3. Liberty Mutual Insurance Company
 4. Cincinnati Insurance Company
 5. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company
 6. Hanover Insurance Company
 7. Tokio Marine Companies
 8. Continental Casualty Company
 9. Westfield Insurance Company
 10. Society Insurance Company
-

SIZE OF ISO
DATA BASE

The market share of ISO participating insurers as measured by Annual Statement Page 15 written premium for the year ending 12/31/18 is:

Commercial Multi Peril (ASLOB 51 & 52). 52.1%.

ADDITIONAL
SUPPORTING
MATERIAL

Additional supporting material underlying the calculation of the experience review indications used in this PMF analysis may be found in the respective monoline experience review documents for each line.

ILLINOIS
ADVISORY PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTOR REVIEW
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
ML-2019-RLA1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

COMPANY DECISION

We encourage each insurer to decide independently whether the judgments made and the procedures or data used by ISO in developing the PMFs contained herein are appropriate for your use. We have included within this document the information upon which ISO relied in order to enable companies to make such independent judgments. The data underlying the enclosed material comes from companies reporting to Insurance Services Office, Inc. Therefore, the ISO experience permits the establishment of a much broader statistical ratemaking base than could be employed by using any individual company's data. A broader data base enhances the validity of ratemaking analysis derived therefrom.

At the same time, however, an individual company may benefit from a comparison of its own experience to the aggregate ISO experience, and may reach valid conclusions with respect to the manner in which its own costs can be expected to differ from ISO's projection based on the aggregate data.

Some calculations included in this document involve areas of ISO staff judgment. Each company should carefully review and evaluate whether the ISO selected PMFs are appropriate for its use.

The material has been developed exclusively by the staff of Insurance Services Office, Inc.

COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Explanatory Pages</u>	<u>Corresponding Exhibits</u>
<u>SECTION A – SCOPE OF REVISION</u>		
Methodology Overview	Page 6	--
Summary of Package Modification Factor (PMF) Review	--	Exhibit A1
Calculation of Revised Package Modification Factors	Page 7-9	Exhibit A2
<u>SECTION B – CALCULATION OF PROPOSED CHANGES</u>		
<u>PROPERTY COVERAGES</u>		
Commercial Fire and Allied Lines Distribution of Advisory Loss Cost Level Change	Page 10-19	Exhibits B1-B5
Crime and Fidelity	Page 20	--
Commercial Inland Marine	Page 21	Exhibits B6-B7
<u>LIABILITY COVERAGES</u>		
Distribution of Advisory Loss Cost Level Change	Page 22-27	Exhibits B8-B17
<u>SECTION C- REVISED CLM DIVISION NINE</u>		
Commercial Package Policy Package Modification Factors (Revised MLCP-PMF-1)	--	C-2

COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW

OBJECTIVE

A Commercial Package Policy (CPP) is essentially a combination of monoline coverages. CPP pricing employs monoline loss costs modified by Package Modification Factors (PMFs). These factors vary by the eight CPP types of policy and are reviewed annually. Monoline and multiline experience are combined and reviewed via a monoline/multiline relativity analysis. The resulting indicated PMFs represent the loss cost for a CPP relative to that for monoline policies providing the same coverages.

STEP 1: THE RELATIVITY ANALYSES

Each line of insurance develops indicated changes to monoline and multiline aggregate loss costs based on an experience ratio relativity analysis for that coverage. The monoline indication represents the needed change to monoline loss costs. The multiline indication represents the needed change to multiline aggregate loss costs, which is implemented through changes to the PMFs. For this PMF analysis, multiline indications are developed for each line of insurance and Type of Policy. Relativity analyses are explained in Section B.

STEP 2: CALCULATION OF THE PMFs

The procedure described above generates indicated Implicit PMFs (IPMFs) which vary by the various lines of insurance and by type of policy. IPMFs represent what the PMF would be for the CPP risk if only a single coverage were written. For each Type of Policy, IPMFs are weighted by CPP aggregate loss costs to determine the indicated property and liability PMFs. These PMFs may be capped, or rounded to the nearest one percent, and certain component IPMFs appropriately adjusted for this change. These calculations are explained in the remainder of Section A.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBIT A2

CALCULATION OF REVISED PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTORS

OBJECTIVE Commercial package policies were introduced in the 1960's as a convenient tool for both insurer and insured to have the many types of insurance needed by commercial risks packaged under one cover. Thus fire, extended coverage, crime, liability insurance, etc. could be written using a single policy instead of several. Today, virtually any type of monoline coverage can also be purchased as part of a package policy such as the CPP.

The types of insured which can be written under a CPP are generally categorized into the following Types of Policy:

- . Motels and Hotels (TOP 31)
- . Apartments (TOP 32)
- . Offices (TOP 33)
- . Mercantile Operations (TOP 34)
- . Institutions (TOP 35)
- . Service Operations (TOP 36)
- . Industrial and Processing Operations (TOP 37)
- . Contractors (TOP 38)

PRICING OF POLICIES Since a CPP is essentially a combination of monoline coverages, CPP pricing employs monoline loss costs modified by PMFs (Package Modification Factors). These factors vary by the categories shown above and are reviewed annually.

CPP PMF REVIEW PROCEDURE The CPP review of Package Modification Factors, which appears in Table 2 of this document, determines the appropriate PMF loss cost level for each of the eight CPP categories. This is done by combining the indications of the simultaneous reviews of monoline and multiline experience for the various lines (or coverages).

A detailed explanation of the calculation of the revised PMFs follows.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBIT A2 (Cont'd)

LINES OF INSURANCE (COVERAGES) INCLUDED

The CPP review reflects the contribution from each significant coverage which can be written on a CPP. Included are:

Property Coverages

- . Basic Group I (BGI) - the predominant property coverage included.
- . Basic Group II (BGII) - both Basic Group I and Basic Group II must be purchased under a CPP contract.
- . Special Causes of Loss (SCL) - typically a type of insurance which is purchased in addition to Basic Group I and Basic Group II in order to provide "all risk" property coverage for the insured.
- . Crime (CRIME) - Crime insurance is a commonly purchased CPP coverage.
- . Inland Marine (INL. MAR.) - A highly specialized line of property insurance, Inland Marine coverages can be purchased as part of a package policy.
- . Fidelity (FIDELITY) - Certain forms of fidelity insurance can be part of the CPP package. Various forms of employee dishonesty coverage are available.

Liability Coverages

- . Owners, Landlords and Tenants (OL&T) Liability - this is the prevalent type of Premises/Operations liability for CPP insureds.
- . Manufacturers and Contractors Liability (M&C) - this is the type of Premises/Operations liability insurance for risks whose liability exposure is more heavily off-premises than on.
- . Products/Completed Operations Liability (PROD) - this type of insurance protects against claims for damages arising from products/completed operations in conjunction with an insured's business. For review purposes, this line of insurance is split into the following two categories:
 - Products: experience for this category is reviewed on a multistate basis.
 - Local Products/ Completed Operations: experience for this category reflects an exposure to loss which is local in nature; therefore, individual state experience is used.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBIT A2 (Cont'd)

THE IMPLICIT PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTOR

For each applicable coverage listed under each of the eight (8) CPP categories, a "current implicit PMF" is shown in column (2). The definition of this factor follows:

For a given CPP category (e.g., apartments) the published Package Modification Factor (PMF) represents the loss cost for a CPP relative to that for monoline policies providing the same coverages. Thus a property (liability) PMF of .80 represents a 20% lower aggregate loss cost for a CPP than for the comparable monoline policies. This PMF, however, represents the CPP "loss cost" for all property (liability) coverages combined. Based on CPP experience, it has been determined that this CPP "loss cost" can differ significantly if it is determined for each property (liability) coverage individually. The IPMF represents what the PMF would be for that CPP risk if only a single coverage were written. The use of the IPMF in monoline/multiline ratemaking and in the determination of revised CPP Package Modification Factors is significant in that it appropriately identifies how different the component parts of the multiline "loss cost" are.

THE MULTILINE INDICATION

Under the CPP ratemaking procedures, monoline and multiline experience are combined for each coverage. The results of these coverage analyses are indicated changes to monoline loss costs and also indicated CPP aggregate loss cost level changes. The CPP indications by coverage are then incorporated in the CPP PMF review. These indications (shown in column (3)) represent the needed adjustments to the IPMFs (shown in column (2)) described above.

The development of these indications is detailed in Section B.

THE INDICATED PMF

For each CPP category (and for property vs. liability), the indicated PMF is calculated as follows:

Each of the current IPMFs in column (2) is multiplied by the indicated percent change shown in column (3). A weighted average of the indicated IPMFs, using weights based on latest year aggregate loss costs at current ISO loss cost level (column (1) divided by column (2)), yields the indicated PMF at the bottom of column (4).

THE CAPPED PMF

The indicated PMF for each category (and for property vs. liability) shown at the bottom of column (4) is limited to a maximum of 1.00 in arriving at the proposed PMF (bottom of column (5)). All indicated PMFs which are below 1.00 are rounded to the nearest .01 in determining the proposed PMF. To the extent that any indicated PMFs are capped at 1.00, indicated PMFs below this value are adjusted in order to minimize any revenue changes which would result from capping.

In addition to the adjustments just described, the IPMFs (for property and liability) shown in column (4) are subject to minimum and maximum values and adjusted in column (5) so that they average to the proposed PMF shown at the bottom of column (5).

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBITS B1 AND B2

BASIC GROUP I AND SPECIAL CAUSES OF LOSS RELATIVITY ANALYSIS

OBJECTIVE

The explanations which follow clarify Exhibits B1 and B2, the Basic Group I Relativity Analysis and the Special Causes of Loss Relativity Analysis, respectively. The purpose of these analyses is to:

- (1) determine monoline classification and territorial loss cost level needs for Basic Group I;
- (2) determine monoline category loss cost level need for Special Causes of Loss;
- (3) determine indicated changes to the eight property CPP Package Modification Factors based on Basic Group I/Special Causes of Loss experience.

COLUMN (1)

LEAST SQUARES FORMULA RELATIVITIES

The Least Squares Formula Relativities are the marginal relativities which result from the application of the simultaneous review procedure to the raw experience (where marginal refers to the relativities for a given rating variable, e.g. type of policy, across all subsets of any other rating variables, i.e. rating group and territory for Basic Group I, and category for Special Causes of Loss).

The purpose of such a simultaneous review procedure is to arrive at a set of type of policy relativities (which will serve to price CPP policies relative to monoline policies via the PMF); a set of rating group/territory relativities for Basic Group I; and a set of category relativities for Special Causes of Loss that best represent the experience. This procedure is in contrast to a review of each rating variable's experience separately. Such one-way types of review do not take into account differing percentages of monoline and multiline experience in each rating variable, or differing percentages of a particular rating variable's experience in the monoline and multiline types of policy. The simultaneous relativity procedure accounts for these different distributions in generating relativities for the various rating variables.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBITS B1 AND B2 (Cont'd)

COLUMN (1)
(Cont'd)

The procedure uses an iterative technique to determine a set of marginal relativities by rating variable that is a best fit to the individual cell relativities, with each cell being defined as the cross-section of specific values of each rating variable. The process uses the relativity of the five year experience ratios by rating cell to the overall statewide experience ratio and the latest year aggregate loss costs for each rating cell. (This experience is shown in Exhibit B3 for Basic Group I and Exhibit B4 for Special Causes of Loss). Specifically, the iteration procedure uses the following formulas:

BASIC GROUP I:

$$TOP_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^t W_{ijk}^2 R_{ijk} RG_j TER_k}{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^t W_{ijk}^2 RG_j^2 TER_k^2}, \text{ where } 1 \leq i \leq m;$$

$$RG_j = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^m W_{ijk}^2 R_{ijk} TOP_i TER_k}{\sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^m W_{ijk}^2 TOP_i^2 TER_k^2}, \text{ where } 1 \leq j \leq n$$

$$TER_k = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m W_{ijk}^2 R_{ijk} TOP_i RG_j}{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m W_{ijk}^2 TOP_i^2 RG_j^2}, \text{ where } 1 \leq k \leq t$$

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBITS B1 AND B2 (Cont'd)

COLUMN (1)
(Cont'd)

SPECIAL CAUSES OF LOSS:

$$TOP_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n W_{ij}^2 R_{ij} CAT_j}{\sum_{j=1}^n W_{ij}^2 CAT_j^2}, \text{ where } 1 \leq i \leq m;$$

$$CAT_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m W_{ij}^2 R_{ij} TOP_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m W_{ij}^2 TOP_i^2}, \text{ where } 1 \leq j \leq n$$

- TOP_i is the relativity for the i th Type of Policy;
- RG_j is the relativity for the j th Rating Group;
- CAT_j is the relativity for the j th Category;
- TER_k is the relativity for the k th Territory;
- W_{ijk} is the loss cost volume at current level for the i th Type of Policy, j th Rating Group or Category and k th Territory;
- R_{ijk} is the experience ratio relativity for the i th Type of Policy, j th Rating Group or Category and k th Territory;
- R_{ij} is the experience ratio relativity for the i th Type of Policy, j th Rating Group or Category;

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBITS B1 AND B2 (Cont'd)

COLUMN (1) (Cont'd)

- m is the number of Types of Policy in the analysis;
- n is the number of Rating Groups or Categories in the analysis;
- t is the number of Territories in the analysis.

The procedure determines m Type of Policy relativities using the above formulas. Then, using those results, a set of n Rating Group and t Territory relativities are determined. These steps form an iterative process which continues until there is no appreciable difference in results from one iteration to the next.

