

RENAISSANCERE HOLDINGS LTD

Form ARS

April 11, 2014















































UNITED STATES  
 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549  
 FORM 10-K

Q ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF  
 THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934  
 For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013

OR  
 o TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF  
 THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the transition period from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_  
 Commission File No. 001-14428

RENAISSANCERE HOLDINGS LTD.  
 (Exact Name Of Registrant As Specified In Its Charter)

Bermuda 98-014-1974  
 (State or Other Jurisdiction of (I.R.S. Employer  
 Incorporation or Organization) Identification Number)

Renaissance House, 12 Crow Lane, Pembroke HM 19 Bermuda  
 (Address of Principal Executive Offices)  
 (441) 295-4513

(Registrant's telephone number)

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Title of each class	Name of each exchange on which registered
Common Shares, Par Value \$1.00 per share	New York Stock Exchange, Inc.
Series C 6.08% Preference Shares, Par Value \$1.00 per share	New York Stock Exchange, Inc.
Series E 5.375% Preference Shares, Par Value \$1.00 per share	New York Stock Exchange, Inc.

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act: None

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Act. Yes Q No o

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Act. Yes o No Q

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes Q No o

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes Q No o

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K (§229.405 of this chapter) is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K. o

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company, as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Act. Large accelerated filer Q, Accelerated filer o, Non-accelerated filer o, Smaller reporting company o

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Act). Yes o No Q

## Edgar Filing: RENAISSANCERE HOLDINGS LTD - Form ARS

The aggregate market value of Common Shares held by nonaffiliates of the registrant at June 30, 2013 was \$3,716.7 million based on the closing sale price of the Common Shares on the New York Stock Exchange on that date. The number of Common Shares, par value US \$1.00 per share, outstanding at February 19, 2014 was 41,665,815. The information required by Part III of this report, to the extent not set forth herein, is incorporated by reference to the registrant's Definitive Proxy Statement to be filed in respect of our 2014 Annual General Meeting of Shareholders.

### RENAISSANCERE HOLDINGS LTD. TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<u>NOTE ON FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS</u>	1
<u>PART I</u>	4
ITEM 1. <u>BUSINESS</u>	4
ITEM 1A. <u>RISK FACTORS</u>	41
ITEM 1B. <u>UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS</u>	57
ITEM 2. <u>PROPERTIES</u>	58
ITEM 3. <u>LEGAL PROCEEDINGS</u>	58
ITEM 4. <u>MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURES</u>	58
<u>PART II</u>	59
ITEM 5. <u>MARKET FOR REGISTRANT'S COMMON EQUITY, RELATED SHAREHOLDER MATTERS AND ISSUER REPURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES</u>	59
ITEM 6. <u>SELECTED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	62
ITEM 7. <u>MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS</u>	63
ITEM 7A. <u>QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK</u>	141
ITEM 8. <u>FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTARY DATA</u>	146
ITEM 9. <u>CHANGES IN AND DISAGREEMENTS WITH ACCOUNTANTS ON ACCOUNTING AND FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE</u>	146
ITEM 9A. <u>CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES</u>	147
ITEM 9B. <u>OTHER INFORMATION</u>	147
<u>PART III</u>	148
ITEM 10. <u>DIRECTORS, EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE</u>	148
ITEM 11. <u>EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION</u>	148
ITEM 12. <u>SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT AND RELATED SHAREHOLDER MATTERS</u>	148
ITEM 13. <u>CERTAIN RELATIONSHIPS AND RELATED TRANSACTIONS, AND DIRECTOR INDEPENDENCE</u>	148
ITEM 14. <u>PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTANT FEES AND SERVICES</u>	148
<u>PART IV</u>	148
ITEM 15. <u>EXHIBITS AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT SCHEDULES</u>	148
<u>SIGNATURES</u>	154
<u>INDEX TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</u>	F-1
<u>INDEX TO SCHEDULES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</u>	S-1
<u>EXHIBITS</u>	i





#### NOTE ON FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

This Form 10-K contains forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the “Securities Act”), and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “Exchange Act”). Forward-looking statements are necessarily based on estimates and assumptions that are inherently subject to significant business, economic and competitive uncertainties and contingencies, many of which, with respect to future business decisions, are subject to change. These uncertainties and contingencies can affect actual results and could cause actual results to differ materially from those expressed in any forward-looking statements made by, or on behalf of, us.

