Perspectives

Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America

Rethinking **what's ahead** in retirement

by Gary C. Bhojwani

For all that's ahead.℠

ENT-1154

Table of contents

The evolution of retirement 2

Potential land mines dotting the retirement landscape 7

Searching for guarantees in retirement income 11

New attitudes – new opportunities 15

Gary C. Bhojwani is president and chief executive officer of Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America, which has been keeping its promises since 1896. Today, it carries on that tradition, helping Americans achieve their retirement income goals with a variety of annuities and life insurance products. Mr. Bhojwani currently serves on the boards of the Insured Retirement Institute, the American Council of Life Insurers, and Allina Hospitals & Clinics. He is a member of the Financial Services Roundtable and the Young Presidents Organization.

Rethinking what's ahead in retirement

Americans face an era of transformation with a new emphasis on guaranteed income as they prepare for retirement.

By Gary C. Bhojwani

Introduction – the new reality

Many people have no idea where to find **GUARANTEES** in the financial marketplace.

The world of retirement planning is on the precipice of a new reality. The era of retirees being rewarded with a gold watch and lifetime pension after 35 years of work with a company has virtually disappeared. A combination of unpredictable markets, the erosion of defined benefit plans, the uncertainty about Social Security, and longer life expectancies means a new paradigm is emerging in retirement planning, challenging long-held beliefs in financial planning. This shift creates an opportunity to help Americans redefine how they plan for retirement and generate guaranteed income for life, a benefit unique to annuities.

The market turmoil of 2008 and early 2009 cemented a deep-seated crisis of confidence about how to truly create retirement security. If one polled Americans in 2007 about whether large investment firms – the pillars of American finance – could be brought to their knees in a matter of weeks, few would have answered yes. The "shock and awe" of the financial crisis contributed greatly to this rapid shift in how Americans view retirement.

The financial crisis is not the only driver of this shift. The sense of insecurity also comes from the worrisome state of the government retirement system in the United States, which reached an unsettling milestone in 2010. For the first time since 1983, Social Security payouts exceeded the amount paid in by workers.[1]

Individuals are also coming to terms with the decline of the defined benefit plan, a once-common source of guaranteed lifetime income. During the last 30 years, it appears that most employers have determined that a defined benefit plan is too costly and carried too much long-term financial risk for the company. They moved instead to tax-advantaged savings plans (e.g., 401(k) plans) for their workers, thereby shifting the responsibility for retirement security and longevity risk from corporations to their employees. Unfortunately, most Americans have not yet truly comprehended this new risk that they now own.

As 76 million baby boomers enter or are near retirement, they are coming to realize more than ever that they must learn how to convert assets into guaranteed retirement income. Many people have no idea where to find guarantees in the financial marketplace. Options do exist, so boomers will need to learn as much as they can about new forms of insured retirement income offered in the private sector, and begin taking action.

The depth of fear about Social Security and retirement funding should startle both financial leaders and policymakers. But this should not be considered a polarizing political issue. It's a math problem that will only get worse if left unanswered. When more than half of Americans who are just 15-20 years from retirement believe they are more likely to be hit by lightning than to receive their full due from the government, the need to act and educate is irrefutable.[2]

[1] Mary Williams Walsh, "Social Security to See Payout Exceed Pay-In This Year," *The New York Times*, March 2010, http://nytimes.com/2010/03/25/business/economy/25social.html.
[2] Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America, The Allianz ***Reclaiming the Future*** Study, 2010.

1

The evolution of retirement

The mindsets and buzzwords that characterize how a generation views saving and investing for retirement have evolved from one generation to the next. These mindsets are built on the personal experiences of that generation, imprinted deeply on their psyches, with each generation typically emphasizing one aspect of the retirement question over another.

A confluence of factors is forcing boomers to **READJUST** their financial beliefs.

As we look back in time, we see that all approaches and beliefs about retirement are not equal. Today's generation of baby boomers is experiencing a confluence of factors that are forcing them to readjust their financial beliefs and expectations, including:

- A realization that they will soon need to replace their paycheck with other sources of income.
- The severity of the financial crisis and Great Recession – and the significant hit on their retirement nest eggs – that undermined their once-steady faith in the equity markets as a solution to their retirement problems.
- A series of challenges – e.g., a lack of savings and guaranteed income – that are forcing the next generation of retirees to look for solutions different from those that worked for their parents.