COLUMN (2)

CREDIBILITY

The credibility of the experience for each rating variable is determined from the formula:

$$Z = \frac{P}{P + K}$$

where P is the 5-year adjusted aggregate loss costs for a given rating variable, and K is a constant value. For Basic Group I, K equals an aggregate loss cost volume of \$55,000,000 for territory, \$40,000,000 for rating group, and \$100,000,000 for type of policy. For Special Causes of Loss, K equals an aggregate loss cost volume of \$15,000,000.

COLUMN (3)

CREDIBILITY-WEIGHTED RELATIVITIES

Credibility-weighted relativities are calculated based on the formula

$$W = R^Z$$

where Z is the credibility, R is the least squares formula relativity and W is the credibility-weighted relativity for a given rating variable.

This formula implicitly assigns the complement of credibility to a relativity of unity.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBITS B1 AND B2 (Cont'd)

COLUMN (4)

BALANCED RELATIVITIES

The credibility-weighted relativities are balanced to assure that the average relativity across all rating variables remains at unity.

MULTILINE
CONSIDERATIONS

The type of policy (TOP) relativities are used to generate multiline indications which apply to the current Implicit Package Modification Factors (IPMFs). The indicated IPMFs are calculated as follows:

$$\text{TOP y indicated IPMF} = \frac{(\text{TOP y current IPMF}) \times (\text{TOP y relativity})}{\text{monoline relativity}}$$

For each CPP Type of Policy the indicated IPMF is subject to a minimum value of 0.50 and a maximum value of 1.50. If an indicated IPMF falls outside one of those limits, it is capped at that amount, the aggregate loss costs for that Type of Policy are adjusted to the capped IPMF level, and the entire relativity review as described above is re-performed to take this into account. If an IPMF has been capped it is so noted at the bottom of Exhibits B1 and B2.

Loss cost changes for each TOP are calculated as described on Exhibits B1 and B2.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBITS B3 AND B4

BASIC GROUP I/SPECIAL CAUSES OF LOSS RELATIVITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW

INTRODUCTION The experience used in the relativity analysis and displayed in Exhibits B3 and B4 is the latest five years of accident year data as reported under the Commercial Statistical Plan. As in the overall review, loss costs have been adjusted to current ISO loss cost and prospective amount of insurance levels (with multiline aggregate loss costs adjusted additionally by the current implicit package modification factors). Incurred losses are adjusted to prospective cost levels, and are further adjusted by the Basic Group I large loss procedure and the Special Causes of Loss excess procedure. Losses have also been developed to their ultimate settlement value by application of loss development factors.

COLUMN (1) AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS

The latest year adjusted aggregate loss costs (adjusted as described above) are used as weights both in the calculation of any totals shown in this table and in the iterative formulae used in the simultaneous review procedure.

COLUMN (2) 5 - YEAR AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS

The combined five-year adjusted aggregate loss costs (adjusted as described above) are used to calculate the experience ratios in column (3).

COLUMN (3) FIVE-YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIOS

These are the ratio of the combined five-year adjusted incurred losses (adjusted as described above) to the combined five-year adjusted aggregate loss costs as shown in Column (2). Any totals which are shown are weighted averages using the adjusted aggregate loss costs in Column (1).

COLUMN (4) CREDIBILITY (Z) WEIGHTED EXPERIENCE RATIO

A credibility procedure is applied to the initial experience ratios in column (3) on a cell-by-cell basis prior to the simultaneous review procedure. The credibility values are calculated using an empirical Bayesian credibility procedure. In the following discussion, cell refers to an individual combination of TOP, rating group or category, and territory (where applicable).

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBITS B3 AND B4 (Cont'd)

COLUMN (4) (Cont'd)

The important concept underlying empirical Bayesian credibility is that the credibility should depend both on the overall variation of the group of which the cell is a member, in addition to the variation of the yearly experience ratios for each cell. Therefore, if a cell's data is itself very stable then we would assign a relatively high credibility value, and vice versa.

The empirical Bayesian credibility formula for individual cell credibility is $Z = ((C-3)/C) (P/(P+K)) + (3/C)$. P equals the cell's five-year adjusted aggregate loss costs and C equals the number of unique combinations of rating variables (Territory, TOP and Rating Group/Category) within a class group. The K value is estimated from the underlying data using the empirical Bayes method and varies by TOP group and by territory where applicable. The three TOP groups used in this analysis are: Monoline (TOP 10), Premises (TOP's 31-35), and Operations (TOP's 36-38). The 3/C term corrects for the statistical bias associated with the credibility process. The minimum credibility that is possible is 3/C.

The calculated credibility (Z) is then applied to the five-year experience ratio with the complement of credibility applied to the credibility-weighted average of the individual experience ratios of the group, where group refers to the specified TOP/territory group. In a non-territory state, K values would be determined for the three TOP groups on an entire state basis.

COLUMN (5)

WEIGHTED RELATIVITIES

The relativities are the ratios of the five-year credibility-weighted experience ratios shown in column (4) to the average five-year credibility-weighted experience ratio for all TOP's, rating groups and territories (where applicable) combined. These relativities represent how much better or worse than average the experience for a given cell is. They are used along with the aggregate loss costs in column (1) as input for the simultaneous review procedure.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBIT 5

BASIC GROUP II RELATIVITY ANALYSIS

OBJECTIVE

The explanations which follow clarify Exhibit 5, the Basic Group II (BG II) relativity analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to:

- (1) determine the monoline loss cost level need;
- (2) determine indicated changes to the eight property Commercial Package Policy (CPP) Package Modification Factors (PMFs) based on Basic Group II experience.

COLUMN (1)

AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS

The latest accident year adjusted aggregate loss costs (adjusted in the same manner as in the overall review, i.e. to current manual loss cost and prospective amount of insurance levels, with multiline aggregate loss costs further adjusted to current IPMF level) are used as weights in the calculation of any totals shown in this table.

COLUMN (2)

10 - YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO

These experience ratios are the ratio of the combined ten year CSP adjusted incurred losses (adjusted to current deductible and prospective cost levels including loss development, and also adjusted to reflect the BGII excess loss procedure) to the combined ten year CSP adjusted aggregate loss costs. Any totals which are shown are weighted averages using the aggregate loss costs in Column (1). When a dash is displayed in the column, it indicates that the indicated IPMF which resulted from this procedure was capped. The procedure which follows when capping occurs is described below.

COLUMN (3)

FORMULA RELATIVITY

The formula relativities are the ratios of the ten year experience ratios for the type of policy (either monoline vs. multiline or individual multiline programs) to the average ten year experience ratio for monoline and multiline combined. These relativities represent how much better or worse than average the experience for a given type of policy is. Again, any totals which are shown are weighted averages and the display of a dash indicates that the resulting IPMF was capped.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBIT 5 (Cont'd)

COLUMN (3)
(Cont'd)

Unlike the BGI and SCL relativity analyses, the BGII analysis does not employ a simultaneous review procedure since a one way review is involved. That is, the overall loss cost change is only distributed across type of policy; no other rating variables are considered.

COLUMN (4)

CREDIBILITY

The credibility of the experience for each type of policy is determined from the formula:

$$Z = \frac{P}{P + K}$$

where P is the ten year adjusted aggregate loss costs for a given type of policy, and K is a constant loss cost volume of \$45,000,000.

COLUMN (5)

Z - WEIGHTED RELATIVITY

The weighted relativity is a weighted average of the individual TOP formula relativity and the overall (coverage) formula relativity using credibility and its complement as the respective weights. Therefore, to the extent that the indication for a type of policy is not fully credible, the complement of credibility is assigned to the statewide coverage level change.

COLUMN (6)

BALANCED FORMULA RELATIVITY

The individual multiline weighted relativities are balanced to the multiline weighted relativity level by applying a factor equal to the overall multiline relativity (i.e. the weighted relativity for all multiline combined which is shown on the top of the exhibit directly under the corresponding monoline relativity) divided by the average multiline relativity (i.e. the weighted average of the individual multiline weighted relativities which is shown on the bottom of the exhibit). When the indicated IPMF for a type of policy is capped, the balanced relativity is set equal to the product of the capped IPMF and the monoline balanced formula relativity, divided by the current IPMF.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBIT 5 (Cont'd)

COLUMN (7)

NORMALIZED FORMULA RELATIVITY

The normalized relativity is equal to the balanced formula relativity divided by the average monoline/multiline combined relativity. This balances the average monoline/multiline relativity to unity.

COLUMN (8)

INDICATED LOSS COST CHANGES

The indicated multiline (by TOP) changes are calculated by taking the ratio of the TOP relativity (Column 7) to the monoline relativity.

For each type of policy the indicated IPMF is subject to a minimum value of 0.50 and a maximum value of 1.50. If an indicated IPMF falls outside one of those limits, it is capped at that amount, the aggregate loss costs for that type of policy are adjusted to the capped IPMF level, and the entire relativity review as described above is redone to take this into account. If an IPMF has been capped it is so noted in footnote A.

CRIME AND FIDELITY

The reviews for Burglary and Theft and for Fidelity are done on a multistate basis, combining both multiline and monoline experience. However, unlike other coverages included in a Commercial Package Policy, there is no simultaneous review procedure for either Burglary and Theft or for Fidelity in which separate loss cost level changes can be determined for multiline and monoline experience. In the absence of a simultaneous review procedure, we are unable to determine Type of Policy relativities with which to price CPP policies relative to monoline policies and therefore have assumed a multiline change of 0.0% and thus no change to the historic Crime or Fidelity IPMFs.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO EXHIBITS B6 AND B7

COMMERCIAL INLAND MARINE RELATIVITY ANALYSIS

EXPERIENCE BASE	The Commercial Inland Marine IPMF review presented in the attached exhibits is based on a review of the latest available five years of monoline and multiline experience through accident year 2016 for all companies reporting data to Insurance Services Office under the Inland Marine Module of the Commercial Statistical Plan (CSP) and the Intermediate Level of the Commercial Minimum Statistical Plan (CMSP).
ADJUSTMENT OF DATA	Aggregate loss costs for each year in the review period have been adjusted to the levels which would have been earned had the current loss costs applied throughout the experience period. Reported premiums are adjusted to current level on an individual policy basis by applying a factor equal to all loss cost level changes that have been implemented subsequent to the policy being written. These adjusted premiums are then converted to a loss cost at current level. In order to eliminate the impact of company deviations from the manual level and individual risk modifications which were in effect at the time the policy was written, aggregate loss costs are further adjusted based on reported Rate Modification and Rate Departure Factors/Loss Cost Multipliers. Multiline aggregate loss costs are further adjusted to the level of the current Implicit Package Modification Factor (IPMF). Incurred losses are loaded for all loss adjustment expenses by applying a factor of 1.105.
RELATIVITY ANALYSIS	For Inland Marine coverage, a <u>multistate</u> IPMF level is determined via a two-way relativity analysis similar to the analysis used in Basic Group I. The experience for all reviewed classes is used to form class group relativities. These relativities for monoline and multiline (all programs combined) are determined through an iterative procedure. The ratio of the multiline relativity to the monoline relativity is multiplied by the current IPMF to yield the indicated IPMF. The indicated IPMF is subject to a minimum value of 0.500 and a maximum value of 1.500. If an indicated IPMF falls outside one of those limits, it is capped at that amount, the premiums for that Type of Policy (i.e., TOP 10 versus TOP 3X) are adjusted to the capped IPMF level, and the entire relativity review is performed again to take this into account.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO GENERAL LIABILITY

RELATIVITY ANALYSIS - EXHIBITS B8 THROUGH B17.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this procedure are to:

- 1) determine monoline loss cost level needs for the appropriate rating variables;
- 2) determine indicated changes to the eight liability Commercial Package Policy (CPP) Package Modification Factors (PMFs) based on Premises/Operations and Products/Completed Operations data.

EXPERIENCE BASE

The experience used in this relativity analysis is the latest five (5) years of accident year data, as reported under the Commercial Statistical Plan with aggregate loss costs adjusted to current loss cost level (multiline aggregate loss costs adjusted additionally by the current Implicit Package Modification Factors). Losses have been trended and developed in the Relativity Analysis. ALCCL have been trended.

SIMULTANEOUS DETERMINATION OF RATING VARIABLE RELATIVITIES

Once the aggregate loss costs at current level and incurred losses used in the analysis have been appropriately adjusted, the 5-year experience ratios are calculated for each combination of the appropriate rating variables. From these ratios, relativities to the statewide 5-year experience ratio are calculated. These relativities are then used in a minimum bias iterative review procedure, which simultaneously determines the relativities for each rating variable.

The purpose of a simultaneous review procedure is to arrive at a set of relativities for each rating variable that best represent the experience. For example, the type of policy relativities will serve to derive the relationship of CPP policies relative to monoline policies, via the PMF, while the class group and territory (if applicable) relativities will serve to derive the relationship of the various classification and territories relative to one another. An iterative technique is used to derive relativities for each rating variable. This procedure is in contrast to a one-way type of review, wherein relativities for each rating variable would each be reviewed separately.

Such one-way types of review do not take into account differing percentages of experience of each rating variable within the other rating variables. The simultaneous review procedure accounts for these different distributions in generating relativities for each rating variable.

RATING VARIABLES USED

For Premises/Operations and Products/Completed Operations, the rating variables used in the relativity analysis are as follows:

Manufacturers and Contractors -	type of policy and class group
Owners, Landlords and Tenants -	type of policy, territory and class group
Products -	type of policy and class group
Local Products/Completed Operations-	type of policy, state and class group

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO GENERAL LIABILITY
RELATIVITY ANALYSIS - EXHIBITS B8 THROUGH B17.

