

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The rural households not only want insurance to be affordable, but also to protect against high-frequency risks such as serious ill health, accidents, harvest failure and fire. Insurance is not only the mechanism for reducing vulnerability but also ensure social and economic security to the poor. Insurance protects households against those risks that are unable to protect themselves through informal mechanisms, savings or credit. Insurance providers are concerned that coverage of risks can be provided on a sustainable basis. “Development of the microinsurance sector needs a longer-term perspective that combines responsiveness to client priorities with market development and financial viability,” The use of ICTs (Information and Communications Technology) in this process could also help to cut down costs to rural microinsurance clients. Current coverage tends to be far more common for life insurance rather than non-life insurance for livestock, health and crops, confirming that most non-life products need to be “sold”.

IRDA regulations legally recognized Non-Government organizations, self-help groups and microfinance institutions as “microinsurance agents,” substantially increasing the pool of permissible agents.

The present study on the “Risk Management and Demand for Microinsurance among Rural Households” is carried out with the following objectives:

- To analyse the factors that influence the risk and risk management strategies.
- To determine the awareness of microinsurance products.
- To analyse the factors that motivate to buy the microinsurance.
- To identify the features of different microinsurance products.
- To segment the market for microinsurance in the rural area.

The following hypotheses were tested

- There is no association between the risk of the rural households and coping mechanism.
- There is no significant difference between socio economic factors and awareness on insurance among rural households.
- Motivational factor do not influence the rural households on their investment in microinsurance.
- There is no relationship between investment in microinsurance and features of microinsurance.
- There is no association between the knowledge of the respondents and investment in microinsurance products.
- There is no association between the respondent's perception on investment and investment in microinsurance products.

Multistage Random Sampling method was followed for selection of sample respondents being the rural households in Coimbatore District. The data were collected from rural households by adopting random sampling technique, through carefully instructed interview schedule. The sample respondents of 580 were resulted, 558 were validated and the remaining was rejected due to incomplete information. The study was conducted from September 2011 to March 2015.

The study was mainly concerned with primary data. The collected data have been analysed by using suitable statistical tools. Chi-square test was applied to study the association between the risk of the rural households and coping mechanism. To study the influence of socio economic factors with insurance awareness among rural households and investment in microinsurance products with their features by applying the analysis of variance test. Factor analysis was applied to understand the motivational factors which influence to buy microinsurance products and multiple regression analysis were used to identify the influence of motivational factor on investment in microinsurance products by the rural households. Cross tabulation was applied for socio-economic factors and investment on different microinsurance products. Garrett's ranking techniques was used to find out

the reasons for not willing to buy different microinsurance products. The Access Frontier Approaches adopted in projecting the market development for microinsurance.

5.1 Findings of the Study

The findings of the study are given under the following sections:

- Socio-economic factors and financial behaviour of the rural households.
- Risk and risk management strategies of the rural households.
- Awareness of microinsurance products.
- Factors motivate to buy microinsurance products.
- Factors determining the demand for microinsurance.
- Market segment for microinsurance in the selected area.

Socio-economic Factors and Financial Behaviour of the Rural Households

Socio-economic factors of the rural households and their financial behaviour were discussed in the first part.

Socio-economic factors of the respondents were discussed under the sections namely demographic, social, economic and financial behaviour of the rural households.

Demographic Background

- Majority of the respondents (62.2 per cent) belongs to male gender.
- Most of the respondents (41.2 per cent) were in the age group of 36 - 45 years.
- Majority of the rural households (58.2 per cent) in the study area were married.
- Maximum of the rural households (35.3 per cent) fell into the high school level of education.

Social Background

- Majority 63.8 per cent of the respondents were from nuclear type of family.

- Out of total respondents, 33.5 per cent of respondents had above four members in the family.

Economic Background

- Most of the respondents (30.6 per cent) were under the occupation status of business.
- 35.7 per cent of the respondents in the study area had monthly income between Rs. 5,001 and Rs.10, 000.
- 47.7 per cent of the respondents were spending between Rs. 3,001 and Rs. 6,000 as monthly expenses
- 38.9 per cent of the respondents had less than one acre of agricultural land.