In particular, statements using words such as “may”, “should”, “estimate”, “expect”, “anticipate”, “intends”, “believe”, “predict”, “potential”, or words of similar import generally involve forward-looking statements. For example, we may include certain forward-looking statements in “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” with regard to trends in results, prices, volumes, operations, investment results, margins, combined ratios, fees, reserves, market conditions, risk management and exchange rates. This Form 10-K also contains forward-looking statements with respect to our business and industry, such as those relating to our strategy and management objectives, market standing and product volumes, competition and new entrants in our industry, industry capital, insured losses from loss events, government initiatives and regulatory matters affecting the reinsurance and insurance industries.

In light of the risks and uncertainties inherent in all future projections, the inclusion of forward-looking statements in this report should not be considered as a representation by us or any other person that our objectives or plans will be achieved. Numerous factors could cause our actual results to differ materially from those addressed by the forward-looking statements, including the following:

- we are exposed to significant losses from catastrophic events and other exposures that we cover, which we expect to cause significant volatility in our financial results from time to time;
- the inherent uncertainties in our reserving process, particularly as regards to large catastrophic events and longer tail casualty lines, the uncertainties of which we expect to increase as our product and geographical diversity increases over time;
- the frequency and severity of catastrophic and other events which we cover could exceed our estimates and cause losses greater than we expect;
- the risk of the lowering or loss of any of the financial strength, claims paying or enterprise wide risk management ratings of RenaissanceRe Holdings Ltd. (“RenaissanceRe”) or of one or more of our subsidiaries or changes in the policies or practices of the rating agencies;
  - risks associated with appropriately modeling, pricing for, and contractually addressing new or potential factors in loss emergence, such as the trend toward potentially significant global warming and other aspects of climate change which have the potential to adversely affect our business, any of which could cause us to underestimate our exposures and potentially adversely impact our financial results;
- the risk we might be bound to policyholder obligations beyond our underwriting intent, or unable to enforce our own intent in respect of retrocessional arrangements, including in each case due to emerging claims and coverage issues;
- risks due to our increasing reliance on a small and decreasing number of reinsurance brokers and other distribution services for the preponderance of our revenue;
- the risk that our customers may fail to make premium payments due to us, as well as the risk of failures of our reinsurers, brokers or other counterparties to honor their obligations to us, including as regards to large catastrophic events, and also including their obligations to make third party payments for which we might be liable;
- a contention by the Internal Revenue Service that Renaissance Reinsurance Ltd. (“Renaissance Reinsurance”), or any of our other Bermuda subsidiaries, is subject to U.S. taxation;
- other risks relating to potential adverse tax developments, including potential changes to the taxation of inter-company or related party transactions, or potential changes to the tax treatment of investors in RenaissanceRe or our joint ventures or other entities we manage;





risks relating to adverse legislative developments that could reduce the size of the private markets we serve, or impede their future growth, including proposals to shift United States (“U.S.”) catastrophe risks to federal mechanisms; similar proposals at the state level in the U.S., including the risk of legislation in Florida to expand the reinsurance coverage offered by the Florida Hurricane Catastrophe Fund (“FHCF”) and the insurance policies written by Citizens Property Insurance Corporation (“Citizens”), or failing to implement reforms to reduce such coverage; risks of adverse legislation in relation to U.S. flood insurance or the failure to implement such legislation; and the risk that new legislation will be enacted in the international markets we serve which might reduce market opportunities in the private sector, weaken our customers or otherwise adversely impact us;

risks relating to the inability, or delay, in the claims paying ability of Citizens, FHCF or of private market participants in Florida, particularly following a large windstorm or of multiple smaller storms, which we believe would weaken or destabilize the Florida market and give rise to an unpredictable range of impacts which might be adverse to us, perhaps materially so;

risks associated with our investment portfolio, including the risk that our investment assets may fail to yield attractive or even positive results; and the risk that investment managers may breach our investment guidelines, or the inability of such guidelines to mitigate investment risks;