ITERATIVE
PROCEDURE

The iterative technique referred to in the previous paragraph solves for a set of relativities for each rating variable based on the experience for the cells; that is, based on the experience ratio and latest year adjusted aggregate loss cost volume for each combination of rating variables relative to the experience ratio and adjusted aggregate loss cost volume for all combinations of rating variables combined. Specifically, the iterative procedure uses the following formulas:

For Owners, Landlords and Tenants:

$$TOP_i = \frac{\sum_j \sum_k W_{ijk} r_{ijk}}{\sum_j \sum_k W_{ijk} CG_j TER_k} \quad \text{where } 1 \leq i \leq m$$
$$CG_j = \frac{\sum_i \sum_k W_{ijk} r_{ijk}}{\sum_i \sum_k W_{ijk} TOP_i TER_k} \quad \text{where } 1 \leq j \leq n$$
$$TER_k = \frac{\sum_i \sum_j W_{ijk} r_{ijk}}{\sum_i \sum_j W_{ijk} TOP_i CG_j} \quad \text{where } 1 \leq k \leq p$$

TOP_i is the relative change for the i^{th} type of policy;

CG_j is the relative change for the j^{th} class group;

TER_k is the relative change for the k^{th} territory;

W_{ijk} is the aggregate loss costs at current level for the i^{th}

type of policy, j^{th} class group and k^{th} territory;

r_{ijk} is the relative change for the i^{th} type of policy,

j^{th} class group and k^{th} territory;

m is the number of types of policy in the analysis;

n is the number of class groups in the analysis;

p is the number of territories in the analysis;

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO GENERAL LIABILITY
RELATIVITY ANALYSIS - EXHIBITS B8 THROUGH B17.

For Manufacturers and Contractors, and Products:

$$TOP_i = \frac{\sum_j W_{ij} r_{ij}}{\sum_j W_{ij} CG_j} \quad \text{where } 1 \leq i \leq m$$
$$CG_j = \frac{\sum_i W_{ij} r_{ij}}{\sum_i W_{ij} TOP_i} \quad \text{where } 1 \leq j \leq n$$

TOP_i is the relative change for the i^{th} type of policy;

CG_j is the relative change for the j^{th} class group;

W_{ij} is the aggregate loss costs at current level for the i^{th}

type of policy and j^{th} class group;

r_{ij} is the relative change for the i^{th} type of policy

and j^{th} class group;

m is the number of types of policy in the analysis;

n is the number of class groups in the analysis;

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO GENERAL LIABILITY
RELATIVITY ANALYSIS - EXHIBITS B8 THROUGH B17.

For Local Products/Completed Operations:

$$TOP_i = \frac{\sum_j \sum_k W_{ijk} r_{ijk}}{\sum_j \sum_k W_{ijk} CG_j ST_k} \quad \text{where } 1 \leq i \leq m$$

$$CG_j = \frac{\sum_i \sum_k W_{ijk} r_{ijk}}{\sum_i \sum_k W_{ijk} TOP_i ST_k} \quad \text{where } 1 \leq j \leq n$$

$$ST_k = \frac{\sum_i \sum_j W_{ijk} r_{ijk}}{\sum_i \sum_j W_{ijk} TOP_i CG_j} \quad \text{where } 1 \leq k \leq p$$

TOP_i is the relative change for the i^{th} type of policy;

CG_j is the relative change for the j^{th} class group;

ST_k is the relative change for the k^{th} state;

W_{ijk} is the aggregate loss costs at current level for the i^{th}

type of policy, j^{th} class group and k^{th} state;

r_{ijk} is the relative change for the i^{th} type of policy,

j^{th} class group and k^{th} state;

m is the number of types of policy in the analysis;

n is the number of class groups in the analysis;

p is the number of states in the analysis;

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO GENERAL LIABILITY
RELATIVITY ANALYSIS - EXHIBITS B8 THROUGH B17.

ITERATIVE
PROCEDURE
(Cont'd)

For example, for Owners, Landlords and Tenants, the procedure starts by inserting the actual relativities for type of policy and class group into the third formula to get a territory relativity. This result is then used with the class group relativity in the first formula to get a new type of policy relativity, which in turn is substituted along with the territory relativity into the second formula to get a new class group relativity. The process continues on in that fashion until there is no appreciable difference from one iteration to the next.

APPLICATION OF
CREDIBILITY

Consideration is then given to the credibility of the experience for each rating variable. The credibility of each of these categories is based on the formula $Z = \sqrt{P/18,000}$ for Owners, Landlords and Tenants, $Z = \sqrt{P/18,000}$ for Manufacturers and Contractors and $Z = \sqrt{P/20,000}$ for Products, where P is the 5 year occurrence total for a given class group, territory or type of policy. For Local Products/Completed Operations, separate formulas are used to calculate the credibility of the experience for each type of policy and class group versus the credibility of the experience for each state, namely $Z = \sqrt{P/15,000}$ for type of policy and class group, and $Z = \sqrt{P/5,500}$ for state (in this case, P is the 5 year occurrence total for a given state). Credibility-weighted relativities are then calculated as follows:

$$W = R^Z \quad \text{where:}$$

Z is the class group, territory, state or type of policy credibility;

R is the class group, territory, state or type of policy relativity;

W is the credibility-weighted relativity.

The resulting credibility-weighted relativities are then balanced to assure that the average relativity remains at unity.

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO GENERAL LIABILITY
RELATIVITY ANALYSIS - EXHIBITS B8 THROUGH B17.

MULTILINE
CONSIDERATIONS

The monoline relativities and the class group, territory (if applicable) and state relativities which result from the aforementioned procedures are then used to generate indicated monoline classification loss cost changes. The multiline relativities are used to generate multiline indications that apply to the current Implicit Package Modification Factors. The indicated IPMFs are calculated as follows:

$$\text{TOP y indicated IPMF} = \frac{(\text{TOP y current IPMF}) \times (\text{TOP y relativity})}{(\text{monoline relativity})}$$

For each CPP Type of Policy the indicated IPMF is subject to a minimum value of 0.50 and a maximum value of 1.50. If an indicated IPMF falls outside one of those limits, it is capped at that amount, the aggregate loss costs for that Type of Policy are adjusted to the capped IPMF level, and the entire relativity review as described above is re-performed to take this into account.

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS

COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
SUMMARY OF THIS REVIEW

TYPE OF POLICY	PROPERTY PMFS			LIABILITY PMFS			PROP. & LIAB. TOTAL
	CURRENT	CAPPED	% CHANGE	CURRENT	CAPPED	% CHANGE	% CHANGE
MOTEL/HOTEL(31)	1.00	1.00	0.0%	1.00	1.00	0.0%	0.0%
APARTMENT (32)	1.00	1.00	0.0%	1.00	1.00	0.0%	0.0%
OFFICE (33)	0.87	0.83	-4.6%	0.90	0.94	4.4%	2.1%
MERCANTILE (34)	1.00	1.00	0.0%	1.00	1.00	0.0%	0.0%
INSTITUTION(35)	0.99	0.91	-8.1%	0.85	0.93	9.4%	-4.8%
SERVICES (36)	1.00	1.00	0.0%	1.00	1.00	0.0%	0.0%
IND/PROC (37)	0.88	0.82	-6.8%	0.78	0.80	2.6%	-1.9%
CONTRACTORS(38)	1.00	0.98	-2.0%	0.96	1.00	4.2%	3.8%
STATEWIDE			-3.7%			3.0%	0.1%

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
CALCULATION OF REVISED CPP PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTORS(PMF)

MOTEL/HOTEL(31) *****	(1) AGGREGATE LOSS <u>COSTS</u>	(2) CURRENT IMPLICIT <u>PMF</u>	(3) NET <u>INDICATION</u>	(4) INDIC. <u>PMF</u>	(5) CAPPED <u>PMF</u>
COVERAGE					
PROPERTY-					
BASIC GRP I	629,498	0.868	-2.3%	0.848	0.831
BASIC GRP II	393,260	1.106	8.6%	1.201	1.177
SP CAUSE/LOSS	273,145	1.349	-1.4%	1.330	1.303
* CRIME	5,390	0.909	0.0%	0.909	0.909
* INL. MAR.	8,759	0.910	0.0%	0.910	0.910
* FIDELITY	13,469	1.000	0.0%	1.000	1.000
TOTAL	1,323,521	1.000	2.0%	1.020	1.000
LIABILITY-					
OL&T	2,367,005	1.000	5.2%	1.052	1.000
TOTAL	2,367,005	1.000	5.2%	1.052	1.000

PROP. & LIAB. TOTAL	3,690,526		4.1%		

APARTMENT (32) *****	(1) AGGREG- ATE LOSS <u>COSTS</u>	(2) CURRENT IMPLICIT <u>PMF</u>	(3) NET <u>INDICATION</u>	(4) INDIC. <u>PMF</u>	(5) CAPPED <u>PMF</u>
COVERAGE					
PROPERTY-					
BASIC GRP I	5,296,895	0.830	0.7%	0.836	0.794
BASIC GRP II	4,236,132	1.247	7.4%	1.339	1.272
SP CAUSE/LOSS	2,187,121	1.257	2.9%	1.293	1.228
* CRIME	11,374	0.909	0.0%	0.909	0.909
* INL. MAR.	5,906	0.910	0.0%	0.910	0.910
* FIDELITY	102,707	1.000	0.0%	1.000	1.000
TOTAL	11,840,135	1.000	5.3%	1.053	1.000
LIABILITY-					
OL&T	8,915,340	1.000	11.6%	1.116	1.000
TOTAL	8,915,340	1.000	11.6%	1.116	1.000

PROP. & LIAB. TOTAL	20,755,475		8.0%		

* indicates coverage for which reviews are on a MULTISTATE basis.

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
CALCULATION OF REVISED CPP PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTORS(PMF)

OFFICE (33) *****	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	AGGREGATE	CURRENT	NET	INDIC.	CAPPED
COVERAGE	<u>LOSS COSTS</u>	<u>IMPLICIT</u>	<u>INDICATION</u>	<u>PMF</u>	<u>PMF</u>
PROPERTY-					
BASIC GRP I	1,802,019	0.999	-3.0%	0.969	0.984
BASIC GRP II	1,858,704	0.725	-11.8%	0.639	0.649
SP CAUSE/LOSS	1,350,733	0.907	0.4%	0.910	0.924
* CRIME	12,179	0.909	0.0%	0.909	0.909
* INL. MAR.	150,863	0.910	0.0%	0.910	0.910
* FIDELITY	59,796	1.000	0.0%	1.000	1.000
TOTAL	5,234,294	0.870	-6.4%	0.814	0.830
LIABILITY-					
OL&T	13,468,184	0.895	3.0%	0.922	0.935
M&C	1,902,920	0.962	0.1%	0.963	0.977
TOTAL	15,371,105	0.900	3.0%	0.927	0.940

PROP. & LIAB.	20,605,399		0.6%		
TOTAL					

MERCANTILE (34) *****	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	AGGREGATE	CURRENT	NET	INDIC.	CAPPED
COVERAGE	<u>LOSS COSTS</u>	<u>IMPLICIT</u>	<u>INDICATION</u>	<u>PMF</u>	<u>PMF</u>
PROPERTY-					
BASIC GRP I	7,726,155	0.957	-6.7%	0.893	0.887
BASIC GRP II	7,985,289	1.103	6.6%	1.176	1.168
SP CAUSE/LOSS	4,354,166	0.960	-1.3%	0.947	0.941
* CRIME	58,940	0.909	0.0%	0.909	0.909
* INL. MAR.	278,973	0.910	0.0%	0.910	0.910
* FIDELITY	430,856	1.000	0.0%	1.000	1.000
TOTAL	20,834,379	1.000	0.7%	1.007	1.000
LIABILITY-					
OL&T	16,486,167	1.049	-1.9%	1.030	1.046
M&C	3,405,330	0.927	-0.3%	0.924	0.939
LOCAL PRODUCT	553,622	0.830	0.4%	0.833	0.847
* MULTI PRODUCT	2,288,700	0.847	0.7%	0.853	0.853
TOTAL	22,733,819	1.000	-1.5%	0.985	1.000

PROP. & LIAB.	43,568,198		-0.4%		
TOTAL					

* indicates coverage for which reviews are on a MULTISTATE basis.

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
CALCULATION OF REVISED CPP PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTORS(PMF)

INSTITUTION(35) *****	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	AGGREGATE	CURRENT	NET	INDIC.	CAPPED
COVERAGE	<u>LOSS COSTS</u>	<u>IMPLICIT</u>	<u>INDICATION</u>	<u>PMF</u>	<u>PMF</u>
PROPERTY-					
BASIC GRP I	7,080,265	0.691	-4.3%	0.662	0.671
BASIC GRP II	11,341,858	1.038	-9.0%	0.944	0.959
SP CAUSE/LOSS	7,170,081	1.500	-15.6%	1.267	1.285
* CRIME	77,300	0.909	0.0%	0.909	0.909
* INL. MAR.	124,908	0.910	0.0%	0.910	0.910
* FIDELITY	281,103	1.000	0.0%	1.000	1.000
TOTAL	26,075,515	0.990	-9.8%	0.893	0.910
LIABILITY-					
OL&T	5,771,615	0.861	9.9%	0.946	0.960
M&C	251,468	0.505	-1.0%	0.500	0.507
TOTAL	6,023,082	0.850	7.7%	0.915	0.930

PROP. & LIAB.	32,098,597		-6.5%		
TOTAL					

SERVICES (36) *****	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	AGGREGATE	CURRENT	NET	INDIC.	CAPPED
COVERAGE	<u>LOSS COSTS</u>	<u>IMPLICIT</u>	<u>INDICATION</u>	<u>PMF</u>	<u>PMF</u>
PROPERTY-					
BASIC GRP I	5,505,005	0.981	-3.5%	0.947	0.953
BASIC GRP II	5,107,404	1.043	-4.9%	0.991	0.998
SP CAUSE/LOSS	2,969,259	0.982	11.1%	1.091	1.098
* CRIME	38,445	0.909	0.0%	0.909	0.909
* INL. MAR.	176,869	0.910	0.0%	0.910	0.910
* FIDELITY	279,550	1.000	0.0%	1.000	1.000
TOTAL	14,076,532	1.000	-0.6%	0.994	1.000
LIABILITY-					
OL&T	4,820,295	1.151	0.5%	1.157	1.132
M&C	5,305,386	0.858	4.1%	0.894	0.874
LOCAL PRODUCT	1,262,064	1.233	2.1%	1.259	1.232
* MULTI PRODUCT	165,508	0.925	-1.0%	0.916	0.916
TOTAL	11,553,253	1.000	2.1%	1.021	1.000

PROP. & LIAB.	25,629,785		0.6%		
TOTAL					

* indicates coverage for which reviews are on a MULTISTATE basis.

