

Data Precision Loss in Multi-Tier Insurance Systems: Critical Implications for Geospatial Risk Assessment

Kishor Kumar Jakkula

Independent Researcher, USA

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/ejcsit.2013/vol13n441623>

Published June 26, 2025

Citation: Jakkula KK (2025) Data Precision Loss in Multi-Tier Insurance Systems: Critical Implications for Geospatial Risk Assessment, *European Journal of Computer Science and Information Technology*, 13(44),16-23

Abstract: Insurance rating systems increasingly rely on precise geospatial data to calculate risk-based premiums, particularly for property insurance, where location-based factors significantly influence pricing. This article presents a critical production incident where coordinate precision loss during data transformation between enterprise systems resulted in systematic miscalculation of coastal proximity distances, leading to incorrect premium assignments for thousands of homeowner policies. The incident occurred when an intermediate integration layer truncated latitude and longitude coordinates from 16-digit to 2-decimal precision before transmitting to a third-party risk assessment service, causing inland properties to be misclassified as coastal risks. The resulting financial impact affected tens of thousands of policies with substantial premium discrepancies. Resolution required cross-functional collaboration, rapid root cause identification, and implementation of automated correction mechanisms within the policy administration system. The case highlights fundamental vulnerabilities in multi-tier system architectures where data transformation occurs at integration points, emphasizing the critical importance of maintaining data fidelity throughout complex enterprise workflows. Key insights include the necessity of comprehensive data validation protocols at system boundaries, the value of collaborative incident response frameworks, and the importance of transparent customer communication during remediation efforts. The findings contribute to understanding how seemingly minor technical decisions in system integration can cascade into significant business impacts in the insurance technology domain.

Keywords: geospatial data precision, insurance rating systems, enterprise integration, data transformation errors, production incident management

INTRODUCTION

Evolution of Property Insurance Rating Systems

Property insurance rating systems have undergone a fundamental transformation with the integration of geospatial data analytics. Modern insurers now leverage precise location information to assess multiple risk factors, including exposure to natural hazards, proximity to emergency services, and neighborhood

characteristics that influence claim patterns. The incorporation of geographic information systems has enabled insurers to move beyond traditional zip-code-based rating to property-specific risk assessment, allowing for more accurate and equitable premium determination [1].

Location-Based Risk Factors in Premium Calculation

The role of location in homeowners' insurance pricing extends far beyond simple geographic boundaries. Critical factors such as distance to coastline, elevation metrics, proximity to fault lines, flood zone designations, and wildfire risk scores all contribute to sophisticated rating algorithms. These location-based variables have become essential components in actuarial models, enabling insurers to differentiate risk at the individual property level and price policies according to actual exposure rather than broad geographic assumptions [2].

Data Precision Challenges in Enterprise Integration

Contemporary insurance technology ecosystems comprise multiple integrated systems, including policy administration platforms, rating engines, third-party data services, and integration middleware. Each system in this complex architecture potentially transforms or interprets data differently, creating opportunities for precision loss. High-precision numeric values such as geographic coordinates are particularly vulnerable to degradation as they traverse system boundaries, and even minor variations can cascade through subsequent calculations, resulting in significant pricing discrepancies.

Case Study Objectives and Significance

This case study examines a critical production incident where coordinate precision loss during system integration resulted in systematic rating errors affecting thousands of homeowner policies. The analysis explores how technical decisions at integration points can generate substantial business impacts, highlighting the challenges of maintaining data fidelity across enterprise systems. The findings offer valuable insights into system design principles, data governance practices, and incident management strategies essential for modern insurance operations.

System Architecture and Integration Challenges

PolicyCenter as Core Policy Administration Platform

PolicyCenter serves as the central policy administration system for many insurance carriers, providing comprehensive functionality for policy lifecycle management, including quoting, binding, endorsements, and renewals. The platform operates as the system of record for policy data, maintaining critical information such as insured details, property characteristics, coverage selections, and premium calculations. PolicyCenter's architecture supports extensive configuration and integration capabilities, enabling insurers to implement complex business rules while connecting to external systems for specialized processing needs [3].