risks associated with implementing our business strategies and initiatives, including risks related to developing or enhancing the operations, controls and other infrastructure necessary in respect of our more recent, new or proposed initiatives, and the risk that we may fail to succeed in our business or financing plans for these initiatives;

risks that certain of our new or potentially expanding business lines could have a significant negative impact on our financial results or cause significant volatility in our results for any particular period;

risks associated with potential for loss of services of any one of our key senior officers, the risk that we fail to attract or retain the executives and employees necessary to manage our business, and difficulties associated with the transition of members of our senior management team for new or expanded roles necessary to execute our strategic and tactical plans, including in connection with the senior management transition we announced during the second quarter of 2013;

risks associated with the management of our operations as our product and geographical diversity increases over time, including the potential inability to allocate sufficient resources to our strategic and tactical plans or to address additional industry or regulatory developments and requirements;

changes in economic conditions, including interest rate, currency, equity and credit conditions which could affect our investment portfolio or declines in our investment returns for other reasons which could reduce our profitability and hinder our ability to pay claims promptly in accordance with our strategy, which risks we believe are currently enhanced in light of the current uncertainty regarding U.S. fiscal policy and the recent period of relative economic weakness, both globally, particularly in respect of Eurozone countries and companies, and in the U.S.;

risks associated with highly subjective judgments, such as valuing our more illiquid assets, and determining the impairments taken on our investments, all of which impact our reported financial position and operating results;

risks associated with our retrocessional reinsurance protection, including the risks that the coverages and protections we seek may become unavailable or only available on unfavorable terms, that the forms of retrocessional protection available in the market on acceptable terms may give rise to more risk in our net portfolio than we find desirable or that we correctly identify, or that we are otherwise unable to cede our own assumed risk to third parties; and the risk that providers of protection do not meet their obligations to us or do not do so on a timely basis;

risks associated with inflation, which could cause loss costs to increase, and impact the performance of our investment portfolio, thereby adversely impacting our financial position or operating results;

operational risks, including system or human failures, which risks could result in our incurring material losses;



risks in connection with our management of capital on behalf of investors in joint ventures or other entities we manage, such as failing to comply with complex laws and regulations relating to the management of such capital or the potential rights of third party investors, which failure could result in our incurring significant liabilities, penalties or other losses;

risks that we may require additional capital in the future, particularly after a catastrophic event or to support potential growth opportunities in our business, which may not be available or may be available only on unfavorable terms;

risks relating to our potential failure to comply with covenants in our debt agreements, which failure could provide our lenders the right to accelerate our debt which would adversely impact us;

the risk of potential challenges to the claim of exemption from insurance regulation of RenaissanceRe and certain of our subsidiaries in certain jurisdictions under certain current laws and the risk of increased global regulation of the insurance and reinsurance industry;

risks relating to the inability of our operating subsidiaries to declare and pay dividends, which could cause us to be unable to pay dividends to our shareholders or to repay our indebtedness;

the risk that there could be regulatory or legislative changes adversely impacting us, as a Bermuda-based company, relative to our competitors, or actions taken by multinational organizations having such an impact;

risks relating to operating in a highly competitive environment, which we expect to continue to increase over time from new competition from traditional and non-traditional participants, particularly as capital markets products provide alternatives and replacements for more traditional reinsurance and insurance products, as new entrants or existing competitors attempt to replicate our business model, and as a result of consolidation in the (re)insurance industry;

risks arising out of possible changes in the distribution or placement of risks due to increased consolidation of customers or insurance and reinsurance brokers; and

risks relating to changes in regulatory regimes and/or accounting rules, which could result in significant changes to our financial results, including but not limited to, the European Union (“EU”) directive concerning capital adequacy, risk management and regulatory reporting for insurers.

The factors listed above should not be construed as exhaustive. Certain of these risk factors and others are described in more detail from time to time in our filings with the SEC. We undertake no obligation to release publicly the results of any future revisions we may make to forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date hereof or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events.





