

## 6. Pareto efficient risk allocation

Think of an economy consisting of two risk averse individuals,  $a$  and  $b$ . They face two possible states of the world. The probability for the realization of state 1 is  $1 - \pi$ , the probability for state 2 is  $\pi$ . In state 1,  $a$ 's ( $b$ 's) wealth is  $w_{1a}$  ( $w_{1b}$ ), in state 2 it is  $w_{2a}$  ( $w_{2b}$ ). The society's wealth in the two states of the world is simply defined as the sum of the individuals' wealth ( $w_1 = w_{1a} + w_{1b}$  and  $w_2 = w_{2a} + w_{2b}$ ). The two agents can now write a contract, in which they reallocate their wealth in both of the two possible states of the world. Draw the situation in an Edgeworth-box and show the set of Pareto-efficient risk allocations in case where there is

- a) no social risk (i.e., social wealth is the same in both states of the world:  $w_{1a} + w_{1b} = w_{2a} + w_{2b}$ );
- b) social risk (i.e., social wealth differs in the two states of the world, respectively);
- c) social risk and one of the agents is risk neutral.

## 7. Risk allocation, financial markets

Consider the following situation: There are two states of the world  $s \in \{1, 2\}$  that occur with  $\pi$  and  $1 - \pi$ , respectively. Two individuals,  $a$  and  $b$ , with endowments  $e_{1a}$ ,  $e_{2a}$ ,  $e_{1b}$ ,  $e_{2b}$  can trade income  $y_{si}$  between the states. Let income in state one be the numeraire; income in state two can be traded at price  $p$ .

- a) First, take the general welfare maximization problem with  $e_{1a} = 1$ ,  $e_{2a} = 0$ ,  $e_{1b} = 0$ ,  $e_{2b} = 1$  and determine a Pareto-efficient outcome.
- b) Take the following numerical example and derive the market outcome:  $u_i(y_{1i}, y_{2i}) = \pi \ln y_{1i} + (1 - \pi) \ln y_{2i}$  for  $i \in \{a, b\}$  and  $e_{1a} = 1$ ,  $e_{2a} = 0$ ,  $e_{1b} = 0$ ,  $e_{2b} = 1$
- c) Take the following numerical example and derive the market outcome:  $u_i(y_{1i}, y_{2i}) = \pi \ln y_{1i} + (1 - \pi) \ln y_{2i}$  for  $i \in \{a, b\}$  and  $e_{1a} = 1$ ,  $e_{2a} = 0$ ,  $e_{1b} = 0$ ,  $e_{2b} = 2$
- d) Most of the time, agents have different beliefs about  $\pi$ . Assume  $\pi_a = \frac{1}{3}$  and  $\pi_b = \frac{2}{3}$  in the setting of c). Derive the market outcome.
- e) Does Gossen's second law hold in b), c) and d)?
- f) Would the individuals appreciate it if someone told them the true state of the world before the transaction takes place?
- g) Instead of writing a contract the individuals now have access to the financial markets and trade two assets, so called Arrow-securities, that yield one unit of income in exactly one state of the world and zero in all the other states. Let the price of the first asset be  $p_1 = 1$ . Find the optimal amounts  $q_{1i}$  and  $q_{2i}$  that will be traded and calculate  $p_2$ . In the presence of financial markets, why can there still be scope for insurance markets?

## 8. Informal insurance agreements

Suppose that two individuals,  $a$  and  $b$ , agree on risk sharing, according to exercises 6. and 7., but the transfer payment is not contractible. In the absence of binding contracts they might design a self enforcing mechanism if the game is repeated. Take the setting in the diagram as given. Let  $2\pi_e$  and  $2\pi_d$  denote the probabilities for equal and different incomes, respectively. To start with, assume that  $\pi_e = 0$ . Let  $u(y_i) = \sqrt{y_i}$  be a person's utility derived from his income level.

	$y_b = 0$	$y_b = 1$	
$y_a = 0$	$\pi_e$	$\pi_d$	0.5
$y_a = 1$	$\pi_d$	$\pi_e$	0.5
	0.5	0.5	1

Derive:

- a) the first best transfer;
- b) the expected utility per person and period without insurance;
- c) the expected utility per person and period with transfer  $\theta = 0.36$ ;
- d) the maximum value for the discount rate  $r$ , so that the informal insurance contract with a second best transfer of  $\theta = 0.36$  is still implementable.

Assume now the more general case  $\pi_e > 0$ .

- e) Calculate the correlation coefficient  $\rho(y_a, y_b)$ . What has to hold for  $r$  and  $\rho$  so that the informal contract with  $\theta = 0.36$  is self enforcing?

## 9. Economies of scale

It is often stated that there are economies of scale in the insurance industry.

- a) Think about a way to model an insurance company's cost function. Especially try to find a way to plausibly describe an insurance company's marginal costs.

b) Now assume a standard risk neutral utility function of the form  $u(w) = aw$ . Is it, for this specific utility function, true that there are economies of scale in the insurance business?

(Economies of scale means that average costs are decreasing.)

- c) Do you think there are economies of scale in the real world insurance industry? (Hint: Think of the firms' attitude towards risk and other than risk costs.)

## 10. The Arrow-Lind Theorem

The compensating risk premium  $k$  is defined as  $u(y) = Eu[y + k + x]$  According to the Arrow-Lind Theorem both the premium of each risk averse insurer and the sum of all premia decrease as the number of insurers increases.

- a) Give an intuition for the compensating risk premium, e.g. compare the compensating risk premium with the standard equivalent risk premium.

b) Suppose that  $Ex = 0$  and that the risky project is shared among all insurers. Using a Taylor-approximation find an approximative value of  $k$ .

- c) Then show that both the individual premium and the sum of all premia decrease as the number of investors increases.