Multi-Layered Integration Architecture

The technical architecture in modern insurance operations typically involves multiple layers of system integration, creating a complex data flow pattern from the policy administration system through intermediate layers to specialized third-party services. In this case, PolicyCenter transmits property location data to an integration middleware layer, which then processes and forwards the information to CoreLogic for distance-to-coast calculations. This multi-tiered approach introduces additional complexity as each layer may apply its own data handling, validation, and transformation logic, potentially altering the precision or format of transmitted information [4].

Table 1: Insurance System Integration Architecture Layers [3, 4]

System Layer	Primary Function	Data Handling Responsibility
PolicyCenter	Policy Administration	Source data entry and storage
Integration Middleware	Data Transformation	Format conversion and routing
CoreLogic Service	Risk Assessment	Distance calculations and scoring
Rating Engine	Premium Calculation	Apply risk factors to base rates

Third-Party Services in Risk Assessment

Insurance carriers increasingly rely on specialized third-party services to provide sophisticated risk assessment capabilities that would be costly or impractical to develop internally. Services like CoreLogic offer detailed geographic risk analysis, including coastal proximity calculations, flood zone determinations, and natural hazard assessments based on precise location coordinates. These external systems utilize proprietary algorithms and extensive geographic databases to generate risk scores that directly influence policy pricing, making the accuracy of input data critically important for proper rating determination [3].

Data Transformation Challenges in Enterprise Systems

Complex enterprise architectures create numerous data transformation points where information format, precision, or structure may be modified. Each system boundary represents a potential risk for data degradation, particularly when handling high-precision numeric values such as geographic coordinates. Integration layers often perform data mapping, format conversion, and validation processes that can inadvertently alter data characteristics. The challenge intensifies when different systems utilize varying data types, precision standards, or storage mechanisms, requiring careful attention to preserve data fidelity throughout the entire processing chain [4].

Problem Identification and Root Cause Analysis

Initial Symptoms and Business Impact

The production issue manifested as systematic miscalculation of distance-to-coast values for homeowner policies, resulting in incorrect risk classifications and premium assignments. Properties located well inland were being rated as coastal risks, leading to elevated premiums that did not reflect actual exposure. The

symptoms initially appeared sporadic, but investigation revealed a consistent pattern affecting all policies where location-based rating factors were applied, indicating a systemic rather than isolated failure in the rating process [6].

Investigation Methodology and Collaborative Response

The investigation employed a systematic troubleshooting approach, beginning with the validation of source data in PolicyCenter, where property coordinates appeared to be correctly stored with full precision. A cross-functional war room was established, bringing together technical leads from policy administration, integration, and third-party service teams to trace data flow through each system component. This collaborative methodology enabled simultaneous investigation across multiple system layers, accelerating the identification of discrepancies between transmitted and received coordinate values at various integration points [5].

Discovery of Precision Truncation

Root cause analysis revealed that the integration middleware layer was truncating geographic coordinates from their original high precision format to merely two decimal places before transmission to the CoreLogic service. This dramatic reduction in precision fundamentally altered the geographic position being evaluated, as coordinate precision directly correlates to location accuracy on the ground. The truncation occurred during data persistence in the integration layer's database, where field definitions had been configured with insufficient decimal precision, causing automatic rounding during storage operations [5].

Table 2: Geographic Coordinate Precision and Location Accuracy [5]

Decimal Places	Coordinate Format	Approximate Ground Distance Error
0	40°, -74°	~111 kilometers
1	40.7°, -74.0°	~11 kilometers
2	40.75°, -74.01°	~1.1 kilometers
6	40.748817°, -74.012345°	~0.11 meters
16	40.7488172119344°, -74.0123456789012°	~0.0000011 millimeters

Geospatial Calculation Impacts

The precision loss had profound effects on distance calculations, as geographic coordinate accuracy determines the reliability of any derived spatial measurements. When coordinates are truncated to two decimal places, the potential location error can span significant distances, particularly at lower latitudes where longitude degrees represent greater physical distances. This imprecision cascaded through the rating algorithm, causing the third-party service to return incorrect coastal proximity values that directly influenced premium calculations, demonstrating how technical data handling decisions can generate substantial business consequences [6].