## PART I

### ITEM 1. BUSINESS

Unless the context otherwise requires, references in this Form 10-K to “RenaissanceRe” refers to RenaissanceRe Holdings Ltd. (the parent company) and the “Company” refers to RenaissanceRe Holdings Ltd. and its subsidiaries, which principally include, but are not limited to, Renaissance Reinsurance Ltd. (“Renaissance Reinsurance”), RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks Ltd. (“RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks”), RenaissanceRe Specialty U.S. Ltd. (“RenaissanceRe Specialty U.S.”), Renaissance Reinsurance of Europe (“ROE”) and the Company’s Lloyd’s syndicate, RenaissanceRe Syndicate 1458 (“Syndicate 1458”).

We also underwrite reinsurance on behalf of joint ventures, principally including Top Layer Reinsurance Ltd. (“Top Layer Re”), recorded under the equity method of accounting, Upsilon Reinsurance Fund Opportunities Ltd. (“Upsilon RFO”), a consolidated variable interest entity, RenaissanceRe Medici Fund Ltd. (“Medici”) and DaVinci Reinsurance Ltd. (“DaVinci”). The financial results of Medici, Medici’s parent company RenaissanceRe Fund Management Ltd., and DaVinci and DaVinci’s parent company, DaVinciRe Holdings Ltd. (“DaVinciRe”), are consolidated in our financial statements. For your convenience, we have included a “Glossary of Selected Insurance and Reinsurance Terms”. All dollar amounts referred to in this Form 10-K are in U.S. dollars unless otherwise indicated. Any discrepancies in the tables included herein between the amounts listed and the totals thereof are due to rounding.

#### OVERVIEW

RenaissanceRe was established in Bermuda in 1993 to write principally property catastrophe reinsurance and today is a leading global provider of reinsurance and insurance coverages and related services. Our aspiration is to be the world’s best underwriter by matching well-structured risks with efficient sources of capital. Through our operating subsidiaries, we seek to produce superior returns for our shareholders by being a trusted, long-term partner to our customers for assessing and managing risk, and by delivering responsive solutions. We accomplish this by leveraging our core capabilities of risk assessment and information management, by investing in our capabilities to serve our customers across the cycles that have historically characterized our markets and by keeping our promises. Overall, our strategy focuses on superior risk selection, superior customer relationships and superior capital management. We provide value to our customers and joint venture partners in the form of financial security, innovative products, and responsive service. We are known as a leader in paying valid reinsurance claims promptly. We principally measure our financial success through long-term growth in tangible book value per common share plus the change in accumulated dividends, which we believe is the most appropriate measure of our Company’s financial performance, and believe we have delivered superior performance in respect of this measure over time.

Our core products include property catastrophe reinsurance, which we primarily write through our principal operating subsidiary Renaissance Reinsurance, Syndicate 1458, and joint ventures, principally DaVinci, Top Layer Re and Upsilon RFO; specialty reinsurance written through Renaissance Reinsurance, RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks, RenaissanceRe Specialty U.S., Syndicate 1458 and DaVinci; and certain insurance products primarily written through Syndicate 1458 or on an excess and surplus lines basis. We believe that we are one of the world’s leading providers of property catastrophe reinsurance. We also believe we have a strong position in certain specialty reinsurance lines of business and a growing presence in the Lloyd’s marketplace. Our reinsurance and insurance products are principally distributed through intermediaries, with whom we seek to cultivate strong long-term relationships. We continually explore appropriate and efficient ways to address the risk needs of our clients. We have created, managed, and continue to manage multiple capital vehicles and may create additional risk bearing vehicles in the future. As our product and geographical diversity increases, we may be exposed to new risks, uncertainties or sources of volatility. Since a substantial portion of the reinsurance and insurance we write provides protection from damages relating to natural and man-made catastrophes, our results depend to a large extent on the frequency and severity of such catastrophic events, and the coverages we offer to customers affected by these events. We are exposed to significant losses from these catastrophic events and other exposures that we cover. Accordingly, we expect a significant degree of volatility in our financial results and our financial results may



vary significantly from quarter-to-quarter or from year-to-year, based on the level of insured catastrophic losses occurring around the world.