Financial professionals have helped their clients accumulate wealth in preparation for retirement, something still important for younger baby boomers and subsequent generations. The fact remains, however, that a vast group of people in their late 50s and early 60s are now reaching the retirement income planning phase when they now must rely on their investment assets for income.

Looking back at attitudes about retirement during the past 70 years, three broad shifts in mindset have occurred.

The first wave – "guarantees" and "safety"

Shaped by lifetime events such as the Great Depression and World War II, the so-called "greatest generation" generally took a cautious approach to financial planning, investing, and preparing for retirement. The buzzwords for this generation were "guarantees" and "safety."

This sense of caution and concern is not surprising, given that attitudes toward investing were greatly informed by a series of momentous events:

- The 1929 stock market crash that led to the creation of the Securities and Exchange Commission and new securities laws to regulate investment markets.
- The financial collapse and insolvency of banks (where people lost their savings) that led to the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in 1935 to protect bank savings.
- The inception of Social Security in 1935 to provide a base level of financial support in retirement.

The greatest generation stayed away from **EQUITY** markets.

These government interventions and the insecurity about markets in general led many of this generation to want rock-solid guarantees and safety in both their financial planning and career choices. The high unemployment of the Great Depression led many to value a job for a lifetime, and be attracted to companies that offered a defined benefit (DB) plan in the form of an employer-sponsored pension to provide their retirement security.

This is the generation that may have stayed at a company for 35 years and received the gold watch at retirement. Whether they knew it or not, the result of their choices was a formula for retirement income known as the "three-legged stool." One-third was derived from Social Security, another third from employer plans, and one-third from personal savings. This model worked fairly well for 30-40 years.

Their generally cautious attitude and the guarantees underlying two-thirds of their retirement income (Social Security and defined benefit plans) led members of the greatest generation to stay away from equity markets. In 1952, long after the great stock market crash of 1929, stockholders represented only 4% of the American population, a number that increased to just 13% by 1980, in the midst of the era when baby boomers entered the workforce.

By avoiding the stock market and mutual fund investing, this generation was less interested in having control of their retirement assets and instead was comfortable allowing the government (in the form of Social Security) and their employer (in the form of pension plans) to provide the guarantees and security that they preferred. In addition, the third leg of the stool (i.e., personal savings) often took the form of bank savings, certificates of deposit, and fixed annuities that provided either FDIC insurance on savings or a guaranteed rate of return. Guarantees and safety oriented their decision-making, and banks and life insurers provided the bulk of their retirement planning products.



Source: "The First Measured Century," www.pbs.org/fmc/book/14business6.htm.

The second wave – "rate of return" and "control"

Boomers focused on maximizing their RATE OF RETURN.

Like many things they touched in society, the baby boomers approached the management of their assets in a decidedly different way from their parents. Growing up in primarily favorable economic times and energized by solid economic growth for most of their early working years, baby boomers were mostly fearless and emboldened as investors. Instead of seeking guarantees and safety, the buzzwords for this generation were "rate of return" and "control."

For the better part of the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, boomers focused on maximizing their rate of return in order to accumulate more wealth. They wanted more say in how their money was invested. Significant advances in information technology enabled this sense of control. Technology provided new ways to track investments virtually instantaneously and execute personal financial transactions at amazing speed and low cost. With the cost of commissions down, day trading became prevalent. Many boomers felt empowered that they could create long-term financial security better than the government or those managing pension assets.

This was also the era when new self-directed retirement savings vehicles, such as employer-sponsored defined contribution (DC) plans (typified by the 401(k) plan and started by law in 1981) and IRAs (modified and made more relevant beginning in 1981), began to assume prominence in the marketplace. DC plans allowed employers to shift the retirement plan's longevity risk and responsibility from their balance sheet to the employee, while still attracting talent via a match of what an employee contributed to the plan. Outside of these plans, IRAs empowered individuals to invest in nearly any type of investment for their own personal retirement, giving control to the individual.