Impact Assessment and Risk Quantification

Scope Determination and Policy Analysis

The impact assessment revealed extensive ramifications across the homeowner line of business, with tens of thousands of policies affected by the coordinate precision error. The scope determination process involved a systematic analysis of all policies where distance-to-coast calculations influenced rating factors, requiring comprehensive database queries and policy record examination. The assessment methodology identified patterns in affected policies based on geographic distribution, policy effective dates, and rating algorithm versions to establish the complete universe of impacted accounts requiring remediation [7].

Table 3: Production Incident Impact Categories [7]

Impact Category	Assessment Criteria	Measurement Approach
Policy Scope	Number of affected accounts	Database query analysis
Financial Impact	Premium discrepancy totals	Recalculation comparison
Customer Experience	Service disruption level	Communication requirements
Regulatory Risk	Compliance violations	State filing obligations
Operational Cost	Resource hours required	Team allocation tracking

Financial Impact Quantification

The financial analysis uncovered substantial premium discrepancies resulting from the incorrect coastal proximity calculations, with aggregate impact reaching significant monetary thresholds. The assessment methodology incorporated detailed premium recalculation for each affected policy, comparing actual premiums charged against corrected rates based on accurate distance measurements. This comprehensive financial review required coordination with actuarial teams to ensure proper application of rating factors and validation of corrected premium amounts, establishing both customer refund requirements and revenue impact projections [7].

Customer Experience and Regulatory Implications

Beyond immediate financial considerations, the incident created substantial customer experience challenges requiring careful management of policyholder communications and trust restoration. Regulatory implications emerged as a critical concern, given insurance industry requirements for accurate rating and fair premium determination. The situation necessitated proactive engagement with regulatory bodies, transparent disclosure of the issue and remediation plans, and implementation of customer notification strategies that balanced clarity with technical complexity while maintaining compliance with state insurance regulations [7].

Production Risk Assessment Framework

The incident highlighted the need for robust risk assessment methodologies specifically tailored to production data issues in insurance systems. The framework developed in response incorporated multiple

risk dimensions, including data precision requirements, integration point vulnerabilities, downstream calculation dependencies, and business impact potential. This systematic approach to production risk assessment enables proactive identification of similar vulnerabilities across the enterprise architecture, establishing monitoring protocols and validation checkpoints to prevent recurrence of precision-related failures [7].

Remediation Strategy and Implementation

Technical Solution Architecture

The technical remediation centered on modifying the integration layer's database schema to support full coordinate precision, ensuring geographic data maintained its original accuracy throughout the processing chain. The solution required careful analysis of data type specifications and storage requirements to accommodate high-precision decimal values without truncation or rounding. Implementation involved updating column definitions to support the necessary decimal places while maintaining backward compatibility with existing system interfaces, following established database design principles for precision-critical numeric data [8].

Automated Policy Correction Framework

Remediation of affected policies required the development of sophisticated automation scripts within PolicyCenter to recalculate premiums based on corrected distance-to-coast values. The automation framework leveraged PolicyCenter's native scripting capabilities to systematically process each impacted policy, retrieve updated geographic risk scores from the corrected integration service, and apply appropriate premium adjustments. This automated approach ensured consistency in corrections while maintaining full audit trails of all modifications, which is critical for regulatory compliance and customer service requirements [9].

Customer Communication and Transparency

The customer notification strategy balanced the need for transparency with clear, non-technical explanations of the issue and its resolution. Communication protocols included personalized letters to affected policyholders explaining the nature of the error, the corrective actions taken, and any resulting premium adjustments or refunds. The messaging emphasized the company's commitment to accuracy and fairness while providing multiple channels for customer inquiries, ensuring policyholders understood both the immediate impact and long-term measures implemented to prevent recurrence [8].