Financial Behaviour

- Majority of the respondents whose monthly income was above Rs.15, 000 saved more money with the mean score of 2.606.
- Most of the respondents (43.7 per cent) stated that unforeseen events were the main constraint affecting the ability to save.
- 80.8 per cent of the respondents selected for the study had bank account for their basic needs.
- Maximum of 43.2 per cent of the respondents selected for the study had more trust with banks.
- There is a significant association between socio-economic factors of the respondents and trust with the bank.
- Most of 33.9 per cent of the respondents borrowed from friends, relatives and neighbours. 29.8 per cent borrowed from private money lenders, 27.6 per cent of them borrowed from banks, 4.5 per cent borrowed from micro financial institution and 4.2 per cent borrowed from SHGs.
- Majority of the respondents had borrowed several times from friends, relatives and neighbour because they were easily approachable.
- Majority of the respondents had debt more than their capacity and also their earning was less than Rs.5, 000 per month. So it was

understood that the respondents monthly income was less, hence they were not able to meet their basic needs which force them to borrow beyond their repaying capacity to accomplish their basic needs.

Risk and Risk Management Strategies of the Rural Households

Risk and risk management strategies of the rural households were discussed under the following sections.

- ❖ Households affected by different risks
- ❖ Prevalence and impact of coping mechanism on risks management

Households Affected by Different Risks

- Maximum of the respondents were affected with the risk of illness in the family under 'Health Loss', risk of damage to personal properties under 'Property Loss' and risk of natural disaster under 'Agricultural Loss'.
- Rural households used different coping mechanism to reduce the risk when they face. Maximum of 30.5 percent of the respondents received money from friends and relatives when they had risk of illness under 'Health Loss', 27.8 of the respondents are received loan when they had business losses under 'Property Loss' and 34.1 percent of the respondents got money from friends and relatives and selling of assets in case of crop losses under 'Agricultural Loss'.
- There is an association between illness, accident, natural disaster, poor harvesting and crop losses with different coping mechanism. Death of the family members, disability, damages to personal properties, livestock disease and business losses do not have any association between the risk of the rural households and with the different coping mechanisms.

Prevalence and Impact of Coping Mechanism on Risks Management

- Majority of the respondents had financial pressure when any of the family members met with an accident under 'Health Loss' followed

by that business loss under 'Property Loss' and natural disaster under 'Agricultural Loss'.

- The coping mechanism had helped to manage the risk of accident to the family member under 'Health Loss', damages to personal properties under 'Property Loss' and natural disaster under 'Agricultural Loss' which was ranked first.

Awareness about Microinsurance Products

- Respondents had extreme awareness: 45.3 per cent on life insurance, 41.4 per cent on vehicle insurance, 39.2 per cent on cattle farm, 36 per cent on health insurance, 33.5 per cent on crop insurance and 33 per cent on property insurance. Further it was noted that majority of the respondents were aware of life insurance which was indicated with high mean score of 3.728 followed by vehicle insurance with the mean score of 3.642 and least was about property insurance with the mean score of 3.231.
- Gender difference existed for awareness on health and vehicle insurance except for all other insurance i.e., there is no significant difference between gender and awareness on life, property, cattle and crop insurance.
- Age significantly differ with awareness on health, life, property, vehicle and crop insurance except for cattle insurance.
- Marital status significantly differs with awareness on health, property, vehicle, cattle farm and crop insurance except life insurance.
- Educational status of the respondent's significantly differs with awareness on health, vehicle, cattle farm and crop insurance except life insurance and property insurance.
- Type of family significantly differs with awareness on only crop insurance and for health, life, property, vehicle insurance and cattle farm there is no difference with awareness.
- Family size of the respondent's significantly differs with awareness on health, life, property, vehicle, cattle farm and crop insurance.

- Occupation of the respondent's significantly differs with awareness on health, life, vehicle, cattle farm and crop insurance except for property insurance.
- Monthly income of the respondent's significantly differs with awareness on health, life, property, vehicle and crop insurance except cattle insurance.

Factors Motivate the Rural Households to buy Microinsurance Products

The factors which motivate the rural households to buy microinsurance products are discussed as under:

- ❖ Investment in Microinsurance Products
- ❖ Reasons for Investment in Microinsurance Products
- ❖ Motivational Factors to invest in Microinsurance Products
- ❖ Multiple Regression Analysis for Motivational Factor

Investment in Microinsurance Products

- Majority of 52.9 per cent of the respondents had the insurance policy and 47.1 per cent of the respondents do not have the insurance policy.