With the help of employers who educated their staff about DC plan options, mutual funds became the investment of choice for baby boomers. As seen in the chart below, household ownership of mutual funds rose dramatically from 5% in 1980 to nearly 48% in 2001. Though down from that point, the number remains at 43% even at the end of 2009. Mutual fund ownership in the country now tops $11.5 trillion.[1]

Percentage of U.S. households owning mutual funds



Source: Investment Company Institute, "Ownership of mutual funds, shareholder sentiment and use of the Internet," December 2009.

[1] Michael Bogdan, John Sabelhaus, and Daniel Schrass, "Ownership of Mutual Funds, Shareholder Sentiment, and Use of the Internet, 2010," *Research Fundamentals*, Investment Company Institute, September 2010, Vol.19, No. 6.

As the trend toward greater personal control took hold, employers cut back on defined benefit plans. In 1980, 38% of employees were covered at least in part by a traditional pension plan. Over the next three decades, the DB-based guaranteed pension plan eroded significantly, in part due to accounting rule changes, with only 13% covered in 2006. The risk of building sufficient savings (through a workplace plan) to meet a major portion of retirement income needs shifted from the employer to employees. This has created a gap in longevity protection for individuals that is still not widely recognized by Americans today. Perhaps even more worrisome is the fact that the percentage of Americans who are not covered by either a DB or DC plan has remained constant at around 54-56%.

As a practical matter, this shift means that stock and bond investing, mutual fund accounts, and real estate investments have become more prevalent with this generation. Bank and insurance products, on the other hand, were mostly off the radar as safety and guarantees took a back seat to achieving higher rates of return and having personal control.

The decline of defined benefit plans



[1] "Notes," February 2009, Vol. 30, No. 2, www. ebri.org.
[2] "The Financial Crisis and Private Defined Benefit Plans," Center for Retirement Research at Boston College, November 2008.

A gap in **longevity** protection is still not widely recognized.

The next wave – "lifetime income" and "guarantees"

In the wake of the 2008 financial collapse, the next wave of retirement is emerging. As in the past, the shift in attitudes is happening because of powerful and compelling experiences that have hit the American psyche. Memories of the Great Recession will not fade quickly (especially as many are still feeling its effects) just as the greatest generation never let go of beliefs formed from their experiences of the Great Depression.

Having taken on greater personal responsibility for retirement and with the era of retirement bearing down on them, boomers are seeing a new, harsh reality – controlling one's investments can result in greater uncertainty about the future in terms of income, the value of one's portfolio, and longevity risk.

This reality hit home in the first decade of the new millennium. Most baby boomers began investing after the last dramatic and sustained market decline, the 43% drop that occurred in 1973 and 1974.[1] After that point, particularly between 1982 and 1999, stocks enjoyed an unprecedented level of growth. In this case, uncertainty was welcome as most saw their portfolios accumulate faster than the historical averages would have predicted.

[1] *Stock Trader's Almanac*, 2011.

Twice in a decade, the tables turned dramatically. From 2000 to early 2003, the stock market (as measured by the S&P 500) lost 41% of its value. Then, after recovering from that drop and reaching new heights, the market lost 51% of its value, this time in a span of 17 months (October 2007 to February 2009).[1] This was a seminal moment for those nearing retirement, who had a good portion of their nest egg invested in the stock market. As a result, many were forced to scale back their expectations or even delay retirement in order to rebuild their lost savings.

Prior to the financial crisis, it is doubtful that many consumers would have questioned the benefits of a "buy-and-hold" strategy. It was taken as gospel that equities would gain in value if held for more than a few years. Yet for a two-year stretch dating back to 2008, the 10-year average annual return of the S&P 500 has been in negative territory. Likewise, most boomers assumed they would be able to sell their home if they wished for a tidy profit. That notion has also changed.

What has occurred is nothing short of a decisive shift in the financial mindset for all Americans, but especially for those in or near retirement. According to The Allianz ***Reclaiming the Future*** Study (conducted in May 2010), 54% of those aged 44 to 49 said they feel unprepared for retirement. Among the entire baby boomer group surveyed, a desire to lock in guarantees, in lieu of higher returns, has emerged. According to this survey, if given a choice, 80% of baby boomers would select an investment with a 4% return and a guarantee against losses compared to one that paid 8% interest, but was subject to market downturns.

In short, the new buzzwords for aging baby boomers are "lifetime income" and "guarantees."