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
CALCULATION OF REVISED CPP PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTORS(PMF)

IND/PROC (37) *****	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	AGGREGATE	CURRENT	NET	INDIC.	CAPPED
COVERAGE	<u>LOSS COSTS</u>	<u>IMPLICIT</u>	<u>INDICATION</u>	<u>PMF</u>	<u>PMF</u>
PROPERTY-					
BASIC GRP I	6,498,746	1.125	-2.3%	1.099	1.116
BASIC GRP II	3,878,910	0.732	-16.1%	0.614	0.623
SP CAUSE/LOSS	2,318,078	0.631	-5.0%	0.599	0.608
* CRIME	11,789	0.909	0.0%	0.909	0.909
* INL. MAR.	10,910	0.910	0.0%	0.910	0.910
* FIDELITY	198,335	1.000	0.0%	1.000	1.000
TOTAL	12,916,768	0.880	-8.7%	0.803	0.820
LIABILITY-					
M&C	7,735,946	0.712	4.4%	0.744	0.754
LOCAL PRODUCT	207,768	0.679	2.0%	0.693	0.703
* MULTI PRODUCT	6,121,178	0.852	1.3%	0.863	0.863
TOTAL	14,064,892	0.780	1.2%	0.789	0.800

PROP. & LIAB.	26,981,660		-3.6%		
TOTAL					

CONTRACTORS(38) *****	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	AGGREGATE	CURRENT	NET	INDIC.	CAPPED
COVERAGE	<u>LOSS COSTS</u>	<u>IMPLICIT</u>	<u>INDICATION</u>	<u>PMF</u>	<u>PMF</u>
PROPERTY-					
BASIC GRP I	932,481	0.866	-3.5%	0.836	0.848
BASIC GRP II	1,144,546	1.058	-6.3%	0.991	1.006
SP CAUSE/LOSS	778,378	1.131	-2.0%	1.108	1.125
* CRIME	4,455	0.909	0.0%	0.909	0.909
* INL. MAR.	28,682	0.910	0.0%	0.910	0.910
* FIDELITY	124,716	1.000	0.0%	1.000	1.000
TOTAL	3,013,258	1.000	-3.8%	0.962	0.980
LIABILITY-					
M&C	31,801,793	0.980	0.8%	0.988	1.002
LOCAL PRODUCT	12,825,997	0.928	4.8%	0.973	0.987
TOTAL	44,627,790	0.960	2.4%	0.983	1.000

PROP. & LIAB.	47,641,048		2.0%		
TOTAL					

* indicates coverage for which reviews are on a MULTISTATE basis.

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
CALCULATION OF REVISED CPP PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTORS(PMF)

STATEWIDE *****	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	AGGREGATE	CURRENT	NET	INDIC.	CAPPED
COVERAGE	<u>LOSS COSTS</u>	<u>IMPLICIT</u>	<u>INDICATION</u>	<u>PMF</u>	<u>PMF</u>
PROPERTY-					
BASIC GRP I	35,471,064	0.894	-3.5%	0.863	0.861
BASIC GRP II	35,946,103	1.005	-3.7%	0.968	0.968
SP CAUSE/LOSS	21,400,961	1.063	-4.3%	1.017	1.019
* CRIME	219,872	0.909	0.0%	0.909	0.909
* INL. MAR.	785,870	0.910	0.0%	0.910	0.910
* FIDELITY	1,490,532	1.000	0.0%	1.000	1.000
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>95,314,402</u>	<u>0.971</u>	<u>-3.6%</u>	<u>0.936</u>	<u>0.935</u>
LIABILITY-					
OL&T	51,828,607	0.979	3.6%	1.014	1.001
M&C	50,402,843	0.906	1.6%	0.920	0.930
LOCAL PRODUCT	14,849,451	0.939	4.4%	0.980	0.991
* MULTI PRODUCT	8,575,386	0.852	1.1%	0.861	0.861
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>125,656,287</u>	<u>0.932</u>	<u>3.0%</u>	<u>0.960</u>	<u>0.960</u>

PROP. & LIAB.	220,970,689		0.1%		
TOTAL					

* indicates coverage for which reviews are on a MULTISTATE basis.

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
CALCULATION OF REVISED CPP PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTORS(PMF)

COMBINED PMFs

TYPE OF POLICY	CURRENT COMBINED	INDICATED COMBINED	CAPPED COMBINED
MOTEL/HOTEL(31)	1.000	1.041	1.000
APARTMENT (32)	1.000	1.080	1.000
OFFICE (33)	0.890	0.897	0.910
MERCANTILE (34)	1.000	0.996	1.000
INSTITUTION(35)	0.950	0.898	0.910
SERVICES (36)	1.000	1.006	1.000
IND/PROC (37)	0.820	0.796	0.800
CONTRACTORS(38)	0.960	0.982	1.000

NOTE: Combined PMFs are provided for informational purposes only.

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS

BASIC GROUP I RELATIVITY ANALYSIS

TYPE OF POLICY	(1) LEAST SQUARES FORMULA	(2) CREDIBILITY	(3) WEIGHTED CREDIBILITY RELATIVITY	(4) BALANCED RELATIVITY	(5) INDICATED CHANGE
	RELATIVITY	RELATIVITY	RELATIVITY	RELATIVITY	CHANGE
10	1.131	0.234	1.029	1.031	
31	1.201	0.028	1.005	1.007	-2.3%
32	1.139	0.269	1.036	1.038	0.7%
33	0.979	0.083	0.998	1.000	-3.0%
34	0.874	0.302	0.960	0.962	-6.7%
35	0.947	0.278	0.985	0.987	-4.3%
36	0.970	0.229	0.993	0.995	-3.5%
37	1.019	0.273	1.005	1.007	-2.3%
38	0.858	0.045	0.993	0.995	-3.5%
RATING GROUP					
1	0.884	0.415	0.950	0.949	
2	0.838	0.255	0.956	0.955	
3	1.160	0.152	1.023	1.022	
4	1.139	0.522	1.070	1.069	
5	1.144	0.042	1.006	1.005	
6	0.913	0.347	0.969	0.968	
7	0.927	0.185	0.986	0.985	
8	0.934	0.332	0.978	0.977	
9	0.963	0.225	0.992	0.991	
10	0.838	0.074	0.987	0.986	
11	1.023	0.079	1.002	1.001	
13	1.235	0.185	1.040	1.039	
14	0.924	0.255	0.980	0.979	
15	1.184	0.179	1.031	1.030	
17	1.036	0.102	1.004	1.003	
18	0.889	0.072	0.992	0.991	
19	1.198	0.017	1.003	1.002	
20	1.158	0.028	1.004	1.003	
21	0.961	0.330	0.987	0.986	
22	0.945	0.186	0.990	0.989	
TERRITORY					
Chicago	0.855	0.437	0.934	0.926	
Balance of State	1.032	0.776	1.025	1.016	

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS

SPECIAL CAUSES OF LOSS RELATIVITY ANALYSIS

TYPE OF POLICY	(1) LEAST SQUARES FORMULA	(2) CREDIBILITY	(3) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED RELATIVITY	(4) BALANCED RELATIVITY	(5) INDICATED CHANGE
	RELATIVITY				
10	1.062	0.236	1.014	1.041	
31	0.994	0.027	1.000	1.026	-1.4%
32	1.189	0.250	1.044	1.071	2.9%
33	1.135	0.144	1.018	1.045	0.4%
34	1.002	0.364	1.001	1.027	-1.3%
35	0.726	0.483	0.857	0.879	-15.6%
36	1.538	0.279	1.128	1.157	11.1%
37	0.857	0.238	0.964	0.989	-5.0%
38	0.939	0.090	0.994	1.020	-2.0%
CATEGORY					
1	0.982	0.847	0.985	0.988	
2	0.702	0.113	0.961	0.964	
3	0.769	0.177	0.955	0.957	
4	0.936	0.205	0.987	0.989	
5	0.929	0.134	0.990	0.993	
6	0.944	0.078	0.996	0.998	
7	0.854	0.013	0.998	1.001	
8	1.306	0.436	1.123	1.127	
9	1.003	0.237	1.001	1.004	
10	1.359	0.037	1.011	1.014	
11	1.202	0.244	1.046	1.049	
12	0.752	0.237	0.935	0.937	
13	0.728	0.105	0.967	0.970	
14	1.192	0.091	1.016	1.019	

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
BASIC GROUP I RELATIVITY ANALYSIS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW

ENTIRE STATE		(1) ACCIDENT YEAR ENDING 09/30/18 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(2) 5 - YEAR AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(3) 5 - YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	(4) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED EXPERIENCE RATIO	(5) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED RELATIVITY
TYPE OF POLICY	CATEGORY					
10 MONOLINE	01 APARTMENTS	571,328	3,303,982	1.045	1.039	0.947
	02 OTHER HABITATIONAL	285,168	1,803,905	0.491	0.938	0.855
	03 RESTAURANTS & BARS	113,741	525,626	0.906	1.064	0.970
	04 OTHER MERCANTILE RS	1,151,825	6,112,889	1.747	1.475	1.345
	05 PUBLIC BUILDINGS	70,478	430,740	0.802	1.143	1.042
	06 CHURCHES	45,834	322,819	5.163	1.926	1.756
	07 SCHOOLS	63,882	324,114	2.782	1.330	1.212
	08 OFFICES AND BANKS	532,098	2,706,241	0.873	1.011	0.921
	09 REC. FACILITIES	310,892	1,584,123	0.325	0.871	0.795
	10 HOTELS AND MOTELS	51,615	261,053	0.258	1.030	0.939
	11 HOSPITALS/NURS HOME	76,956	738,790	1.706	1.355	1.235
	13 MOTOR VEHICLE RISKS	210,534	1,183,431	3.866	2.037	1.857
	14 OTHER NON-MANUF.	812,256	5,694,955	0.807	0.965	0.880
	15 STORAGE	327,861	1,728,485	1.087	1.074	0.979
	17 FOOD MANUFACTURING	53,414	274,646	0.000	0.944	0.861
	18 WOOD MANUFACTURING	36,879	295,190	0.003	0.948	0.864
	19 WEARING APPAREL	11,187	58,722	0.000	0.765	0.698
	20 CHEM. MANUFACTURING	31,082	199,720	0.205	1.029	0.939
	21 METAL MANUFACTURING	378,903	2,006,645	0.338	0.861	0.785
	22 OTHER MANUFACTURING	154,634	930,525	0.072	0.861	0.784
	TOTAL*	5,290,567	30,486,601	1.135	1.144	1.043
31 MULTILINE MOTEL/HOTEL	10 HOTELS AND MOTELS	629,498	2,932,488	1.241	1.107	1.009
	TOTAL*	629,498	2,932,488	1.241	1.107	1.009
32 MULTILINE APARTMENT	01 APARTMENTS	3,763,500	25,015,268	1.150	1.067	0.972
	02 OTHER HABITATIONAL	1,533,395	11,742,917	0.965	1.025	0.934
	TOTAL*	5,296,895	36,758,185	1.096	1.055	0.961
33 MULTILINE OFFICE	08 OFFICES AND BANKS	1,802,019	9,001,579	0.758	0.980	0.893
	TOTAL*	1,802,019	9,001,579	0.758	0.980	0.893
34 MULTILINE MERCANTILE	03 RESTAURANTS & BARS	1,081,272	6,150,033	1.415	1.135	1.035
	04 OTHER MERCANTILE RS	4,936,111	28,695,507	1.025	1.017	0.927
	08 OFFICES AND BANKS	236,924	1,383,977	0.933	1.045	0.953
	13 MOTOR VEHICLE RISKS	519,931	2,001,055	2.259	1.284	1.170
	14 OTHER NON-MANUF.	190,205	1,083,481	1.552	1.148	1.046
	15 STORAGE	761,712	4,003,071	2.245	1.272	1.160
	TOTAL*	7,726,155	43,317,124	1.293	1.081	0.985

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
BASIC GROUP I RELATIVITY ANALYSIS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW

ENTIRE STATE		(1) ACCIDENT YEAR ENDING 09/30/18 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(2) 5 - YEAR AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(3) 5 - YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	(4) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED EXPERIENCE RATIO	(5) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED RELATIVITY
TYPE OF POLICY	CATEGORY					
35 MULTILINE INSTITUTIONAL	02 OTHER HABITATIONAL	20,606	123,925	7.239	2.022	1.843
	05 PUBLIC BUILDINGS	283,298	1,334,471	1.879	1.214	1.106
	06 CHURCHES	3,707,437	20,946,519	0.765	0.961	0.876
	07 SCHOOLS	1,764,747	8,752,034	0.680	0.974	0.889
	08 OFFICES AND BANKS	407,342	2,157,486	0.671	0.925	0.843
	09 REC. FACILITIES	124,369	896,778	0.787	0.997	0.909
	11 HOSPITALS/NURS HOME	509,060	2,709,009	0.962	1.037	0.946
	13 MOTOR VEHICLE RISKS	8,343	45,125	0.000	0.824	0.752
	14 OTHER NON-MANUF.	255,063	1,509,405	0.364	0.933	0.850
	TOTAL*	7,080,265	38,474,752	0.801	0.980	0.894
36 MULTILINE SERVICES	03 RESTAURANTS & BARS	89,802	498,746	1.577	1.215	1.107
	04 OTHER MERCANTILE RS	542,003	3,096,623	1.873	1.237	1.127
	08 OFFICES AND BANKS	532,063	3,181,341	1.263	1.385	1.262
	09 REC. FACILITIES	1,780,154	9,130,241	0.905	1.075	0.980
	13 MOTOR VEHICLE RISKS	1,052,027	5,821,622	1.812	1.279	1.166
	14 OTHER NON-MANUF.	806,877	4,038,754	1.304	1.242	1.132
	15 STORAGE	471,884	2,540,802	1.126	1.134	1.033
	21 METAL MANUFACTURING	57,632	313,296	0.006	0.969	0.883
	22 OTHER MANUFACTURING	172,563	1,144,402	0.238	1.026	0.935
	TOTAL*	5,505,005	29,765,827	1.266	1.189	1.084
37 MULTILINE INDUST/PROCESS	04 OTHER MERCANTILE RS	463,523	2,461,195	0.585	1.039	0.947
	08 OFFICES AND BANKS	69,447	513,241	0.472	1.059	0.966
	13 MOTOR VEHICLE RISKS	4,965	32,043	0.000	0.958	0.873
	14 OTHER NON-MANUF.	159,843	908,059	1.524	1.237	1.128
	15 STORAGE	89,812	447,413	0.015	0.998	0.910
	17 FOOD MANUFACTURING	728,606	4,272,751	1.400	1.182	1.077
	18 WOOD MANUFACTURING	492,662	2,805,701	0.572	1.024	0.934
	19 WEARING APPAREL	104,302	643,561	0.645	1.245	1.136
	20 CHEM. MANUFACTURING	183,225	963,689	2.555	1.337	1.219
	21 METAL MANUFACTURING	2,975,732	17,389,032	1.313	1.302	1.187
	22 OTHER MANUFACTURING	1,226,629	7,052,747	0.932	1.061	0.967
	TOTAL*	6,498,746	37,489,432	1.144	1.195	1.089

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
BASIC GROUP I RELATIVITY ANALYSIS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW

ENTIRE STATE		(1) ACCIDENT YEAR ENDING 09/30/18 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(2) 5 - YEAR AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(3) 5 - YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	(4) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED EXPERIENCE RATIO	(5) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED RELATIVITY
TYPE OF POLICY	CATEGORY					
38 MULTILINE CONTRACTORS	04 OTHER MERCANTILE RS	649,999	3,391,732	0.958	1.090	0.993
	08 OFFICES AND BANKS	183,077	898,822	0.556	1.055	0.962
	14 OTHER NON-MANUF.	99,405	447,787	0.106	0.996	0.908
	TOTAL*	932,481	4,738,341	0.788	1.073	0.978
TOTAL ALL TOPS*	01 APARTMENTS	4,334,828	28,319,250	1.136	1.063	0.969
	02 OTHER HABITATIONAL	1,839,169	13,670,747	0.961	1.022	0.932
	03 RESTAURANTS & BARS	1,284,815	7,174,405	1.381	1.135	1.035
	04 OTHER MERCANTILE RS	7,743,461	43,757,946	1.160	1.108	1.010
	05 PUBLIC BUILDINGS	353,776	1,765,211	1.665	1.200	1.094
	06 CHURCHES	3,753,271	21,269,338	0.819	0.972	0.887
	07 SCHOOLS	1,828,629	9,076,148	0.753	0.987	0.900
	08 OFFICES AND BANKS	3,762,970	19,842,687	0.832	1.045	0.952
	09 REC. FACILITIES	2,215,415	11,611,142	0.817	1.042	0.950
	10 HOTELS AND MOTELS	681,113	3,193,541	1.166	1.101	1.004
	11 HOSPITALS/NURS HOME	586,016	3,447,799	1.059	1.079	0.984
	13 MOTOR VEHICLE RISKS	1,795,800	9,083,276	2.169	1.366	1.245
	14 OTHER NON-MANUF.	2,323,649	13,682,441	1.011	1.093	0.996
	15 STORAGE	1,651,269	8,719,771	1.574	1.178	1.074
	17 FOOD MANUFACTURING	782,020	4,547,397	1.304	1.166	1.063
	18 WOOD MANUFACTURING	529,541	3,100,891	0.532	1.019	0.929
	19 WEARING APPAREL	115,489	702,283	0.582	1.199	1.093
	20 CHEM. MANUFACTURING	214,307	1,163,409	2.214	1.292	1.178
	21 METAL MANUFACTURING	3,412,267	19,708,973	1.182	1.247	1.137
	22 OTHER MANUFACTURING	1,553,826	9,127,674	0.770	1.037	0.945
	TOTAL*	40,761,631	232,964,329	1.098	1.097	1.000

* TOTALS IN COLUMNS (3), (4) & (5) ARE AVERAGES USING COLUMN (1) AS WEIGHTS

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
SPECIAL CAUSES OF LOSS RELATIVITY ANALYSIS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW

TYPE OF POLICY	CATEGORY	(1) ACCIDENT YEAR ENDING 09/30/18 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(2) 5 - YEAR AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(3) 5 - YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	(4) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED EXPERIENCE RATIO	(5) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED RELATIVITY
10 MONOLINE	01 BUILDINGS	1,528,540	8,211,403	1.010	0.990	1.062
	02 RES. APTS. AND COND	17,136	79,504	1.425	1.058	1.135
	03 OFFICES	161,528	779,822	0.688	0.872	0.936
	04 MERCANTILE - HIGH	206,685	1,014,767	0.771	0.893	0.958
	05 MERCANTILE - MEDIUM	56,419	252,167	0.526	0.847	0.909
	06 MERCANTILE - LOW	48,339	252,030	0.865	0.930	0.998
	07 MOTELS AND HOTELS	2,926	14,711	0.702	0.898	0.964
	08 INSTITUTIONAL - HIG	30,800	203,916	0.862	0.930	0.998
	09 INSTITUTIONAL - LOW	23,289	119,633	3.763	1.596	1.712
	10 INDUST-PROC - HIGH	14,024	62,558	1.808	1.142	1.225
	11 INDUST-PROC - LOW	121,460	648,921	0.745	0.892	0.957
	12 SERVICE - HIGH	52,312	278,871	0.436	0.824	0.884
	13 SERVICE - LOW	85,086	417,900	0.811	0.915	0.982
	14 CONTRACTORS	6,178	31,391	0.022	0.749	0.804
	TOTAL*	2,354,722	12,367,594	0.949	0.963	1.033
31 MULTILINE	01 BUILDINGS	236,755	933,534	1.164	0.925	0.992
MOTEL/HOTEL	07 MOTELS AND HOTELS	36,390	189,506	0.262	0.804	0.863
	TOTAL*	273,145	1,123,040	1.044	0.909	0.975
32 MULTILINE	01 BUILDINGS	1,848,508	11,529,372	1.279	1.106	1.187
APARTMENT	02 RES. APTS. AND COND	338,613	1,830,600	0.513	0.790	0.848
	TOTAL*	2,187,121	13,359,972	1.160	1.057	1.134
33 MULTILINE	01 BUILDINGS	906,934	4,550,896	1.364	1.058	1.135
OFFICE	03 OFFICES	441,959	2,185,478	0.636	0.813	0.872
	04 MERCANTILE - HIGH	5	13	0.000	0.787	0.844
	08 INSTITUTIONAL - HIG	685	3,378	11.030	1.892	2.030
	11 INDUST-PROC - LOW	36	128	0.000	0.787	0.844
	12 SERVICE - HIGH	1,042	3,117	0.000	0.787	0.844
	14 CONTRACTORS	72	310	0.000	0.787	0.844
	TOTAL*	1,350,733	6,743,320	1.130	0.978	1.049

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
SPECIAL CAUSES OF LOSS RELATIVITY ANALYSIS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW

TYPE OF POLICY	CATEGORY	(1) ACCIDENT YEAR ENDING 09/30/18 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(2) 5 - YEAR AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(3) 5 - YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	(4) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED EXPERIENCE RATIO	(5) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED RELATIVITY
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
34 MULTILINE MERCANTILE	01 BUILDINGS	3,273,476	17,054,743	0.962	0.932	1.000
	03 OFFICES	10,421	43,490	3.183	1.114	1.195
	04 MERCANTILE - HIGH	475,454	2,519,360	0.953	0.896	0.961
	05 MERCANTILE - MEDIUM	350,956	2,051,754	0.912	0.884	0.948
	06 MERCANTILE - LOW	200,537	939,440	0.999	0.896	0.961
	08 INSTITUTIONAL - HIGH	137	514	0.000	0.787	0.844
	10 INDUST-PROC - HIGH	-	39	0.000	1.000	1.000
	11 INDUST-PROC - LOW	1,272	3,831	0.000	0.787	0.844
	12 SERVICE - HIGH	19,251	139,466	1.344	0.927	0.995
	13 SERVICE - LOW	16,048	91,207	0.564	0.841	0.902
	14 CONTRACTORS	6,614	30,977	0.000	0.785	0.842
	TOTAL*	4,354,166	22,874,821	0.962	0.923	0.990
35 MULTILINE INSTITUTIONAL	01 BUILDINGS	4,080,032	21,370,619	0.591	0.675	0.724
	03 OFFICES	14,664	62,192	1.276	0.917	0.984
	04 MERCANTILE - HIGH	41	189	0.000	0.787	0.844
	08 INSTITUTIONAL - HIGH	2,153,275	11,312,304	0.916	0.898	0.964
	09 INSTITUTIONAL - LOW	902,401	4,478,015	0.374	0.689	0.739
	12 SERVICE - HIGH	13,881	45,852	0.000	0.784	0.841
	13 SERVICE - LOW	3,629	13,735	0.000	0.786	0.843
	14 CONTRACTORS	2,158	12,863	0.000	0.786	0.843
	TOTAL*	7,170,081	37,295,769	0.661	0.744	0.799
36 MULTILINE SERVICES	01 BUILDINGS	1,865,495	9,691,602	1.589	1.431	1.535
	03 OFFICES	17,777	61,051	0.449	1.008	1.082
	04 MERCANTILE - HIGH	20,449	87,392	2.576	1.233	1.323
	05 MERCANTILE - MEDIUM	2,107	9,036	0.306	1.001	1.074
	06 MERCANTILE - LOW	3,119	9,428	0.497	1.019	1.093
	08 INSTITUTIONAL - HIGH	16,297	84,996	0.000	0.958	1.028
	09 INSTITUTIONAL - LOW	14,072	53,484	0.000	0.964	1.034
	10 INDUST-PROC - HIGH	292	1,461	0.000	0.974	1.045
	11 INDUST-PROC - LOW	4,231	18,282	0.000	0.971	1.042
	12 SERVICE - HIGH	776,187	4,186,832	1.117	1.095	1.175
	13 SERVICE - LOW	238,704	1,228,763	0.972	1.045	1.121
	14 CONTRACTORS	10,529	50,828	0.000	0.965	1.035
	TOTAL*	2,969,259	15,483,155	1.390	1.300	1.395

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
SPECIAL CAUSES OF LOSS RELATIVITY ANALYSIS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW

TYPE OF POLICY	CATEGORY	(1) ACCIDENT YEAR ENDING 09/30/18 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(2) 5 - YEAR AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(3) 5 - YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	(4) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED EXPERIENCE RATIO	(5) CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED RELATIVITY
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
37 MULTILINE INDUST/PROC	01 BUILDINGS	1,431,795	7,740,507	0.642	0.794	0.852
	03 OFFICES	1,713	10,105	0.345	1.005	1.078
	04 MERCANTILE - HIGH	8,695	33,370	1.002	1.065	1.143
	05 MERCANTILE - MEDIUM	526	2,226	0.000	0.974	1.045
	06 MERCANTILE - LOW	471	1,330	0.000	0.974	1.045
	09 INSTITUTIONAL - LOW	-	70	0.000	1.000	1.000
	10 INDUST-PROC - HIGH	95,314	515,476	1.287	1.110	1.191
	11 INDUST-PROC - LOW	777,150	4,176,998	0.902	0.986	1.058
	12 SERVICE - HIGH	1,073	3,502	0.000	0.974	1.045
	13 SERVICE - LOW	314	1,816	0.000	0.974	1.045
	14 CONTRACTORS	1,027	2,316	0.000	0.974	1.045
	TOTAL*	2,318,078	12,487,716	0.756	0.873	0.936
38 MULTILINE CONTRACTORS	01 BUILDINGS	435,494	2,198,250	0.523	0.868	0.931
	03 OFFICES	18,772	93,650	2.054	1.178	1.264
	04 MERCANTILE - HIGH	47,865	205,657	1.539	1.132	1.215
	05 MERCANTILE - MEDIUM	1,032	5,893	14.020	2.262	2.427
	06 MERCANTILE - LOW	16,361	68,688	1.319	1.098	1.178
	08 INSTITUTIONAL - HIG	314	385	0.000	0.975	1.046
	11 INDUST-PROC - LOW	1,019	3,244	1.896	1.147	1.231
	12 SERVICE - HIGH	1,371	4,663	0.000	0.974	1.045
	13 SERVICE - LOW	924	3,684	0.000	0.974	1.045
	14 CONTRACTORS	255,226	1,380,574	1.041	1.063	1.141
	TOTAL*	778,378	3,964,688	0.827	0.963	1.033
TOTAL ALL TOPS*	01 BUILDINGS	15,607,029	83,280,926	0.967	0.943	1.012
	02 RES. APTS. AND COND	355,749	1,910,104	0.557	0.803	0.861
	03 OFFICES	666,834	3,235,788	0.737	0.851	0.912
	04 MERCANTILE - HIGH	759,194	3,860,748	0.985	0.921	0.988
	05 MERCANTILE - MEDIUM	411,040	2,321,076	0.888	0.883	0.948
	06 MERCANTILE - LOW	268,827	1,270,916	0.987	0.916	0.983
	07 MOTELS AND HOTELS	39,316	204,217	0.295	0.811	0.870
	08 INSTITUTIONAL - HIG	2,201,508	11,605,493	0.911	0.899	0.965
	09 INSTITUTIONAL - LOW	939,762	4,651,202	0.452	0.716	0.768
	10 INDUST-PROC - HIGH	109,630	579,534	1.350	1.114	1.195
	11 INDUST-PROC - LOW	905,168	4,851,404	0.877	0.973	1.044
	12 SERVICE - HIGH	865,117	4,662,303	1.058	1.069	1.147
	13 SERVICE - LOW	344,705	1,757,105	0.900	1.000	1.073
	14 CONTRACTORS	281,804	1,509,259	0.943	1.043	1.120
	TOTAL*	23,755,683	125,700,075	0.928	0.932	1.000

