

**Life Insurance as an Asset Class: A Value-Added Component of an Asset Allocation**  
**Richard M. Weber, MBA, CLU, AEP (Distinguished)**

**1. Life Insurance Basics**

- A. What is the right price to *pay* for life insurance (when no one wants to pay more than they have to)?
- i. The answer is predicated on knowing “how long will you *need* life insurance?”
  - ii. Short term / intermediate term / lifetime *price* for a 33-year old healthy male
  - iii. Value statistics
    - a. Regardless of the starting age, term insurance will cost approximately 70% of the death benefit through life expectancy
    - b. Term life insurance cannot effectively or affordably provide insurance for the entirety of one’s life, unless we are unlucky enough to die substantially before life expectancy.

**2. The policy “Illustration Beauty Contest” - the attractive *impossibility* versus the less attractive *probability***

- A. \$6,000 or \$12,000 premium per year - which would you pay?  
B. The illustration dilemma: how it’s portrayed versus how it really works  
C. It’s all about your minimum threshold for risk

**3. Matching permanent policy “styles” to the customer’s investment risk tolerance**

- A. Whole life is generally comparable to the “style” of the conservative investor who is mostly intolerant to volatility and seeks guarantees in most investment choices.
- i. Underlying investments are government and high-grade corporate bonds
  - ii. Premiums are guaranteed
  - iii. Policy itself is guaranteed
  - iv. There will be some “upside” potential, but magnitude is not guaranteed
- B. No-lapse guarantee universal life is also generally comparable to the “style” of the conservative investor – intolerant of volatility and seeks guarantees
- i. The death benefit and premium obligation are guaranteed
  - ii. Bare bones; “what you see is what you get”
  - iii. No upside potential for death benefit

- C. “Traditional” universal life is generally comparable to the “style” of the balanced investor – tolerant of modest volatility and willing to accept fewer guarantees in favor of premium payment flexibility
  - i. The risk of premium “sufficiency” has been shifted to the policy owner
  - ii. Policies should be funded with more premium than an illustration is likely to suggest
  - iii. No ability to manage the policy owner’s risk (premium sufficiency) except by paying more premium.
  
- D. Variable universal life is generally comparable to the “style” of the growth or aggressive investor – tolerant of volatility and willing to lack of guarantees in favor of having the opportunity to manage the underlying investments supporting the policy
  - i. The risk of premium “sufficiency” has been shifted to the policy owner
  - ii. Policies should be funded with substantially more premium than an illustration is likely to suggest
  - iii. Professional management of underlying investment accounts is imperative

#### **4. Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT), Asset Classes, and life insurance**

##### A. Introduction

- i. Diversification is at the heart of MPT
- ii. Correlated versus uncorrelated assets
- iii. Net net returns

##### B. MPT essentials

- i. Assess a portfolio into component “asset classes”
- ii. Traditional classes
- iii. Diversify with dissimilar categories

##### C. Life insurance as an asset class

- i. Death benefit is cash
- ii. Living benefits – cash value –take on the asset class attributes of the underlying policy style: whole life = fixed

- iii. Life insurance has unique attributes that keep it in a category by itself
  - a. income tax-deferred accumulation of cash value
  - b. income tax-free death benefit
  - c. estate-tax free planning opportunities
  - d. free from reach of creditors
  - e. inherent leverage of premium to death benefit
  - f. death benefit is triggered by the event of death; no market value adjustment
  - g. policy premiums should be allocated out of investment portfolio assets
  - h. permanent life insurance can produce a favorable long-term return with less risk within a portfolio of equity and fixed components

D. Life insurance as a value-added component of the fixed component of an asset allocation

- i. \$500,000 municipal bond example
- ii. Risk Index explained
- iii. Needed life insurance can reduce risk and increase overall return of portfolio
- iv. Two strategies for enhancing retirement income
- v. Inherent leverage of premium to death benefit
- vi. Death benefit is triggered by the event of death; no market value adjustment
- vii. Policy premiums should be allocated out of investment portfolio assets
- viii. Permanent life insurance can produce a favorable long-term return with less risk within a portfolio of equity and fixed return components

## 5. Efficient Choices

A. Introduction

- i. The sophisticated form of diversification under MPT is Efficient Frontier Analysis
- ii. A similar process can be applied to the efficient selection of life insurance policies intended for lifetime uses

B. MPT indicates that appropriate diversification is how investors maximize returns for a given amount of risk tolerance.