Reasons for Investment in Microinsurance Products

- Majority of the respondents (79.7 per cent) invested in microinsurance products for regular pension for their retirement, 74.3 per cent invested for medical expenses and 72.2 per cent invested for marriage expenses.

Motivational Factors to invest in Microinsurance Products

- The reliability of scaled items tested by applying cronbach's alpha. The value was 0.739, which stated that the scale is reliable and appropriate. Further to test the sampling, Kaiser-Meyer-Olin measure of sampling adequacy was computed which was found to be 0.719. It indicated that sample was good enough for sampling. So, the eight factors were highly significant at one per cent level of significance.

- Only three factors had Eigen value of more than one and the variance explained by these three factors were 36.388 per cent, 17.845 per cent and 14.957 per cent respectively and cumulative variance explained by all these three factors were 69.190 per cent.
- Each statement corresponding to the highlighted factor loading was correlated with the factor corresponding to that factor loading. Higher the factor loading, stronger was the correlation between the factors and statement.
- Factors were in the order of degree of importance. Factor one has 25.097 percentage of variance which is the highest variance and grouped as 'risk aversion', factor two as 'future contingency' and factor three as 'investment attitude' where percentage of variance is 24.178 and 19.915 respectively. It further reveals that risk aversion, future contingency and investment attitude were main factors that motivated the rural households to invest in microinsurance products.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Motivational Factor

- It was noted from the model summary that the value of R square for the model is 0.063. It means that only 6.3 percent of the variation in the investment in microinsurance (dependent variables) can be explained from the three independent variables. R square always increase as independent variables and added to a multiple regression model. To keep away from over estimating the impact of adding an independent variable to the model, to use the adjusted R square value. The adjusted R square for the model is 0.053 which shows only a small over estimate with the model.
- It was found that, the regression model was statistically significant. (F = 6.518; Significant @ 1%) This means that the chances are almost zero and result of regression model owes to random events as a substitute of a true relationship.
- Risk aversion (0.007), future contingency (0.005) and investment attitude (0.040) were found to be significant predictors for overall satisfaction. Investment in microinsurance was positively correlated

with future contingency and investment attitude. It negatively correlated with risk aversion.

- Multiple Regression analysis was conducted to examine whether motivational factors are influencing the investment in microinsurance. The overall model explained 6.3 percent of variance in investment, which revealed statistically significant, $F= 6.518$, $P<0.05$. An inspection of individual predictors revealed that negatively correlated of risk aversion (Beta = - 0.155, $P<0.05$) and positively correlated of future contingency (Beta = 0.159, $P<0.05$) and investment attitude (Beta = 0.117, $P<0.05$) were significant predictors of all predictors with dependent variables.
- The motivational factors influenced the rural households on their investment in microinsurance was 'risk aversion' of X_1 , 'future contingency' of X_2 and 'investment attitude' of X_3 . The regression equation was

$$Y = 2.827 - 0.273X_1 + 0.282X_2 + 0.207X_3$$

Factors Determining the Demand for Microinsurance Products

Factors determining the demand for microinsurance products had been analysed in the following section:

- ❖ Investment in Different Microinsurance Products.
- ❖ Cross Tabulation of Socio-economic Factors and Investment in Different Types of Microinsurance Products.
- ❖ Microinsurance Product Concept and Usage of Rural Households.
- ❖ Knowledge and Investment in Different Types of Microinsurance Products.
- ❖ Reasons for not possessing Microinsurance Products.
- ❖ Willingness to buy Microinsurance Products in Future.

Investment in Different Microinsurance Products

- Maximum of 24.7 per cent of the rural households invested in life insurance to give financial assurance to the family in their absence and only 10.8 per cent invested in property insurance.
- Under vehicle insurance, 52.1 per cent of the respondents invested with the policy amount of less than Rs. 5000, under health

insurance, 42.6 per cent had taken the insurance policy amount of less than Rs. 5000, under crop insurance, 46.4 per cent had taken the policy amount of less than Rs. 5000, under cattle farm, 39.6 per cent invested less than Rs. 5000 and between Rs. 10001 and Rs. 15000 amount as insurance policy, under property insurance, 48.9 per cent have invested the policy amount between Rs. 5001 and Rs. 10000.