* TOTALS IN COLUMNS (3)& (4) ARE AVERAGES USING COLUMN (1) AS WEIGHTS

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS

BASIC GROUP II RELATIVITY ANALYSIS

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	ACCIDENT YEAR ENDING 09/30/18 AGGR. LOSS COSTS AT CURRENT IMPLICIT PMF	ACCIDENT YEARS 2009-2018 EXPER. RATIO AT CURRENT PMF	FORMULA RELATIVITY (2)/ 1.052	CREDIBILITY C	CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED RELATIVITY	BALANCED FORMULA RELATIVITY	NORMALIZED FORMULA RELATIVITY	INDICATED CHANGE
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
MONOLINE	4,301,983	1.1050	1.0500	0.6480	1.032	1.0320	1.0340	
MULTILINE	35,946,103	1.0460	0.9940	0.9420	0.994	0.9940	0.9959	
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
COVERAGE	40,248,086	1.0520	1.0000			0.9981	1.0000	
MULTILINE TOP								
31 MOTEL/HOTEL	393,260	2.0610	1.9590	0.1260	1.121	1.1210	1.1231	8.6%
32 APARTMENT	4,236,132	1.2190	1.1590	0.6770	1.108	1.1080	1.1101	7.4%
33 OFFICE	1,858,704	0.8310	0.7900	0.4290	0.910	0.9100	0.9117	-11.8%
34 MERCANTILE	7,985,289	1.1880	1.1290	0.7790	1.100	1.1000	1.1021	6.6%
35 INSTITUTIONAL	11,341,858	0.9750	0.9270	0.8390	0.939	0.9390	0.9408	-9.0%
36 SERVICES	5,107,404	1.0230	0.9720	0.6920	0.981	0.9810	0.9829	-4.9%
37 INDUST/PROCESS	3,878,910	0.8290	0.7880	0.6310	0.866	0.8660	0.8676	-16.1%
38 CONTRACTORS	1,144,546	0.9480	0.9010	0.3370	0.967	0.9670	0.9688	-6.3%
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	35,946,103	1.0460	0.9940		0.9940	0.9940	0.9960	

C - CREDIBILITY = P/(P+K) WHERE P REPRESENTS THE TOTAL 10 YEAR ADJUSTED LOSS COSTS AND K = 45,000,000

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS

COMMERCIAL I.M. RELATIVITY ANALYSIS

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
TOP	BALANCED RELATIVITY	CURRENT IPMF	INDICATED IPMF	SELECTED IPMF
10	1.000	0.910	0.910	0.910
3X & 7X	1.000			

CLASSIFICATION

150	0.923
191	1.1
192	0.785
220	0.789
221	0.755
234	1.202
235	1.088
240	0.789
241	0.715
327	0.757
328	0.932
340	0.646
341	0.757
342	0.751
343	0.767
403	0.64
451	0.946
452	0.778
453	0.811
454	0.713
460	0.479
482	0.889
510	0.662
514	0.631
530	0.628
534	0.757

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
COMMERCIAL INLAND MARINE RELATIVITY ANALYSIS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW

TYPE OF POLICY	RATING GROUP	(1) 2016 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(2) 2012 - 2016 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(3) FIVE-YEAR EXP RATIO	(4) RELATIVITY
MONOLINE 10	150	311,633	1,898,096	1.151	1.353
	191	5,446,492	15,816,054	1.032	1.213
	192	862,002	2,760,886	0.627	0.737
	220	5,112	87,903	5.716	6.717
	221	1,491	2,853	1.199	1.409
	234	5,224,155	20,144,072	0.600	0.705
	235	8,439,000	24,407,283	0.761	0.894
	240	928,183	3,685,254	0.656	0.771
	241	15,553	114,739	0.053	0.062
	327	18,917	91,546	0.000	0.000
	328	2,319,887	11,908,665	0.792	0.931
	340	40,688	87,993	0.000	0.000
	341	0	0	0.000	0.000
	342	19,188	65,375	0.555	0.652
	343	589	3,417	343.665	578.925
	403	1,600,852	5,771,545	0.345	0.405
	451	3,309,677	12,953,836	0.855	1.005
	452	34,702	137,467	1.628	1.913
	453	45,575	212,456	3.203	3.764
	454	164,836	745,300	0.734	0.863
	460	790,198	3,687,530	0.415	0.488
	482	839,364	2,841,134	0.986	1.159
	510	3,252	39,977	0.020	0.024
	514	446,469	1,612,361	0.339	0.398
	530	504,434	2,697,004	0.489	0.575
	534	0	0	0.000	0.000
	TOTAL#	31,372,249	111,772,746	0.785	0.922

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
COMMERCIAL INLAND MARINE RELATIVITY ANALYSIS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW

TYPE OF POLICY	RATING GROUP	(1) 2016 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(2) 2012 - 2016 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(3) FIVE-YEAR EXP RATIO	(4) RELATIVITY
MULTILINE ## 3X & 7X	150	720,095	3,333,227	0.795	0.934
	191	603,595	2,704,067	0.774	0.910
	192	202,803	783,492	0.826	0.971
	220	6,439	28,512	1.526	1.793
	221	5,606	27,010	0.258	0.303
	234	12,669,443	52,530,286	1.162	1.365
	235	478,171	2,380,353	2.879	3.383
	240	11,651	60,061	1.983	2.330
	241	5,028	15,371	0.019	0.022
	327	2,942	18,862	0.000	0.000
	328	396	2,751	168.726	198.268
	340	32,828	132,609	0.016	0.019
	341	0	0	0.000	0.000
	342	6,082	30,546	0.000	0.000
	343	2,369	7,996	0.000	0.000
	403	479,869	2,417,275	0.739	0.868
	451	95,342	438,635	0.360	0.423
	452	38,096	206,651	0.535	0.629
	453	34,375	104,958	0.147	0.173
	454	228,162	984,183	0.274	0.322
	460	3,613,811	15,118,089	0.318	0.374
	482	127,496	760,961	0.693	0.814
	510	23,290	121,842	0.000	0.000
	514	63,169	300,866	0.073	0.086
	530	1,129,574	4,779,992	0.414	0.486
	534	0	0	0.000	0.000
	TOTAL#	20,580,632	87,288,595	0.952	1.119

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
COMMERCIAL INLAND MARINE RELATIVITY ANALYSIS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN SIMULTANEOUS REVIEW

TYPE OF POLICY	RATING GROUP	(1) 2016 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(2) 2012 - 2016 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS	(3) FIVE-YEAR EXP RATIO	(4) RELATIVITY
TOTAL ALL TOPS#	150	1,031,728	5,231,323	0.903	1.061
	191	6,050,087	18,520,121	1.006	1.182
	192	1,064,805	3,544,378	0.665	0.781
	220	11,551	116,415	3.380	3.972
	221	7,097	29,863	0.456	0.536
	234	17,893,598	72,674,358	0.998	1.173
	235	8,917,171	26,787,636	0.875	1.028
	240	939,834	3,745,315	0.672	0.790
	241	20,581	130,110	0.045	0.053
	327	21,859	110,408	0.000	0.000
	328	2,320,283	11,911,416	0.821	0.965
	340	73,516	220,602	0.007	0.008
	341	0	0	0.000	0.000
	342	25,270	95,921	0.421	0.495
	343	2,958	11,413	267.552	314.397
	403	2,080,721	8,188,820	0.436	0.512
	451	3,405,019	13,392,471	0.841	0.988
	452	72,798	344,118	1.056	1.241
	453	79,950	317,414	1.889	2.220
	454	392,998	1,729,483	0.467	0.549
	460	4,404,009	18,805,619	0.335	0.394
	482	966,860	3,602,095	0.947	1.113
	510	26,542	161,819	0.002	0.002
	514	509,638	1,913,227	0.306	0.360
	530	1,634,008	7,476,996	0.437	0.514
	534	0	0	0.000	0.000
	TOTAL#	51,952,881	199,061,341	0.851	1.000

TOTAL IN COLUMN (3) IS AN AVERAGE USING COLUMN (1) AS WEIGHTS.

REFLECTS CURRENT IPMF OF 0.910.

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
OWNERS, LANDLORDS AND TENANTS
BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

TYPE OF POLICY	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	BAILEY FORMULA RELATIVITY	CREDIBILITY CREDIBILITY	CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED RELATIVITY	BALANCED RELATIVITY	INDICATED CHANGE
10	0.918	0.386	0.967	0.972	
31	1.117	0.171	1.019	1.023	5.2%
32	1.369	0.244	1.080	1.085	11.6%
33	0.989	0.304	0.997	1.001	3.0%
34	0.862	0.344	0.950	0.954	-1.9%
35	1.260	0.265	1.063	1.068	9.9%
36	0.868	0.199	0.972	0.977	0.5%
CLASS GROUP					
1	0.870	0.159	0.978	0.977	
2	0.923	0.230	0.982	0.981	
3	1.147	0.189	1.026	1.025	
4	0.577	0.059	0.969	0.968	
5	0.625	0.079	0.964	0.963	
6	1.029	0.136	1.004	1.003	
7	1.243	0.173	1.038	1.037	
8	1.287	0.079	1.020	1.019	
9	1.272	0.230	1.057	1.055	
10	0.840	0.267	0.955	0.953	
11	0.815	0.235	0.953	0.952	
12	1.068	0.438	1.029	1.028	
13	0.957	0.092	0.996	0.995	
16	0.577	0.028	0.985	0.984	
TERRITORY					
501	0.882	0.345	0.958	0.958	
504	1.449	0.053	1.020	1.021	
506	1.006	0.217	1.001	1.002	
507	1.052	0.269	1.014	1.015	

508	0.969	0.193	0.994	0.995
509	1.064	0.349	1.022	1.023
514	1.086	0.395	1.033	1.034

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS

MANUFACTURERS AND CONTRACTORS

BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
TYPE OF	BAILEY		CREDIBILITY		
POLICY	FORMULA	WEIGHTED	BALANCED	INDICATED	
	RELATIVITY	CREDIBILITY	RELATIVITY	RELATIVITY	CHANGE

10	0.963	0.341	0.987	0.990	
33	0.818	0.061	0.988	0.991	0.1%
34	0.868	0.112	0.984	0.987	-0.3%
35 *	-	-	0.977	0.980	-1.0%
36	1.150	0.200	1.028	1.031	4.1%
37	1.246	0.138	1.031	1.034	4.4%
38	0.989	0.421	0.995	0.998	0.8%

*TOP 35 IMPLICIT PMF CAPPED AT 0.500

CLASS GROUP		0.194			
30	1.081	0.284	1.022	1.007	
31	1.001	0.394	1.000	0.992	
32	1.074	0.394	1.029	1.020	
		0.145			
33	0.820	0.166	0.968	0.964	
34	1.066	0.058	1.004	1.002	
35	1.106	0.057	1.006	0.997	
		0.113			
36	0.638	0.079	0.965	0.943	
37	0.757	0.160	0.956	0.970	
38	1.182	0.160	1.027	1.018	

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
OWNERS, LANDLORDS, AND TENANTS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