What has occurred is nothing short of a **decisive shift** in the financial mindset of all Americans.

[1] "The Callan Periodic Table of Investment Returns," Callan Associates, 2011.

2 Potential land mines dotting the retirement landscape

The risks that lie ahead for new and pending retirees are often ones not talked about, though they have been on the radar for some time. Taken as a whole, they add to the sense of urgency about finding targeted solutions to help overcome the challenges. Yet, many boomers have not been fully educated about them.

Here are some key risks Americans need to prepare for as they finalize plans for retirement.

Longer life expectancies

In 1939, before America entered World War II, life expectancy was just over 59 for men and slightly above 63 for women. This means that when Social Security was implemented with an eligibility age of 65, the average American would not live long enough to access the benefit.

Today, males have a life expectancy of 75 years, while women's life expectancy has reached 80. These numbers represent a remarkable triumph for our society, as it may be the fastest increase in life expectancy in the course of human history. It also means, however, that retirement will last much longer than just a few decades ago.

Life expectancy remains unpredictable in an age when new medical technologies may extend life even longer than today. What we do know, however, are the actuarial probabilities to help us measure life expectancy in the aggregate. So for a married couple age 65, a 50% chance exists that at least one of the two will reach age 89; a 25% chance exists that one will survive to age 94. In other words, that couple faces a one-in-four chance that one of them will be in retirement for three decades or longer.

How many Americans are prepared to fund their retirement for this length of time?

Retirement will last longer

Probability of 65-year-olds surviving to select ages



Note: "Either" assumes lives are independent.
Source: LIMRA, "Retirement Income Reference Book," 2009, 71.

The sustainability of Social Security as we know it

As individuals plot out their potential sources of retirement income, the annual statement from the Social Security Administration provides an estimate of monthly benefits for which they will qualify depending on the age at which they begin drawing on Social Security. If one reads the news on Social Security, questions are increasing as to whether these estimates will remain valid.

As noted previously, when Social Security was created in the 1930s, the average person was not even expected to reach the full retirement age of 65. Though life expectancies have grown dramatically since then, the age at which benefits are paid out of Social Security has not risen to a comparable degree.

Moreover, the system may not be able to support beneficiaries as it did in the past. Most notable is that the ratio of workers paying into the system to support each beneficiary has declined dramatically since 1950, and will continue to decline into the future.

With the balance between contributors and recipients shifting so dramatically, changes to the system seem inevitable. The result could be that government support of retirement may be less than many expected through increases in eligibility age, a reduction in benefits, or a combination of both. This is supported by The Allianz ***Reclaiming the Future*** Study, which found that nearly half of 44 to 49 year olds feel they have a better chance to be struck by lightning than get their full due from Social Security.

Regardless of what happens to the system, Americans need to factor into their planning the idea that Social Security may pay out differently from what is projected today.

Fewer workers to support retirees



Source: "The 2009 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds," May 12, 2009.

Rising health care costs

While wages have generally kept up with modest overall inflation during the last decade, at least one area of the economy has experienced far more significant cost increases – health care.

Compared to the 29% increase in the Consumer Price Index from 1999 through 2008, health care expenses rose 119%. The harsh reality for baby boomers is that health care expenses tend to become more significant as they grow older. This is adding a notable cost factor for retirees.

Despite the rising awareness of escalating health care costs, solutions have yet to be found. Even the far-reaching health care reform legislation enacted in 2010 failed to address the two largest drivers of rapid inflation in health costs – obesity and smoking. Recent trends are likely to continue.

Health care costs can have a dramatic effect on retirement

Cumulative changes in health insurance premiums, inflation, and workers' earnings



Source: "Trends in Health Care Costs and Spending," Kaiser Family Foundation, March 2009.

The hidden risk – how sequence of returns affects a portfolio

One of the tantalizing and more easily understood concepts for investors is the average rate of return (either for the market as a whole or for specific investments). For example, the average annual return of the S&P 500 from 1990 to 2009 was 8.23%.[1] Yet the range of returns varied dramatically from 37.6% in 1995 to -37.0% in 2008. Averages do not account for the variability of investment performance.

This is not an issue for consumers focused on accumulation who do not draw down on their investments. They can weather the volatile times and ultimately achieve the average return for any given holding period, assuming the dollars stay invested. But for those drawing down assets or taking income from their holdings, the variability of performance can have a huge impact.