Cross Tabulation of Socio-economic Factors and Investment in Different Types of Microinsurance Products

- Majority of both male and female respondents invested in life insurance and minimum number of respondents invested in crop insurance under male category and minimum number of female respondents had property insurance.
- Majority of the respondents (50.6 per cent) who were in the age group between 36 and 45 years invested in microinsurance products. Out of which 23.7 per cent taken both life insurance and vehicle insurance, 33.6 per cent of the respondents who were in the age group between 26 and 35 years, out of this 27.1 per cent had taken life insurance, 9.1 per cent of the respondents who were in the age group of less than 25 years, out of this 36.8 per cent had taken vehicle insurance and only 6.7 per cent of the respondents who were in the age group of above 45 years, out of this 50 per cent had taken life insurance.
- Maximum of the respondents (34.8) who studied high school level of education invested in microinsurance, out of this, 24.1 per cent had taken vehicle insurance, 27.6 per cent of respondents were illiterates, out of this 24.3 per cent had taken vehicle insurance, 21.6 per cent of the respondents studied at higher secondary level, out of this 36.7 per cent had taken life insurance, 13.4 per cent of the respondents studied Under Graduation, out of this 28.6 per cent had taken vehicle insurance and 2.6 per cent of the respondents were Post Graduates, out of this 81.8 per cent had taken life insurance.

- 53.9 per cent of the respondents who were married had invested in different microinsurance products, out of this 24 per cent had taken life insurance, 39.1 per cent of the respondents who were unmarried invested in microinsurance, out of this 25.5 per cent had taken vehicle insurance, 5 per cent of the respondents were in the category of divorcees, out of this 61.9 per cent had taken life insurance and 1.9 per cent of the respondent who were widows invested in microinsurance, out of this 37.5 per cent had taken crop insurance.
- Majority of the respondents (75.5) were from nuclear family invested in microinsurance, out of this 24 per cent had taken life insurance, 24.5 per cent of the respondents were from joint families, out of this 34.3 per cent had taken vehicle insurance.
- Maximum of the respondents (35.5 per cent) have above four members in the family invested in microinsurance products, out of this 29.1 per cent had taken life insurance. 31.4 per cent of the respondents have three members in the family, of which 22.1 per cent had taken health insurance. Another 30.7 per cent of the respondents were have above four members in the family, out of which 29.1 per cent had taken life insurance and only 2.4 per cent of the respondents were have two members in the family invested in microinsurance products, of this 70 per cent had taken life insurance.
- 30.5 per cent of the respondents who possessed occupational status as employment, invested in microinsurance, of which 28.3 per cent had taken life insurance, 28.1 per cent of the respondents were doing business, of this 32.5 per cent had taken vehicle insurance, 15.8 per cent of the respondents were occupational status of unemployed, of this 40.9 per cent had taken crop insurance, 14.1 per cent of the respondents were agriculturist, of which 38.9 per cent had taken vehicle insurance and 11.5 per cent of the respondents are professionals, out of this 35.4 per cent had taken life insurance.

- 41.5 per cent of the respondents whose monthly income range between Rs. 5,000 and Rs. 10,000 invested in microinsurance products, out of this 25.4 per cent had taken crop insurance and all other categories of monthly income group, the maximum per cent have taken vehicle insurance.

Features of Microinsurance Products by Rural Households

- Frequency of premium payment, coverage and sum assured were the main features that influenced the respondents to invest in micro life insurance with high mean score.
- Frequency of premium payment, coverage and sum assured were the main features that influenced the respondents to invest in micro health insurance with high mean score.
- Coverage, claim procedure and trust were the main features that influenced the respondents to invest in micro property insurance with high mean score.
- There is a significant difference between investment in micro life insurance with claim processing and frequency of premium payment.
- There is a significant difference between investment in micro health insurance with sum assured, claim processing and insurance provider.
- There was a significant difference between investment in micro property insurance with sum assured, insurance provider and frequency of premium payment.
- Majority of the respondents (32.8 per cent) received information from insurance agents regarding microinsurance products.
- Maximum of the respondents (30.8 per cent) had complete trust with insurance company in which they purchased the microinsurance products.
- Trust with insurance companies is associated with the socio-economic factors namely age, marital status, education, type of family, family size and occupation.