- i. The sophisticated form of diversification under MPT is Efficient Frontier Analysis;
- ii. A similar process can be applied to the efficient selection of life insurance policies intended for lifetime uses

C. Dominant attributes/qualities of life insurance policies

- i. Price (premium outlay)
- ii. Cost (the resulting cash value compared to premiums paid)
- iii. Access to cash value
- iv. Likely natural, long-term death benefit increases
- v. Any policy owner risk associated with the investments underlying the policy's reserves

D. Attributes assessment matrix

	<b>Price</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Increases in Death Benefit</b>	<b>Investment Risk</b>
No Lapse UL	Lowest	Highest	None	Lowest
Universal Life	Low	High	Some	Low
Variable UL	High	Low	Good	High
Par Whole Life	Highest	Best	Excellent	Very Low

E. Efficient Choices matrix

- i. Conservative Style / Price-focused

0% WL / 70% NLG / 30% VUL with a Risk Index = 4.5

- ii. Conservative Style / Value-focused

80% WL / 0% NLG / 20% VUL with a Risk Index = 4.44

- iii. Balanced Style / Price-focused

0% WL / 50% NLG / 50% VUL with a Risk Index = 7.5

- iv. Balanced Style / Value-focused

60% WL / 0% NLG / 40% VUL with a Risk Index = 7.08

v. Aggressive Style / Price-focused

10% WL / 20% NLG / 70% VUL with a Risk Index = 10.68 – OR –

0% WL / 20% NLG / 80% VUL with a Risk Index = 12.0

vi. Aggressive Style / Value-focused

30% WL/ 0% NLG / 70% VUL with a Risk Index = 11.04

**6. Yesterday's new policy is today's "in-force" policy**

A. In-force view 10 years after purchase

- i. 10<sup>th</sup> year cash value illustrated as \$64,510 "on the curve"
- ii. Actual 10<sup>th</sup> year cash value \$60,513 and age 88 lapse
- iii. Monte Carlo premium remediation = \$15,073 (90% confidence)
- iv. Monte Carlo death benefit remediation = \$650,000 (90% confidence)
- v. Exchange to a new policy? \$10,530 / year guaranteed
- vi. Surrender or Life Settle

B. New policy to replace "failed" policy

- i. 1035 Exchange + annual premium of \$10,540 No-Lapse Guarantee
- ii. "I don't want to pay more for life insurance than I have to!"

C. Internal Rate of Return analysis on Death benefit

- i. \$1 million vs \$2,796,000 life expectancy death benefit 10.13% IRR
- ii. \$1 million vs \$5,891,000 age 100 death benefit 9.55% IRR

**7. *Intelligently* remediating in-force policies**

A. Re-funding the original policy

B. Reducing the death benefit of the original policy

- i. Initially level DB
- ii. Initially increasing DB

C. Exchanging for a new policy

- i. Generally effective only if shifting style
- ii. Big debate whether “more modern” scale of COI makes sufficient difference to begin with new sales charges, surrender charges, contestable period, etc; begs “migration to mean” expectation

D. Life Settlement

- i. Generally practical when review of medical records suggests a specific life expectancy of less than 150 months
- ii. Under certain circumstances, may facilitate a more financially favorable exchange to a new policy

**8. Assessing older clients**

- A. VUL as purchased: premium of \$20,243 based on a projection of 8% gross
- B. In-force view after 2008 market “correction”
- C. Revised funding: 70% increase to \$34,478

**9. Policy management**

- A. Not your father’s Oldsmobile - or life insurance policy
  - i. Life insurance is property. It should be managed as any other asset.
  - ii. Expect to pay for expert management advice
  - iii. Insurance companies are *not* providing analytical tools or data. You’re on your own.

**10. Trustees of ILITs are especially vulnerable in defending their fiduciary obligations. Issues to explore include**

- A. Life Insurance Investment Policy Statement
- B. Periodic evaluation to determine if policies continue to be suitable and meet expectations
- C. Are premiums sufficient to sustain policy?

- D. Have variable accounts performed within an acceptable range for the asset classes and planned asset allocation?
- E. Have carrier financial ratings deteriorated? Should anything be “done” about that?
- F. Examine remediation alternatives
- G. Actuarial evaluation is critical
- H. Seek periodic review from agents
- I. VUL policies should only be considered if the underlying sub-accounts are professionally managed

## 11. Conclusion

- A. Short-term needs are best met with term insurance for the appropriate duration; term insurance can be purchased on the basis of premium and carrier financial ratings.
- B. Needs change; current uses for life insurance may transform. We don't always know the answer to the “how long will I need it?” question.
- C. Lifetime uses of life insurance require an enhanced level of understanding, assessment, and explanation in order to acquire the right type(s) of policies for specific financial, estate, and portfolio considerations.
- D. Policy illustrations are almost always an *inappropriate* means of valuing the price/ value proposition.
- E. Buyers of VUL should consider scaling back their initial asset allocation as they get older.
- F. Permanent life insurance has unique characteristics that qualify it as an asset class in the context of an investment portfolio that *includes* a life insurance policy.
- G. Lifetime uses and needs for life insurance can enhance the value - while reducing the risk - of an investment portfolio holding a policy appropriate to the portfolio.
- H. A process of associating a risk tolerance with the dominant attributes of whole life, no-lapse guarantee universal life, and variable universal life produces an efficient portfolio of policies that optimize potential results within the chosen risk category.

---

To obtain a PDF version of ***Life Insurance as an Asset Class***, please email a request to

[Dick@EthicalEdgeConsulting.com](mailto:Dick@EthicalEdgeConsulting.com)

The Ethical Edge, Inc.  
25A Crescent Drive - Suite 415  
Pleasant Hill CA 94523  
510 868 8804

or download the PDF by visiting our website at  
[www.EthicalEdgeConsulting.com](http://www.EthicalEdgeConsulting.com)  
and click on SERVICES > LIFE INSURANCE AS AN ASSET CLASS