[1] "The Callan Periodic Table of Investment Returns," Callan Associates, 2011.

The **SEQUENCE** of a portfolio's returns has a large impact on how long assets will last.

Consider the case of a retired couple with a $1 million nest egg and plans to withdraw 5% per year ($50,000), adjusted for inflation (3.5%) each year. If the portfolio generates a steady annualized return of 6% per year, the couple could count on their distributions lasting for 30 years.

The operative word is "steady," which we know does not happen with markets. What this couple's portfolio will actually reflect is a series of returns, with the sequence of those returns having a large impact on how long the assets will last.

So what happens if the portfolio moves up and down every year? As an example, we can still keep the 6% average return over 30 years, but add four distinct rate-of-return values cycling every four years to see what would happen. The four values would show the portfolio earning 27% in year one, 9% in year two, 7% in year three, and -15% in year four. The rotation begins applying these market returns to the portfolio while withdrawing $50,000 per year until the value hits zero. We then compare that result with the reverse sequence rotation starting with -15%, then 7%, 9%, and 27%. The chart below shows that the different sequencing of returns represents a 13-year difference in how long the money will last.

What we see is that the money could run out much more quickly than anticipated, or could be extended if investments perform better in the early years. The problem is the unpredictability of variable investments in the short run. While it is hard enough to accurately project an average annual return over an extended period of time, it is essentially impossible to project specific returns each year and determine how they will affect a distribution strategy.

No matter how accurate one may be in projecting an "average" return, it provides little assurance that retirement income goals will be met if the sequence of returns happens to work in an unfavorable way.



This is a hypothetical example and is not intended to project the performance of any specific investment. If this were an actual product, the returns may be reduced by certain fees and expenses.

3 Searching for guarantees in retirement income

A long-standing era in retirement planning may be coming to an end. This is the era of the famed "three-legged stool" referred to earlier, the generally equal mix of income generated by three sources:

- Government (via Social Security)
- Employers (through defined benefit plans)
- Individual savings and investments

The bulk of personal assets right now do not come with **GUARANTEES.**

The first two legs are becoming increasingly wobbly, while the third – personal assets – is by necessity taking a bigger role in keeping the stool upright. Unfortunately, unlike the other two legs of the stool, the bulk of these assets right now do not come with guarantees.

Social Security

Given strong anti-tax sentiment, a quick fix of Social Security does not appear likely. Without a fix, the Social Security system is estimated to exhaust its trust fund (another word for "surplus") in 2037.[1] After that, the system will rely entirely on the direct payments of workers to fund beneficiaries, and it is assumed that some reduction from current benefit levels will occur.

In fact, the trend worldwide and even at the state level within the United States is for government cutbacks to retirement programs. Pension reform and increases in the retirement age are taking hold across many parts of Europe. Germany will increase its retirement age over time from 65 to 67 by 2029. France is struggling to move that age from 60 to 62; Greece is moving the retirement age for women from 60 to 65, with financial penalties on early retirement and pensions frozen until 2012. The International Monetary Fund has urged Spain to increase its retirement age from 65 to 67. The United States last raised its retirement age in 1983 from 65 to 67 for all Americans born after 1960.[2]

Domestically, the state of New Jersey may be setting a precedent by rolling back increases in pension benefits to public employees. With about $46 billion in unfunded liabilities, New Jersey has passed laws rolling back a 9% increase in pension benefits and barring part-time workers from enrolling in the state pension system.[3]

[1] "The 2009 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds," U.S. Government Printing Office, May 2009.
[2] John Lichfield and Cheryl Roussel, "Sarkozy follows Europe in raising retirement age," *The Independent*, May 2010.
[3] Angela Delli Santi, "NJ governor signs worker pension reform measures," *Bloomberg Businessweek*, March 2010, www.businessweek.com/ap/financialnews/D9EKB5800.htm, October 2010.

Employer plans

The era of big corporate defined benefit plans also appears to have ended, with little likelihood that corporations will change course and begin reinstating such plans, especially as accounting rules now require the funding status of pension plans to appear on corporate balance sheets. Like government, employers are looking for ways to reduce costs. CEOs cannot print money to pay bills, but instead must prove to shareholders that they are good stewards of the company's money. This pressure is unlikely to boost interest in guaranteed retirement income benefits for employees at most firms.