Our revenues are principally derived from three sources: (1) net premiums earned from the reinsurance and insurance policies we sell; (2) net investment income and realized and unrealized gains from the investment of our capital funds and the investment of the cash we receive on the policies which we sell; and (3) other income received from our joint ventures, advisory services and various other items.

Our expenses primarily consist of: (1) net claims and claim expenses incurred on the policies of reinsurance and insurance we sell; (2) acquisition costs which typically represent a percentage of the premiums we write; (3) operating expenses which primarily consist of personnel expenses, rent and other operating expenses; (4) corporate expenses which include certain executive, legal and consulting expenses, costs for research and development, and other miscellaneous costs, including those associated with operating as a publicly traded company; (5) redeemable noncontrolling interest, which represents the interest of third parties with respect to the net income (loss) of DaVinciRe and Medici; and (6) interest and dividend costs related to our debt and preference shares. We are also subject to taxes in certain jurisdictions in which we operate. Since the majority of our income is currently earned in Bermuda, which does not have a corporate income tax, the tax impact to our operations has historically been minimal, however, in the future, our net tax exposure may increase as our operations expand geographically.

The underwriting results of an insurance or reinsurance company are discussed frequently by reference to its net claims and claim expense ratio, underwriting expense ratio, and combined ratio. The net claims and claim expense ratio is calculated by dividing net claims and claim expenses incurred by net premiums earned. The underwriting expense ratio is calculated by dividing underwriting expenses (acquisition expenses and operational expenses) by net premiums earned. The combined ratio is the sum of the net claims and claim expense ratio and the underwriting expense ratio. A combined ratio below 100% generally indicates profitable underwriting prior to the consideration of investment income. A combined ratio over 100% generally indicates unprofitable underwriting prior to the consideration of investment income. We also discuss our net claims and claim expense ratio on an accident year basis. This ratio is calculated by taking net claims and claim expenses, excluding development on net claims and claim expenses from events that took place in prior fiscal years, divided by net premiums earned.

On August 30, 2013, we entered into a purchase agreement with a subsidiary of Munich-American Holding Corporation (together with applicable affiliates, "Munich") to sell our U.S.-based weather and weather-related energy risk management unit, which included RenRe Commodity Advisors LLC ("RRCA"), Renaissance Trading Ltd. ("Renaissance Trading") and RenRe Energy Advisors Ltd. (collectively referred to as "REAL"). REAL offered certain derivative-based risk management products primarily to address weather and energy risk and engaged in hedging and trading activities related to those transactions. On October 1, 2013, we closed the sale of REAL to Munich. We have classified the assets and liabilities associated with this transaction as held for sale and, at December 31, 2013, there were no remaining assets or liabilities related to REAL included on our consolidated balance sheet, although we have certain ongoing commitments and obligations pursuant to the sale agreement. The financial results for these operations have been presented in our consolidated financial statements as "discontinued operations" for all periods presented. Consideration for the transaction was \$60.0 million, paid in cash at closing, subject to post-closing adjustments for certain tax and other items. We recorded a loss on sale of \$8.8 million in conjunction with the sale, including related direct expenses to date. Refer to "Note 3. Discontinued Operations in our Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements", for additional information.

Our business consists of three reportable segments: (1) Catastrophe Reinsurance, which includes catastrophe reinsurance and certain property catastrophe joint ventures managed by our ventures unit; (2) Specialty Reinsurance, which includes specialty reinsurance and certain specialty joint ventures managed by our ventures unit; and (3) Lloyd's, which includes reinsurance and insurance business written through Syndicate 1458. Previously, we disclosed Reinsurance and Lloyd's as our reportable segments. In addition, our Other category primarily reflects our strategic investments; investments unit; corporate expenses; capital servicing costs; noncontrolling interests; results of our discontinued operations; and the remnants of our Bermuda-based insurance operations not sold pursuant to our stock purchase agreement with QBE Holdings, Inc. ("QBE").





## CORPORATE STRATEGY

We seek to produce superior returns for our shareholders over the long-term. We believe that market leadership is required to produce the best expected returns. We pursue markets where leadership comes from seeking to be the best underwriter. We define our pursuit of superior underwriting as the process of matching well-structured risk with capital whose owners would find the risk-return trade-off attractive.