TERRITORY ALL		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TYPE OF POLICY	CLASS GROUP	CALENDAR A.Y.E. 09/30/18 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS AT CURRENT LEVEL	CALENDAR A.Y.E. 2014-2018 AGG LOSS COST CURRENT LEVEL	FIVE YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	RELATIVITY	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES	BAL CELL RELATIVITY
10 MONOLINE	01 FOOD&BEV.(RETAIL)	\$499,743	\$2,230,366	0.807		80	
	02 RESTAURANTS	\$904,405	\$5,295,870	0.649		262	
	03 STORES	\$698,310	\$3,844,876	1.563		282	
	04 VENDING & RENTAL	\$104,439	\$266,189	0.759		20	
	05 FOOD & BEV. DIST.	\$406,825	\$1,846,783	0.387		44	
	06 NON-FOOD&BEV.DIST	\$337,319	\$1,768,481	0.749		71	
	07 CLUBS,AMSMT&SPRTS	\$902,654	\$4,106,519	1.842		192	
	08 HEALTH CARE FACIL	\$88,192	\$453,031	1.823		23	
	09 HOTELS AND MOTELS	\$992,369	\$4,811,188	1.403		416	
	10 SCHLS & CHURCHES	\$816,411	\$3,844,190	0.941		192	
	11 APARTMENTS	\$982,310	\$3,803,664	0.969		146	
	12 BUILDINGS&OFFICES	\$3,238,281	\$18,610,961	1.252		895	
	13 MISC. PREMISES	\$133,922	\$1,029,148	0.941		62	
	16 GOVT SUBDIVISIONS	\$54,993	\$129,935	0.003		2	
	TOTAL *	\$10,160,173	\$52,041,201	1.15		2,687	
31 MULT MOTEL/HOTEL	09 HOTELS AND MOTELS	\$1,304,854	\$5,627,564	1.731		526	
	TOTAL *	\$1,304,854	\$5,627,564	1.731		526	
32 MULT APARTMENT	11 APARTMENTS	\$3,986,373	\$15,746,533	1.298		844	
	12 BUILDINGS&OFFICES	\$928,368	\$4,592,214	1.78		231	
	TOTAL *	\$4,914,741	\$20,338,747	1.389		1,075	
33 MULT OFFICE	12 BUILDINGS&OFFICES	\$7,375,572	\$34,183,796	1.302		1,656	
	13 MISC. PREMISES	\$49,006	\$192,252	0.308		5	
	TOTAL *	\$7,424,578	\$34,376,048	1.295		1,661	
34 MULT MERCANTILE	01 FOOD&BEV.(RETAIL)	\$1,494,714	\$8,719,163	1.021		377	
	02 RESTAURANTS	\$2,912,025	\$13,667,414	1.093		693	
	03 STORES	\$1,202,271	\$5,573,330	1.09		307	
	04 VENDING & RENTAL	\$43,731	\$172,222	0.156		5	
	05 FOOD & BEV. DIST.	\$416,148	\$2,476,398	0.991		68	
	06 NON-FOOD&BEV.DIST	\$1,170,444	\$5,496,170	1.264		263	
	12 BUILDINGS&OFFICES	\$1,848,962	\$10,139,234	0.871		419	
	TOTAL *	\$9,088,295	\$46,243,931	1.048		2,132	

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
OWNERS, LANDLORDS, AND TENANTS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

TERRITORY ALL		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		CALENDAR A.Y.E. 09/30/18 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS AT CURRENT LEVEL	CALENDAR A.Y.E. 2014-2018 AGG LOSS COST CURRENT LEVEL	FIVE YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	RELATIVITY	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES	BAL CELL RELATIVITY
TYPE OF POLICY 35 MULT INSTITUT.	CLASS GROUP						
	07 CLUBS,AMSMT&SPRTS	\$58,963	\$153,857	1.749		8	
	08 HEALTH CARE FACIL	\$343,844	\$2,005,994	1.963		89	
	10 SCHLS & CHURCHES	\$2,695,925	\$14,253,987	1.359		1,092	
	12 BUILDINGS&OFFICES	\$39,380	\$249,916	1.641		57	
	13 MISC. PREMISES	\$11,584	\$35,321	1.398		5	
	16 GOVT SUBDIVISIONS	\$32,010	\$220,706	2.113		12	
	TOTAL *	\$3,181,706	\$16,919,781	1.443		1,263	
36 MULT SERVICES	03 STORES	\$209,843	\$776,192	1.524		53	
	04 VENDING & RENTAL	\$157,080	\$1,030,115	0.707		37	
	07 CLUBS,AMSMT&SPRTS	\$1,397,756	\$6,622,611	1.13		339	
	08 HEALTH CARE FACIL	\$2,911	\$17,415	0		0	
	09 HOTELS AND MOTELS	\$34,367	\$263,841	0.727		7	
	10 SCHLS & CHURCHES	\$6,845	\$36,852	0.569		1	
	12 BUILDINGS&OFFICES	\$546,531	\$2,580,110	1.643		193	
	13 MISC. PREMISES	\$301,941	\$1,403,138	1.221		82	
	TOTAL *	\$2,657,274	\$12,730,274	1.244		712	
TOTAL ALL TOP	01 FOOD&BEV.(RETAIL)	\$1,994,457	\$10,949,529	0.968		457	
	02 RESTAURANTS	\$3,816,430	\$18,963,284	0.988		955	
	03 STORES	\$2,110,424	\$10,194,398	1.29		642	
	04 VENDING & RENTAL	\$305,250	\$1,468,526	0.646		62	
	05 FOOD & BEV. DIST.	\$822,973	\$4,323,181	0.692		112	
	06 NON-FOOD&BEV.DIST	\$1,507,763	\$7,264,651	1.149		334	
	07 CLUBS,AMSMT&SPRTS	\$2,359,373	\$10,882,987	1.418		539	
	08 HEALTH CARE FACIL	\$434,947	\$2,476,440	1.921		112	
	09 HOTELS AND MOTELS	\$2,331,590	\$10,702,593	1.576		949	
	10 SCHLS & CHURCHES	\$3,519,181	\$18,135,029	1.261		1,285	
	11 APARTMENTS	\$4,968,683	\$19,550,197	1.233		990	
	12 BUILDINGS&OFFICES	\$13,977,094	\$70,356,231	1.279		3,451	
	13 MISC. PREMISES	\$496,453	\$2,659,859	1.06		154	
	16 GOVT SUBDIVISIONS	\$87,003	\$350,641	0.78		14	
	TOTAL *	\$38,731,621	\$188,277,546	1.235		10,056	

* TOTALS IN COLUMNS (3) ARE AVERAGES USING COLUMN (1) AS WEIGHTS

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
MANUFACTURERS AND CONTRACTORS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

TYPE OF POLICY	CLASS GROUP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		CALENDAR A.Y.E. 09/30/18 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS AT CURRENT LEVEL	CALENDAR A.Y.E. 2014-2018 AGG LOSS COST CURRENT LEVEL	FIVE YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	RELATIVITY	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES	BAL CELL RELATIVITY
10 MONOLINE	30 SERVICE	\$1,059,618	\$3,511,335	0.849	0.785	107	0.997
	31 LIGHT CONTRACTING	\$778,095	\$4,019,212	1.841	1.703	270	0.982
	32 MEDIUM CONTRCTING	\$8,797,570	\$44,006,312	1.07	0.99	1,220	1.01
	33 HEAVY CONTRACTING	\$1,562,657	\$7,815,190	0.81	0.75	94	0.954
	34 DEALER OR DISTRIB	\$956,392	\$4,717,428	1.046	0.968	106	0.992
	35 LGT. MANUFACTURER	\$302,902	\$1,285,068	1.012	0.936	10	0.987
	36 MED. MANUFACTURER	\$1,656,543	\$8,002,030	0.558	0.516	71	0.934
	37 HVY. MANUFACTURER	\$554,594	\$2,447,869	1.128	1.043	38	0.96
	38 MISC. OPERATION	\$1,218,171	\$4,547,715	1.516	1.403	182	1.008
	TOTAL *	\$16,886,542	\$80,352,159	1.049		2,098	
33 MULT OFFICE	31 LIGHT CONTRACTING	\$20,960	\$192,170	0.034	0.032	2	0.983
	32 MEDIUM CONTRCTING	\$37,511	\$181,161	0.274	0.254	1	1.011
	33 HEAVY CONTRACTING	\$287,729	\$1,866,108	0.959	0.887	19	0.955
	38 MISC. OPERATION	\$702,819	\$3,083,400	1.011	0.935	44	1.009
	TOTAL *	\$1,049,019	\$5,322,839	0.951		66	
34 MULT MERCANTILE	30 SERVICE	\$72,249	\$387,111	1.006	0.931	10	0.994
	32 MEDIUM CONTRCTING	\$292,877	\$1,369,408	1.535	1.42	38	1.007
	34 DEALER OR DISTRIB	\$1,434,103	\$7,293,046	0.823	0.761	143	0.989
	38 MISC. OPERATION	\$78,020	\$420,015	2.416	2.235	35	1.005
	TOTAL *	\$1,877,249	\$9,469,580	1.007		226	
35 MULT INSTITUT.	31 LIGHT CONTRACTING	\$38,670	\$164,690	0.701	0.649	7	0.972
	32 MEDIUM CONTRCTING	\$99,956	\$506,853	0.199	0.185	12	1
	TOTAL *	\$138,626	\$671,543	0.339		19	
36 MULT SERVICES	30 SERVICE	\$101,364	\$681,639	1.002	0.927	63	1.038
	31 LIGHT CONTRACTING	\$382,366	\$2,976,694	0.637	0.59	179	1.023
	32 MEDIUM CONTRCTING	\$333,818	\$1,806,695	1.149	1.063	38	1.052
	33 HEAVY CONTRACTING	\$56,700	\$454,736	4.276	3.956	15	0.994
	34 DEALER OR DISTRIB	\$952,088	\$4,389,422	1.722	1.593	233	1.034
	36 MED. MANUFACTURER	\$27,445	\$123,488	0.372	0.344	3	0.973
	38 MISC. OPERATION	\$1,070,908	\$4,762,429	1.262	1.168	190	1.05
	TOTAL *	\$2,924,689	\$15,195,103	1.358		721	

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
MANUFACTURERS AND CONTRACTORS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

TYPE OF POLICY	CLASS GROUP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		CALENDAR A.Y.E. 09/30/18 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS AT CURRENT LEVEL	CALENDAR A.Y.E. 2014-2018 AGG LOSS COST CURRENT LEVEL	FIVE YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	RELATIVITY	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES	BAL CELL RELATIVITY
37 MULT INDUST/PROC	31 LIGHT CONTRACTING	\$2,194	\$12,433	0.047	0.043	1	1.025
	32 MEDIUM CONTRACTING	\$241,601	\$1,194,846	1.154	1.068	23	1.055
	33 HEAVY CONTRACTING	\$171,668	\$936,430	1.968	1.82	16	0.996
	34 DEALER OR DISTRIB	\$81,370	\$413,336	0.679	0.628	13	1.036
	35 LGT. MANUFACTURER	\$400,352	\$1,888,625	1.595	1.476	50	1.031
	36 MED. MANUFACTURER	\$1,787,631	\$9,218,461	0.965	0.893	155	0.975
	37 HVY. MANUFACTURER	\$1,524,582	\$7,496,264	0.897	0.83	75	1.003
	38 MISC. OPERATION	\$55,181	\$291,117	0.611	0.566	10	1.053
	TOTAL *	\$4,264,579	\$21,451,512	1.04		343	
38 MULT CONTRACTORS	30 SERVICE	\$2,119,936	\$11,887,433	1.312	1.213	496	1.005
	31 LIGHT CONTRACTING	\$3,903,850	\$20,011,228	0.977	0.904	990	0.99
	32 MEDIUM CONTRACTING	\$9,039,621	\$45,989,741	1.206	1.116	1,464	1.018
	33 HEAVY CONTRACTING	\$2,347,961	\$14,314,884	0.736	0.681	233	0.962
	38 MISC. OPERATION	\$119,940	\$505,850	0.006	0.006	1	1.017
	TOTAL *	\$17,531,308	\$92,709,136	1.097		3,184	
TOTAL ALL TOF	30 SERVICE	\$3,353,167	\$16,467,518	1.149		676	
	31 LIGHT CONTRACTING	\$5,126,135	\$27,376,427	1.077		1,449	
	32 MEDIUM CONTRACTING	\$18,842,954	\$95,055,016	1.139		2,796	
	33 HEAVY CONTRACTING	\$4,426,715	\$25,387,348	0.87		377	
	34 DEALER OR DISTRIB	\$3,423,953	\$16,813,232	1.132		495	
	35 LGT. MANUFACTURER	\$703,254	\$3,173,693	1.344		60	
	36 MED. MANUFACTURER	\$3,471,619	\$17,343,979	0.766		229	
	37 HVY. MANUFACTURER	\$2,079,176	\$9,944,133	0.958		113	
	38 MISC. OPERATION	\$3,245,039	\$13,610,526	1.273		462	
	TOTAL *	\$44,672,012	\$225,171,872	1.081		6,657	

* TOTALS IN COLUMNS (3) ARE AVERAGES USING COLUMN (1) AS WEIGHTS

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
PRODUCTS
BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
TYPE OF	BAILEY		CREDIBILITY		
POLICY	FORMULA		WEIGHTED	BALANCED	INDICATED
	RELATIVITY	CREDIBILITY	RELATIVITY	RELATIVITY	CHANGE
10	0.988	0.373	0.996	0.996	
34	1.036	0.372	1.013	1.014	1.8%
36	1.005	0.187	1.001	1.002	0.6%
37	0.988	0.507	0.994	0.994	-0.2%
CLASS					
GROUP					
3	0.924	0.501	0.961	0.965	
4	1.048	0.407	1.019	1.024	
5	1.107	0.133	1.014	1.018	
6	1.007	0.320	1.002	1.006	
7	1.006	0.182	1.001	1.005	

NOTE: THE INDICATED CHANGES BY TOP WERE FURTHER ADJUSTED BY THE FOLLOWING
DIFFERENTIALS: TOP 34: 0.989
TOP 36: 0.984
TOP 37: 1.015