Individual investments

Individuals now have to accept greater responsibility for their own retirement security. The market downturn linked to the Great Recession gave pre-retirees a first-hand "feel" for the pitfalls of a nonguaranteed retirement as well as a powerful motivation to rethink how they position their assets for retirement.

From the market peak to its low point during the severe bear market of 2008 – 2009, the value of equity holdings in defined contribution, defined benefit, and household nonpension assets declined by 57%. In dollar terms, these portfolios lost more than $12 trillion.[1] Investment vehicles and diversification strategies intended to help people achieve their retirement goals failed to protect them. Many who spent as many as 40 years accumulating wealth saw much of it evaporate almost overnight.

The losses were most significant for those closest to retirement – a logical outcome given that these people tend to have accumulated the most money. Consumers aged 55 to 64 generally experienced losses of 25% to 30% in their 401(k) plans (from the end of 2007 to January 2009). Thus, the ones most in need of a stable nest egg were the most negatively affected and at precisely the worst time in their retirement trajectory.

Americans have begun to come to grips with a striking reality: It is nearly impossible to feel secure about retirement income if most of it is not guaranteed.



[1] Alicia H. Munnell and Dan Muldoon, "Equity Declines from October 9, 2007 to March 9, 2009, Trillions of Dollars," *Flow of Funds Accounts of the United States*, Center for Retirement Research at Boston College, March 2009.

[2] Based on account balances as of 12/31/2007.

EBRI estimates based on tabulations from EBRI/ICI Participant-Directed Retirement Plan Data Collection Project 2008 and 2009 Account Balances.

The rise of the insured retirement solution

What are boomers looking for as they prepare to enter the next stage of life? The answer, as suggested earlier, is lifetime income and guarantees.

Many in the industry have typically followed a strategy of adjusting an asset allocation mix based on the person's age. That allocation process often overlooked the concept of devoting a portion of assets to products that provide guarantees.

Only recently has a new focus been placed on finding a source of income that is guaranteed for life. As boomers enter retirement and try to personally secure new sources of reliable income that will be sustainable regardless of how long they live, they are increasingly interested in insured retirement solutions.

Among the alternatives currently being considered – but that do not provide guarantees – are systematic withdrawal plans or tactics using target date funds. These tactics often take an arbitrary approach of projecting the income stream that will be needed for, say, 20 years. For those 65-year-olds who are looking for an income solution for a set period of time, these options may be suitable. But, of course, the reality is that no one knows how long they will live.

What is being missed is the insured retirement solution based on annuities that allow people to create their own form of a defined benefit pension plan using their own assets. A fundamental activity an insurance company undertakes is to "pool" risk – and it can be risks of all types, such as the risk of having one's property damaged or stolen or the risk of dying too soon, while protecting one's family financially.

In the case of retirement, insurers are in a unique position to pool overall longevity and financial risk and are thus able to give people the opportunity to guarantee a stream of income that can last throughout retirement, even if they live beyond age 100 (there were more than 92,000 centenarians in America in 2008).[1]

Only insurers that offer annuities can pool and thereby eliminate the biggest risk of retirement – outliving one's assets. Insurers offer lifetime income guarantees. Mutual fund companies or brokerage firms, on the other hand, cannot do this and in fact are required by regulators to avoid using the word "guarantee" when connected to their investment offerings. Though banks offer FDIC-insured products that guarantee a rate of return, they cannot offer ways of guaranteeing a stream of income for life.

The easiest way to understand this concept with respect to retirement is to see how insurers pool risk in the world of auto insurance. Americans who own cars pay for insurance to protect against loss. If an owner of a $50,000 car buys no insurance and wants to take on the exposure alone, he or she is liable for the entire $50,000 of any potential loss. If two people take on the risk, each is willing to pay $25,000 if one car is lost. Spreading the risk among 10 people reduces the exposure to $5,000. If 20 drivers pool their risk, each is on the hook for just $2,500 if one of those 20 autos should be lost.

The concept of pooling risk to protect retirement is the same. In this case, the risk is the possible exhaustion of personal savings before the end of life.

