

Structure Type	Description	Pros	Cons
<b>Dealer Cost</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Manufacturer or Retailer outsources all underwriting and potentially claim administration to an insurance company and third-party administrator (TPA). Some insurance companies and TPA's are vertically integrated so they do both.</li> <li>- Insurance company sets premium based on their calculations plus risk transfer costs and margin</li> <li>- Manufacturer or retailer includes their own markup on top of the dealer cost and sells contracts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Simple structure</li> <li>- Transfers risk – risk is off the books of the Manufacturer or Retailer</li> <li>- Recognize all revenue when contracts are sold</li> <li>- Positive marketing spin of a program backed by a highly rated carrier</li> <li>- This may be a good structure for brand new programs or programs where there is little claim information available</li> <li>- This may also be a good place to start if 'you don't know what you don't know'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Surrender cash</li> <li>- May have no visibility into claims data</li> <li>- Limited flexibility on pricing</li> <li>- Carrier can raise premiums at its discretion according to contractual agreement</li> <li>- No real insight into underwriting performance</li> <li>- No share of underwriting profits Surveys consistently demonstrate consumer preference for OEM and Retailer backed programs</li> </ul>
<b>Profit Share</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Similar to 'Dealer Cost' in many ways, but the carrier agrees to share underwriting profits</li> <li>- Profit share calculations are generated by the carrier according to their actuarial analysis and premium earning patterns</li> <li>- Claim administration may reside with the manufacturer or retailer but insurer controls approval</li> <li>- Amount and timing of profit share is negotiable depending on several variables, including what you know/don't know</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Share in underwriting profits can be large</li> <li>- May include more transparency into claims patterns and resulting rates</li> <li>- Risk transfer – risk is off the books of the Manufacturer or Retailer</li> <li>- Recognize all revenue when contracts are sold</li> <li>- Positive marketing spin of a program backed by a highly rated carrier</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Actuarial analysis is often significantly flawed, leading to higher costs, rates, and pricing than necessary</li> <li>- Smaller programs (&lt;\$1-2M annual premium) are often not eligible for profit share arrangements</li> <li>- Without cutting-edge risk oversight, the manufacturer or retailer will not understand hidden optimization opportunities</li> </ul>
<b>Captive</b>  (for a detailed overview, see our blog: <a href="#">"Captive Insurance 101"</a> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Manufacturer or retailer creates a wholly owned captive insurance company to hold its company-wide risk exposure</li> <li>- Can include warranty risk as well as: employee healthcare insurance, workers compensation, product liability, professional liability, etc.</li> <li>- The risk is often "fronted" by a carrier who issues a Contractual Liability Insurance Policy (CLP or CLIP) on behalf of the captive</li> <li>- Extended Warranty Programs are a good way to diversify a captive portfolio – often not something to create a captive for on its own.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tailored coverage to meet manufacturer's specific needs and risk profile</li> <li>- Significantly lower risk transfer costs – if fronted, results in a much lower 'risk fee'</li> <li>- Retains 100% of underwriting profits and investment income on unearned premium</li> <li>- Control of investment decisions</li> <li>- Immediate income recognition if fronted</li> <li>- Can have positive tax implications</li> <li>- More control over program elements such as pricing, features/benefits, timing of changes, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A more complex structure</li> <li>- Requires insurance and legal/compliance expertise</li> <li>- Requires new-age analytic and modeling capabilities to take full advantage of the benefits of this structure (this 'con' could also be listed on the 'pros' side!)</li> </ul>
<b>Warranty Company and/or Self-Insurance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Manufacturer or Retailer sets aside a certain amount of money internally to cover claims</li> <li>- Generally, an insurance carrier is only used if required by various regulatory bodies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Simpler structure</li> <li>- Control cash – no payment to insurance company or captive</li> <li>- Much more flexibility on pricing, features/benefits, timing, etc.</li> <li>- Lower costs, higher margins</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Retain risk</li> <li>- Potential compliance risk</li> <li>- May not be a core-competency</li> <li>- Without carrier involvement, income may be deferred over the life of the contract</li> </ul>