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

MULTISTATE
PRODUCTS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

TYPE OF POLICY	CLASS GROUP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		CALENDAR A.Y.E. 12/31/2017 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS AT CURRENT LEVEL	CALENDAR A.Y.E. 2013 - 2017 AGG LOSS COST CURRENT LEVEL	FIVE YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	RELATIVITY	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES	BAL CELL RELATIVITY
10 MONOLINE	03 MAN,DLR,DSTFD/DRG	18,227,491	79,500,211	0.856	0.869	1,461	0.961
	04 DLR,DST-NOTFD/DRG	9,616,743	42,155,667	1.119	1.136	640	1.019
	05 MAN.NTFD/DRG(LOW)	1,605,615	6,748,634	1.039	1.055	84	1.014
	06 MAN.NTFD/DRG(MED)	9,640,686	42,498,903	0.958	0.972	466	1.002
	07 MAN.NTFD/DRG(HGH)	2,568,561	11,286,663	1.018	1.033	129	1.001
	TOTAL *	41,659,096	182,190,078	0.957		2,780	
34 MULT MERCANTILE	03 MAN,DLR,DSTFD/DRG	5,166,155	25,851,441	1.131	1.148	791	0.979
	04 DLR,DST-NOTFD/DRG	29,011,611	140,165,685	1.037	1.052	1,972	1.038
	06 MAN.NTFD/DRG(MED)	7,625	57,567	0.000	0.000	-	1.020
	TOTAL *	34,185,391	166,074,693	1.051		2,763	
36 MULT SERVICES	04 DLR,DST-NOTFD/DRG	3,197,904	14,609,890	1.041	1.057	699	1.025
	06 MAN.NTFD/DRG(MED)	54,898	258,512	0.781	0.793	1	1.008
	TOTAL *	3,252,802	14,868,402	1.037		700	
37 MULT INDUST/PROC.	03 MAN,DLR,DSTFD/DRG	16,474,514	81,117,947	0.888	0.901	2,761	0.960
	05 MAN.NTFD/DRG(LOW)	4,070,679	20,897,437	1.092	1.108	269	1.012
	06 MAN.NTFD/DRG(MED)	28,248,516	131,744,418	0.987	1.002	1,582	1.001
	07 MAN.NTFD/DRG(HGH)	7,346,721	36,933,393	0.965	0.980	537	1.000
	TOTAL *	56,140,430	270,693,195	0.963		5,149	
TOTAL ALL TOF	03 MAN,DLR,DSTFD/DRG	39,868,160	186,469,599	0.905		5,013	
	04 DLR,DST-NOTFD/DRG	41,826,258	196,931,242	1.056		3,311	
	05 MAN.NTFD/DRG(LOW)	5,676,294	27,646,071	1.077		353	
	06 MAN.NTFD/DRG(MED)	37,951,725	174,559,400	0.979		2,049	
	07 MAN.NTFD/DRG(HGH)	9,915,282	48,220,056	0.979		666	
	TOTAL *	135,237,719	633,826,368	0.985		11,392	

* TOTALS IN COLUMN (3) ARE AVERAGES USING COLUMN (1) AS WEIGHTS

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS

LOCAL PRODUCTS/COMPLETED OPERATIONS

BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

TYPE OF POLICY	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	BAILEY FORMULA RELATIVITY	CREDIBILITY CREDIBILITY	CREDIBILITY WEIGHTED RELATIVITY	BALANCED RELATIVITY	INDICATED CHANGE
10	0.968	0.748	0.976	0.973	
34	0.964	0.540	0.980	0.977	0.4%
36	0.993	0.515	0.996	0.993	2.1%
37	0.964	0.137	0.995	0.992	2.0%
38	1.025	0.954	1.024	1.020	4.8%
CLASS GROUP					
1	0.916	0.549	0.953	0.948	
2	1.035	0.493	1.017	1.011	
11	1.101	0.352	1.034	1.029	
12	1.015	1.000	1.015	1.009	
13	0.793	0.264	0.941	0.935	

MULTISTATE
LOCAL PRODUCTS/COMPLETED OPERATIONS
BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS *

STATE	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	BAILEY	CREDIBILITY	CREDIBILITY	
	FORMULA		WEIGHTED	BALANCED
	RELATIVITY	RELATIVITY	RELATIVITY	RELATIVITY
ILLINOIS	1.424	0.386	1.146	1.146
	1.207	0.623	1.125	1.124
	1.430	0.229	1.085	1.085
	1.149	0.427	1.061	1.061
	1.419	0.160	1.058	1.057
	1.429	0.153	1.056	1.056
	1.213	0.263	1.052	1.052
	1.101	0.505	1.050	1.050
	1.140	0.345	1.046	1.046
	1.127	0.368	1.045	1.045
	1.195	0.231	1.042	1.042
	1.132	0.326	1.041	1.041
	1.178	0.239	1.040	1.040
	1.153	0.224	1.032	1.032
	1.069	0.435	1.029	1.029
	1.262	0.100	1.024	1.023
	1.093	0.227	1.020	1.020
	1.052	0.369	1.019	1.019
	1.105	0.187	1.019	1.019
	1.069	0.192	1.013	1.013
	1.027	0.453	1.012	1.012
	1.023	0.449	1.010	1.010
	1.015	0.307	1.004	1.004
	1.031	0.143	1.004	1.004
	1.006	0.494	1.003	1.003
	1.007	0.131	1.001	1.001
	1.000	0.377	1.000	1.000
	0.997	0.097	1.000	1.000
	0.996	0.402	0.999	0.998
	0.979	0.190	0.996	0.996
	0.968	0.458	0.985	0.985
	0.928	0.241	0.982	0.982
	0.942	0.349	0.979	0.979
	0.899	0.260	0.973	0.973
	0.895	0.285	0.969	0.969
	0.696	0.104	0.963	0.963
	0.792	0.160	0.963	0.963
	0.893	0.364	0.959	0.959
	0.762	0.154	0.959	0.959
	0.846	0.288	0.953	0.953
	0.723	0.158	0.950	0.950
	0.770	0.195	0.950	0.950
	0.910	0.547	0.950	0.950
	0.796	0.238	0.947	0.947
	0.514	0.084	0.946	0.945
	0.641	0.136	0.941	0.941
	0.816	0.308	0.939	0.939
	0.848	0.470	0.926	0.925
	0.771	0.321	0.920	0.920
	0.604	0.179	0.914	0.914
	0.819	0.527	0.900	0.900
	0.807	0.575	0.884	0.884

* Sorted by balanced relative change

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

ILLINOIS
LOCAL PRODUCTS/COMPLETED OPERATIONS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

TYPE OF POLICY	CLASS GROUP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		CALENDAR A.Y.E. 12/31/17 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS AT CURRENT LEVEL	CALENDAR A.Y.E. 2013-2017 AGG LOSS COST CURRENT LEVEL	FIVE YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	RELATIV.	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES	BAL CELL RELATIV.
10 MONOLINE	01 RET.STRS-FOOD/DRG	\$60,872	\$243,846	0.819	0.758	27	0.967
	02 RET.STRS-NTFD/DRG	\$74,398	\$301,743	3.273	3.031	40	1.032
	11 COMP. OPS. (LOW)	\$126,676	\$463,035	0.505	0.468	9	1.05
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	\$2,371,262	\$9,272,851	1.092	1.011	175	1.03
	13 COMP. OPS. (HGH)	\$263,364	\$863,686	1.405	1.301	7	0.955
	TOTAL *	\$2,896,572	\$11,145,161	1.145		258	
34 MULT MERCANTILE	01 RET.STRS-FOOD/DRG	\$144,105	\$684,303	2.31	2.139	101	0.972
	02 RET.STRS-NTFD/DRG	\$131,776	\$620,943	1.225	1.134	29	1.037
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	\$43,578	\$206,391	0.703	0.651	5	1.035
	TOTAL *	\$319,459	\$1,511,637	1.643		135	
36 MULT SERVICES	01 RET.STRS-FOOD/DRG	\$35,411	\$170,601	2.12	1.963	22	0.987
	02 RET.STRS-NTFD/DRG	\$304,289	\$1,288,972	1.602	1.484	92	1.054
	11 COMP. OPS. (LOW)	\$61,999	\$363,697	0.63	0.584	13	1.072
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	\$292,802	\$1,526,831	0.493	0.456	40	1.052
	13 COMP. OPS. (HGH)	\$33,753	\$196,982	0.308	0.285	1	0.975
	TOTAL *	\$728,254	\$3,547,083	1.038		168	
37 MULT INDUST/PROC	01 RET.STRS-FOOD/DI	\$383	\$1,508	0	0	0	0.986
	11 COMP. OPS. (LOW)	\$2,367	\$11,976	1.379	1.277	2	1.071
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	\$117,074	\$567,457	1.185	1.097	11	1.051
	13 COMP. OPS. (HGH)	\$65	\$3,295	0	0	0	0.974
	TOTAL *	\$119,889	\$584,236	1.184		13	
38 MULT CONTRACTORS	11 COMP. OPS. (LOW)	\$358,943	\$1,793,000	1.046	0.968	40	1.102
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	\$6,516,481	\$31,150,681	1.27	1.176	765	1.081
	13 COMP. OPS. (HGH)	\$525,613	\$2,673,890	0.655	0.607	27	1.002
	TOTAL *	\$7,401,037	\$35,617,571	1.216		832	
TOTAL ALL TOP	01 RET.STRS-FOOD/DRG	\$240,771	\$1,100,258	1.901		150	
	02 RET.STRS-NTFD/DRG	\$510,463	\$2,211,658	1.748		161	
	11 COMP. OPS. (LOW)	\$549,985	\$2,631,708	0.876		64	
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	\$9,341,197	\$42,724,211	1.197		996	
	13 COMP. OPS. (HGH)	\$822,795	\$3,737,853	0.881		35	
	TOTAL *	\$11,465,211	\$52,405,688	1.198		1,406	

* TOTALS IN COLUMNS (3) ARE AVERAGES USING COLUMN (1) AS WEIGHTS.

INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE, INC.

MULTISTATE
LOCAL PRODUCTS/COMPLETED OPERATIONS
SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE USED IN BASIC LIMIT RELATIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS

TYPE OF POLICY	CLASS GROUP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		CALENDAR A.Y.E. 12/31/2017 AGGREGATE LOSS COSTS AT CURRENT LEVEL	CALENDAR A.Y.E. 2013 - 2017 AGG LOSS COST CURRENT LEVEL	FIVE YEAR EXPERIENCE RATIO	RELATIV.	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES	BAL CELL RELATIV.
10 MONOLINE	01 RET.STRS-FOOD/DRG	2,565,927	10,980,064	0.980		762	
	02 RET.STRS-NTFD/DRG	2,610,173	11,610,218	1.215		490	
	11 COMP. OPS. (LOW)	3,985,620	17,948,273	1.339		705	
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	81,183,051	360,572,009	1.070		6,178	
	13 COMP. OPS. (HGH)	7,740,701	39,136,832	0.707		280	
	TOTAL *	98,085,472	440,247,396	1.054		8,415	
34 MULT MERCANTILE	01 RET.STRS-FOOD/DRG	7,845,812	36,883,858	0.939		3,576	
	02 RET.STRS-NTFD/DRG	5,173,763	23,276,176	0.999		661	
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	2,020,750	10,006,085	1.196		139	
	TOTAL *	15,040,325	70,166,119	0.994		4,376	
36 MULT SERVICES	01 RET.STRS-FOOD/DRG	727,880	3,419,301	1.031		196	
	02 RET.STRS-NTFD/DRG	12,212,699	48,258,775	1.090		2,506	
	11 COMP. OPS. (LOW)	3,091,135	13,995,949	1.112		510	
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	4,434,939	20,923,119	0.944		693	
	13 COMP. OPS. (HGH)	988,690	5,057,509	1.200		87	
	TOTAL *	21,455,343	91,654,653	1.066		3,992	
37 MULT INDUST/PROC.	01 RET.STRS-FOOD/DRG	26,958	90,614	2.380		1	
	11 COMP. OPS. (LOW)	114,374	528,775	1.231		19	
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	3,457,092	16,914,115	1.021		263	
	13 COMP. OPS. (HGH)	40,478	307,233	0.581		0	
	TOTAL *	3,638,902	17,840,737	1.033		283	
38 MULT CONTRACTORS	11 COMP. OPS. (LOW)	8,014,155	37,025,620	1.155		627	
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	139,937,888	661,159,691	1.121		12,364	
	13 COMP. OPS. (HGH)	14,291,098	66,309,310	0.926		683	
	TOTAL *	162,243,141	764,494,621	1.106		13,674	
TOTAL ALL TOP	01 RET.STRS-FOOD/DRG	11,166,577	51,373,837	0.958		4,535	
	02 RET.STRS-NTFD/DRG	19,996,635	83,145,169	1.083		3,657	
	11 COMP. OPS. (LOW)	15,205,284	69,498,617	1.195		1,861	
	12 COMP. OPS. (MED)	231,033,720	1,069,575,019	1.099		19,637	
	13 COMP. OPS. (HGH)	23,060,967	110,810,884	0.863		1,050	
	TOTAL *	300,463,183	1,384,403,526	1.080		30,740	

* TOTALS IN COLUMN (3) ARE AVERAGES USING COLUMN (1) AS WEIGHTS.

COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION C - REVISED CLM DIVISION NINE

Commercial Package Policy Package Modification Factors (Revised MLCP-PMF-1) C-2

**COMMERCIAL LINES MANUAL
DIVISION NINE – MULTIPLE LINE
COMMERCIAL PACKAGE POLICY
PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTORS**

ILLINOIS (12)

PACKAGE MODIFICATION FACTORS

Package Modification Assignment (PMA)	Premium From CLM Division			
	Two	Three, Four, Five, Eight Property	Four, Six Liability	All Other Divisions
Apartment House	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00
Contractors	.90	.98	1.00	1.00
Industrial & Processing	.90	.82	.80	1.00
Institutional	.90	.91	.93	1.00
Mercantile	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00
Motel/Hotel	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00
Office	.90	.83	.94	1.00
Service	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00

Table 1. Package Modification Factors