To support our mission to seek to be the best underwriter, our strategy is to operate an integrated system to match well structured risk and efficient capital. Operating our business as an integrated system enables us to pursue three competitive advantages: superior customer relationships, superior risk selection and superior capital management. We believe that all three competitive advantages are necessary simultaneously and that activity must be coordinated to deliver them seamlessly for the benefit of our ceding insurers, brokers, investors in our sidecars and joint ventures, and shareholders. The strategy is supported by our core values, our principles and our culture.

We believe our competitive advantages include:

**Superior Customer Relationships.** We seek to be a trusted long-term partner to our customers for assessing and managing risk and delivering responsive solutions. We believe our modeling and technical expertise, the risk management products that we provide our customers and keeping our promises, has enabled us to become a provider of first choice in many lines of business to our customers worldwide. We seek to offer stable, predictable, and consistent risk-based pricing and a prompt turnaround on our claims.

**Superior Risk Selection.** We seek to build a portfolio of risks that produces an attractive risk-adjusted return on utilized capital. We develop a perspective of the risk in each business using both our underwriters' expertise and sophisticated risk selection techniques including computer models and databases, such as Renaissance Exposure Management System ("REMS®"). We pursue a disciplined approach to underwriting and seek to select only those risks that we believe will produce a portfolio with an attractive return, subject to prudent risk constraints. We manage our portfolio of risks dynamically, both within sub-portfolios and across the Company.

**Superior Capital Management.** We seek to write as much attractively priced business as is available to us and then manage our capital accordingly. We generally seek to raise capital when we forecast an increased demand in the market, at times by accessing capital through joint ventures or other structures, and seek to return capital to our shareholders or joint venture investors when the demand for our coverages appears to decline and when we believe a return of capital would be beneficial to our shareholders or joint venture investors. In using joint ventures, we intend to leverage our access to business and our underwriting capabilities on an efficient capital base, develop fee income, generate profit commissions, diversify our portfolio and provide attractive risk-adjusted returns to our capital providers. We routinely evaluate and review potential joint venture opportunities and strategic investments.

We believe we are well positioned to fulfill our objectives by virtue of the experience and skill of our management team, our integrated underwriting and operating platform, our significant financial strength, and our strong relationships with brokers and customers. In addition, we believe our superior service, our proprietary modeling technology, and our extensive business relationships, which have enabled us to become a leader in the property catastrophe reinsurance market, will be instrumental in allowing us to achieve our strategic objectives. In particular, we believe our strategy, high performance culture, and commitment to our customers and joint venture partners help us to differentiate ourselves by offering specialized services and products at times and in markets where capacity and alternatives may be limited.

## SEGMENTS

In conjunction with changes in our management structure during 2013, including the appointment of a new Chief Executive Officer, and changes in the mix of our reinsurance business, we revised our reportable segments to: (1) Catastrophe Reinsurance, which includes catastrophe reinsurance and certain property catastrophe joint ventures managed by our ventures unit; (2) Specialty Reinsurance, which includes specialty reinsurance and certain specialty joint ventures managed by our ventures unit; and (3) Lloyd's, which includes reinsurance and insurance business written through Syndicate 1458. Previously, our Catastrophe Reinsurance and Specialty Reinsurance segments were aggregated and were reported as the Reinsurance segment. All prior periods presented have been reclassified to conform to this presentation.







In addition, our Other category primarily reflects our: strategic investments; investments unit; corporate expenses; capital servicing costs; noncontrolling interests; results of our discontinued operations; and the remnants of our Bermuda-based insurance operations not sold pursuant to our stock purchase agreement with QBE.

For the year ended December 31, 2013, our Catastrophe Reinsurance, Specialty Reinsurance and Lloyd's segments accounted for 69.7%, 16.2% and 14.1%, respectively, of our total consolidated gross premiums written. We currently expect contributions from our Specialty and Lloyd's segments to increase over time, on both an absolute and relative basis, although we cannot assure you we will succeed in meeting this objective. Operating results relating to our segments is included in "Part II, Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations."