Knowledge on Investment in Different Types of Microinsurance Products

- Maximum of the respondents (44.1 percent) had the knowledge on investment in microinsurance products at an average level.
- Maximum of the respondents (29.3 percent) who had taken life insurance had poor knowledge. Further, the respondents (22.3 per cent) who have taken vehicle insurance had average level of knowledge. In respect of knowledge at rich level, respondents had taken life insurance with the percent of 27.7 percent.
- There is an association between the knowledge of the respondents and their investment in health, life, property, vehicle and crop microinsurance products in the study area and not significant for cattle farm.

Reasons for not possessing Microinsurance Products

- Majority of the rural household's were unaware about microinsurance products and non availability of information was the main reason for not investing in microinsurance products.

Willingness to buy Microinsurance Products in Future

- Minimum of 20.5 per cent of the respondents were definitely willing to buy the micro life insurance products to face future risk related to life.
- Only 11.8 per cent of the respondents were definitely willing to buy micro health insurance products, because of the influencing factors namely the frequency of premium payment, coverage and sum assured.
- Only minimum percentage of the respondents (9.5 per cent) was definitely willing to buy property insurance because of the coverage, claim procedure and trust on the insurance.
- There is an association between the respondent's perception on investment and investment in microinsurance products.

- 79.5 per cent of the respondents were definitely not willing to buy micro life insurance due to 'no need of insurance', 'bad experience' and 'trust with the insurance companies' with the high mean score.
- 88.2 per cent of the respondents were definitely not willing to buy micro health insurance due to no need of insurance, bad experience and trust with the insurance companies with high score.
- 90.5 per cent of the respondents were definitely not willing to buy micro property insurance due to no need of insurance, bad experience and trust with the insurance companies with high score.

Market Segment for Microinsurance in the Rural Area

Access Frontier Approach developed by David Porteous was adopted in projecting the market development for microinsurance. The approach was applied to determine the size of the market for the group within Access Frontier for different types of products namely health, life and property insurance and to develop marketing strategies to reach those within Access Frontier Now and in Future.

Under this approach the total market is divided into four segments as given below:

Table 72

Market Segment for Microinsurance in the Rural Area

Main market segments	Description of the segment	Defined by the study
Within Access Frontier Now	Maximum percentage of households who can access the suggested microinsurance product concepts on current terms and conditions.	52.9 per cent of the rural households have invested in different Microinsurance product supported by Health Insurance: 16.3 per cent Life Insurance: 24.7 per cent Property Insurance: 10.8 per cent Vehicle Insurance: 22.1 per cent Cattle Farm: 12.7 per cent Crop Insurance: 13.4 per cent

Continued .,

Table 72

Market Segment for Microinsurance in the Rural Area

Main market segments	Description of the segment	Defined by the study
Within Access Frontier in the Future	A group of households who are likely to access the suggested microinsurance product concepts if terms and conditions are more adapted to them. In the case of microinsurance, they are reluctant to buy now due to limited knowledge, distrust or underestimation of their capacities to pay due to poor money management.	<p>Willing to buy in the future to meet out their risk and benefits available in the different insurance products.</p> <p>Life Insurance: 20.5 per cent Health Insurance: 11.8 per cent Vehicle Insurance: 9.5 per cent</p>
Supra-Market	A group of households who may wish to buy microinsurance but are unable to, mostly due to lack of surplus income.	<p>14.0 per cent of the respondents are from low income category (i.e., Monthly income of less than Rs.5,000) supported by</p> <p>Life: 57.5 per cent Health: 100 per cent and Property: 85 per cent of the respondents are not willing to buy microinsurance products due to low level of income. It is estimated based on the income sources, financial behaviour, and price sensitivity.</p>
Natural Limit	Maximum extent of usage possible after eliminating those who can but choose not to use the microinsurance.	<p>Definitely not willing to buy different microinsurance products because the respondents expressed that “no need of microinsurance products” supported</p> <p>Life Insurance: 75.6 per cent, Health Insurance: 74.9 per cent Property Insurance: 76.5 per cent</p>

Source: Computed Data

Market Development Projections

Analysis of total insurance market development scenario reflects opportunities and threats to microinsurance provision. The Access Frontier approach distinguishes three zones in a market based on market enablement zone, market development zone and market redistribution zone.