Only insurers that offer **annuities** can pool and thereby eliminate the biggest risk of retirement – outliving one's assets.

[1] *A Profile of Older Americans: 2009*, Administration on Aging, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

If we look at existing models of accessing a portfolio for 20 years of income in the chart below, we see that there's an income gap that exists when a person reaches 85 years of age. The bright blue zone in this chart is the unfunded area of retirement that occurs when the assets are fully depleted. At this point, the consumer must rely almost exclusively on what Social Security provides.

If we then look at pooling risk to take away that longevity risk for the consumer, we see that the insurer is able to cover the gap of living beyond age 85. With a guaranteed benefit, for those who die before they've received 20 years of income, their annuity contract value will go to their beneficiaries. For those who live longer, the pooled assets in the insurer's general account provide for a longer benefit. This is how insurers can guarantee income for life. They pool the risk of a large group of people to help pay for the people who live longer.[1]

There may be no greater financial threat facing consumers today than the risk of outliving one's assets. More than ever, Americans have been left to their own devices to resolve this challenge. Annuities offer a similar level of protection for retirement that auto insurance does for a car owner.

Designed to last 20 years



The insurer's advantage – pooling of risk



[1] Please note: This is for demonstration purposes only. Surrender charges may play a larger role in funding guaranteed lifetime income than account values forfeited by lifetime annuitants who die after receiving only a few payments.

[2] LIMRA, "Retirement Income Reference Book," 2009, 71.

4

New attitudes – new opportunities

Baby boomers are increasingly becoming aware of the risk of outliving one's assets. In The Allianz ***Reclaiming the Future*** Study, boomers indicated that their greatest fear in retirement is not death, but the risk of outliving their assets. While 39% feared the grim reaper, 61% said "outliving my money in retirement" was a bigger fear.

Which do you fear most?



Source: The Allianz ***Reclaiming the Future*** Study, 2010.

This fear is not only gripping older boomers who are near retirement and may be dealing with severe portfolio shock just when they need to start tapping their savings. The study also shows that the concern is even more pronounced for the youngest of the boomers who may still have 20 years of work and wealth accumulation ahead of them. For those aged 44 to 49 who are married and with dependents, the fear of outliving assets more than death jumps to 82%.

The **IDEAL FINANCIAL PRODUCT** that consumers want is, in fact, what an annuity has to offer.

Boomers are not alone in this desire to know more about how to maintain income for life. Financial professionals now recognize the need to make adjustments. According to a 2009 survey of 1,200 financial professionals conducted for the Life Insurance Marketing Research Association (LIMRA), advisors indicated that the top three primary areas about which they want to be more informed are:

1. Strategies to guarantee income in retirement (76%)
2. Strategies to minimize the risk of outliving assets (74%)
3. Techniques to protect against market volatility (70%)

Annuities by another name

Change is clearly under way in the world of financial planning for retirement. Individuals, financial professionals, and government regulators are publicly stating a desire for guaranteed retirement income solutions, with annuities playing a central role. The problem, however, is that the word "annuity" continues to have a negative perception in the general public based on attitudes formed about the products 10 to 20 years ago.

The Allianz ***Reclaiming the Future*** Study found that of the 15 different attributes of financial products that survey respondents were asked to rate, the top five most important were:

1. Stable, predictable retirement standard of living
2. Guaranteed income stream for life
3. Guaranteed not to lose value
4. Protection against market downside
5. Don't need to think about it, stable, and predictable

In short, the ideal financial product that consumers want is, in fact, what an annuity has to offer – even if they do not realize that these are the attributes of annuities. Also noteworthy is that the lowest-rated of the 15 characteristics was "the opportunity to participate in market upside."

The problem, however, is that misperceptions about annuities continue to dominate. The Allianz ***Reclaiming the Future*** Study also showed that 54% of consumers expressed distaste for the word "annuities," even though they described the exact features and benefits of annuities as what they were looking for. Just when consumers might be interested to learn about and benefit from annuities, uttering the word itself could be comparable to letting the air out of a balloon.

Most consumers admit that their biased view against annuities is based on information from 10 to 20 or more years ago. One in four said they determined their perception of annuities more than 20 years ago. In addition, 64% admit they have never researched to learn more about annuities since forming their views. These negative views may be reinforced by commentators in the media who have reflexively attacked annuities, often without understanding them.