Emergency Response Coordination

The incident response required rapid mobilization of resources across multiple teams, with clearly defined roles and escalation paths to ensure timely resolution. The emergency response framework established daily coordination meetings, progress tracking mechanisms, and decision-making protocols that enabled swift technical implementation while maintaining quality controls. Resource allocation prioritized both

immediate remediation needs and ongoing business operations, demonstrating the importance of well-defined incident management procedures in managing complex production issues affecting customer-facing systems [9].

CONCLUSION

The coordinate precision incident in the homeowner insurance rating system underscores fundamental challenges in maintaining data integrity across complex enterprise architectures. The cascade effect from a seemingly minor technical decision—truncating geographic coordinates during data persistence—demonstrates how precision loss at integration points can generate substantial business impacts affecting thousands of customers and significant financial implications. Key lessons emerging from this case include the critical importance of comprehensive data validation protocols at system boundaries, the necessity of maintaining consistent precision standards across all integrated platforms, and the value of robust incident response frameworks that enable rapid cross-functional collaboration. The successful resolution through automated remediation and transparent customer communication highlights the effectiveness of combining technical solutions with proactive stakeholder engagement. Moving forward, insurance organizations must recognize that as rating algorithms become increasingly dependent on precise geospatial data, even minor degradation in data quality can undermine actuarial accuracy and customer trust. The incident serves as a compelling reminder that in modern insurance technology ecosystems, data precision is not merely a technical consideration but a fundamental business requirement that directly impacts rating accuracy, regulatory compliance, and customer satisfaction. Organizations should implement proactive monitoring and validation mechanisms at all integration points, establish clear data governance standards for precision-critical information, and maintain emergency response capabilities that can quickly mobilize resources when production issues arise.

REFERENCES

- [1] LARS POWELL, PhD, "Risk-Based Pricing of Property and Liability Insurance," *Journal of Insurance Regulation*, Vol. 39, No. 4, 2020. <https://content.naic.org/sites/default/files/jir-za-39-04-el-risk-based-pricing.pdf>
- [2] Nigel Lester, "Location in Insurance Risk Management," *Geospatial World*, 2009. <https://geospatialworld.net/article/location-in-insurance-risk-management/>
- [3] Pavan Kumar Gollapudi, et al, "Advanced Policy Administration: Comparative Analysis of Guidewire PolicyCenter and Majesco Policy Management Applications," *International Journal of Computer & Organization Trends (IJCOT)*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 2025. <https://ijcotjournal.org/archive/ijcot/v15i1p302>
- [4] Shanmugasundaram Senathipathi, "Battle of PAS Platforms: Comparing Guidewire PolicyCenter and Duck Creek for Insurance Cloud Digitalization," *International Journal of Computer Engineering and Technology (IJCET)*, Vol. 16, Issue 1, Jan-Feb 2025. https://iaeme.com/MasterAdmin/Journal_uploads/IJCET/VOLUME_16_ISSUE_1/IJCET_16_01_275.pdf

- [5] K. Sahr, "Optimal Representation of Vector Location Using Fixed-Width Multi-Precision Quantizers," *ISPRS Archives*, Vol. XL-4/W2, 2013. <https://isprs-archives.copernicus.org/articles/XL-4-W2/1/2013/isprsarchives-XL-4-W2-1-2013.pdf>
- [6] James Triveri, "Determining Distance to Coastline for Policy Locations Using GeoPandas," *The Pleasure of Finding Things Out*, October 14, 2024. <https://www.jtrive.com/posts/distance-to-coastline/distance-to-coastline.html>
- [7] Liaqat A. Shah, et al. "Process-oriented Risk Assessment Methodology for Manufacturing Processes Evaluation," *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 55, No. 15, 2019. <https://hal.science/hal-02333489/document>
- [8] MikeRayMSFT, et al, "Precision, Scale, and Length in SQL Server," *Microsoft Learn*, 2024. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/sql/t-sql/data-types/precision-scale-and-length-transact-sql?view=sql-server-ver16>
- [9] Raivis Sarkovskis, "All-In Guidewire PolicyCenter Automated Testing," *Kimputing Blog*, 2021. <https://kimputing.com/blog/all-in-guidewire-policycenter-automated-testing/>