Access Frontier approach identifies three zones on the market and it is discussed as follows:

➤ **Market Enablement Zone** – This is a group that can be reached now (within access frontier now) because it is easy to be covered with new microinsurance products that are demanded by enthusiastic respondents. 52.9 per cent of the respondents have invested in different microinsurance products i.e., Health Insurance: 16.3 per cent, Life Insurance: 24.7 per cent, Property Insurance: 10.8 per cent, Vehicle Insurance: 22.1 per cent, Cattle Farm Insurance: 12.7 per cent and Crop Insurance: 13.4 per cent.

➤ **Market Development Zone** – This is a group within access frontier that might be covered if the new products are well-adapted and effective marketing strategies are in place and there is an enabling environment. Microinsurance sector can develop the market based on their needs so that the rural households willing to buy the products and can able to satisfy to their needs. Most of the respondents were willing to buy microinsurance in future Life Insurance: 20.5 per cent, Health Insurance: 11.8 per cent and Property Insurance: 9.5 per cent to meet out their risk and benefits available in the different insurance products.

➤ **Market Redistribution Zone** – It is estimated based on the income sources, financial behaviour and price sensitivity, comes under the group of supra-market. This is a task for the Government to extend an adequate safety net and provide affordable risk-management tools for this group. 14.0 per cent of low income category (i.e., Monthly income of less than Rs.5,000 per month), out of which 57.5 per cent of the respondents are definitely not willing to buy micro life insurance products, 100 per cent are definitely not willing to buy micro health insurance and 85 per cent are

definitely not willing to buy micro property insurance, due to their lack of capacity to pay because of their low income.

The impact of microinsurance of the rural households had been analysed with the help of Access Frontier Approach developed by David Porteous and classified the market into four categories and transferred into three zones to identify the demand for microinsurance among the rural households.

5.2 Conclusion

Microinsurance is not only the mechanism for reducing vulnerability but also ensure social and economic security to the rural households. It protects rural households against those risks that they are unable to protect themselves through informal mechanisms, savings or credit. Microinsurance providers are concerned that coverage of risks can be provided on a sustainable basis. Therefore, microinsurance is appropriate when there is an overlap of perspectives of both the household and the provider. Rural households have different needs and priorities. Designing insurance products on a one-size-fits-all platform run the risk of neglecting these differences and affecting any insurance programme adversely.

To unleash this potential, insurance companies will need to display long-term obligation to the sector, design products that are appropriate for the rural households and employ appropriate distribution mechanisms. Insurers will have to pay special attention to the characteristics of the rural labour force, like the prevalence of irregular income streams and liking for simple products, before they can successfully penetrate this sector.

5.3 Suggestions

On the basis of findings of the study, the following suggestions have been made:

- Microinsurance initiatives launched by Governments, insurers and other organisations to protect the lives, health and assets of the rural households have made a tremendous impact, but their reach has been very limited compared to the size of the unreserved population. So far,

the delivery of insurance to the rural households has not been an integral part of many financial service providers' market strategies. Hence it is suggested to adopt proper marketing strategies to reach the major population.

- Microinsurance in General and Life Insurance in particular is truly an industry for social well-being. But still the full prospective of the tough rural base has perhaps not been fully realized or exploited. Keeping in sight the well established role played by the individual agency force for selling insurance products in the rural areas, it is necessary to strengthen this channel with a set of new and up-to-date inputs in fitting the requirements.
- The technology platforms being envisioned to facilitate financial inclusion should enable microinsurance transactions also. Towards this end, there is a need to integrate the various modules - savings, credit, insurance, etc. - into the technology framework so that holistic inclusive efforts are possible in the rural areas.
- Furthermore, rural households have limited understanding about insurance and there is a misconception about insurers. Microfinance providers are also challenged by their need to achieve scale, the need for data and skills for actuarial analysis, reinsurance, and investment. The insurance product design and packaging for poor people are very critical tasks. Moreover, the product is designed and packaged in such a way that in most of the cases the actual need and demand of the poor people is ignored. So the Microinsurance providers should consider the need and demand of the target clients and the product is designed and packaged by considering demand side.
- IRDA should look into the matter that all the insurers develop their own microinsurance products and fulfil the rural obligations. This will encourage all the existing and upcoming insurers to develop and design more customized microinsurance products for the market which will eventually improve rural poor's conditions and increases the overall insurance penetration in India.