Happiness is an annuity owner

For those who have a knee-jerk reaction against annuities, a surprising fact from the Allianz study is that an informed owner of an annuity is a happy consumer:

- 80% of annuity owners are happy with their purchase because of the safety, security, and protection they benefit from. This ranks second-highest in satisfaction among all financial products.
- Yet 46% of respondents say their financial professional has not presented an annuity as an option.
- Another 19% are not certain whether an annuity was ever recommended.

> The demand and need for guaranteed lifetime income planning and long-term security will only grow in coming years.

Conversations about annuities often have to start with the basic benefits the product provides rather than discussing the name itself. All too often, retirement planning discussions never start because the financial professional's visceral reaction against the word "annuity" preempts the conversation. This has to change, if only to allow the consumer education process to continue so that a fully informed decision may be made about guaranteeing lifetime income.

New ways of describing an annuity are emerging that better reflect what the product can provide consumers. "Longevity insurance" and "retirement insurance" are just two that are increasingly used to help consumers more easily understand the benefits of this product set.

Consumers also need to be reminded that taking no action is not an option, given the dramatic new pressures building up on retirement systems. The model of retirement that they may have adopted and fully believed in just a few years ago may not be appropriate in the future. Since guarantees from the government or employers have been reduced, consumers need to be made aware of other sources of guaranteed income, which is a long-term education process.

Lastly, it is important to emphasize that annuities are not the only solution and may not be appropriate for every financial challenge a consumer faces today. Many of the negative impressions of annuities were created by those who oversold the product or tried to portray it as something it was not. Achieving a healthy understanding of the role an annuity plays in an overall portfolio is the appropriate step consumers need to take.

The world of retirement planning has changed. The fundamental perceptions of how best to prepare for retirement in an increasingly uncertain economy and world have also changed. Whether or not consumers, educators, politicians, the media, government officials, or business leaders want to accept or acknowledge this structural change, one thing is certain – the demand and need for guaranteed lifetime income planning and long-term security will only grow in coming years.

About Allianz

Any financial product is only as strong as the company behind it. And as a leading provider of retirement solutions, Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America (Allianz) has the strength and stability to always remain true to our promises.

We serve millions of customers, with over 2.2 million policies issued for wealth management products that include fixed and variable annuities, and universal life insurance. Founded in 1896, Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America provides innovative financial solutions for wealth accumulation, predictable retirement income, and protection of assets.

We're part of a global financial powerhouse. Our parent company, Allianz SE, is the world's 20th largest company[1] and the world's third largest money manager.[2] Allianz SE serves nearly 75 million customers in 70 countries.

The Allianz SE family of companies in North America, includes Fireman's Fund®, a premier property and casualty insurance company for more than 140 years; and Allianz Global investors, a network of companies that includes PIMCO (Pacific Investment Management Company LLC), one of the world's leading fixed-income money managers.

We have a conservative investment management philosophy designed to weather all market conditions and achieve long-term results, based on diversification across asset types; high credit rating requirements; a high level of liquidity; and strong risk modeling. By monitoring and controlling risks in real time, we have the potential to hedge against both general market turbulence and financial crises.

We've earned consistently high financial ratings from independent rating agencies including Standard & Poors, A.M. Best, and Moody's.[3] In fact, we were never downgraded during the recent market crash.

[1] "Fortune Global 500," *Fortune*, July 26, 2010. *Fortune's* ranking is based on revenue.

[2] "The P&I/Towers Watson World 500: The World's Largest Money Managers," *Pensions & Investments*, October 18, 2010 (www.pionline.com). Ranked by total assets under management.

[3] These independent agency ratings are based on an analysis of financial results and an evaluation of management objectives and strategies. The ratings do not indicate approval by the analysts and are subject to change.

Guarantees are backed by the financial strength and claims-paying ability of Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America. Variable annuity guarantees do not apply to the performance of the variable subaccounts, which will fluctuate with market conditions.

Products are issued by Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America. Variable products are distributed by its affiliate, Allianz Life Financial Services, LLC, member FINRA, 5701 Golden Hills Drive, Minneapolis, MN 55416-1297. www.allianzlife.com

© 2011 AZL
(4/2011)