Our portfolio of business continues to be characterized by relatively large transactions with ceding companies with whom we do business, although no current relationship exceeds 10% of our gross premiums written. Accordingly, our gross premiums written are subject to significant fluctuations depending on our success in maintaining or expanding our relationships with these customers. We market our reinsurance products worldwide exclusively through brokers, whose market has become extremely consolidated in recent years. In 2013, three brokerage firms accounted for 88.2% of our Catastrophe Reinsurance and Specialty Reinsurance segments' gross premiums written. We believe that recent market dynamics, and trends in our industry in respect of potential future consolidation, have increased our exposure to the risks of broker, client and counterparty concentration.

The following table shows our gross premiums written split between our Catastrophe Reinsurance, Specialty Reinsurance and Lloyd's segment, respectively:

Year ended December 31, (in thousands)	2013	2012	2011
Catastrophe Reinsurance	\$1,120,379	\$1,182,207	\$1,177,296
Specialty Reinsurance	259,489	209,887	145,891
Lloyd's	226,532	159,987	111,584
Other category (1)	(988	) (490	) 205
Total gross premiums written	\$1,605,412	\$1,551,591	\$1,434,976

(1) Included in gross premiums written in the Other category is inter-segment gross premiums written of \$1.0 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 (2012 - \$0.5 million, 2011 - \$0.1 million).

#### Catastrophe Reinsurance Segment

Property catastrophe reinsurance is our traditional core business, and is principally written for our own account, for DaVinci and for other joint ventures such as Upsilon RFO. We believe we are one of the world's leading providers of this coverage, based on total catastrophe gross premiums written. This coverage protects against large natural catastrophes, such as earthquakes, hurricanes and tsunamis, as well as claims arising from other natural and man-made catastrophes such as winter storms, freezes, floods, fires, wind storms, tornadoes, explosions and acts of terrorism. We offer this coverage to insurance companies and other reinsurers primarily on an excess of loss basis. This means that we begin paying when our customers' claims from a catastrophe exceed a certain retained amount. We also offer proportional coverages and other structures on a catastrophe-exposed basis and may increase these offerings on an absolute or relative basis in the future.

Our excess of loss property catastrophe reinsurance contracts generally cover all natural perils. Our most significant exposure is to losses from earthquakes and hurricanes and other windstorms, although we are also exposed to claims arising from other catastrophes, such as tsunamis, freezes, floods, fires, tornadoes, explosions and acts of terrorism in connection with the coverages we provide. Our predominant exposure under such coverage is to property damage. However, other risks, including business interruption and other non-property losses, may also be covered under our property reinsurance contracts when arising from a covered peril. We offer our coverages on a worldwide basis. Because of the wide range of possible catastrophic events to which we are exposed, including the size of such events and because of the potential for multiple events to occur in the same time period, our catastrophe reinsurance business

is volatile and our results of operations reflect this volatility. Further, our financial condition may be impacted by this

7



volatility over time or at any point in time. The effects of claims from one or a number of severe catastrophic events could have a material adverse effect on us. We expect that increases in the values and concentrations of insured property and the effects of inflation will increase the severity of such occurrences in the future.

We seek to moderate the volatility of our risk portfolio through superior risk selection, diversification and the purchase of retrocessional coverages and other protections. In furtherance of our strategy, we may increase or decrease our presence in the catastrophe reinsurance business based on market conditions and our assessment of risk-adjusted pricing adequacy. We frequently seek to purchase reinsurance or other protection for our own account to further reduce the financial impact that a large catastrophe or a series of catastrophes could have on our results.

As a result of our position in the market and reputation for superior customer relationships, we believe we have superior access to catastrophe-exposed reinsurance business we view as desirable compared to the market as a whole.

As described above, we use our proprietary underwriting tools and guidelines to attempt to construct an attractive portfolio from these opportunities. We dynamically model policy submissions against our current in-force underwriting portfolio, comparing our estimate of the modeled expected returns of the contract against the amount of capital that we allocate to the contract, based on our estimate of its marginal impact on our overall risk portfolio. At times, our approach to portfolio management has resulted and may result in the future in our having a relatively large market share of catastrophe reinsurance exposure in a particular geographic region, such as Florida where we historically have had a relatively large percentage of coverage exposures, or to a particular peril, such as U.S. hurricane risk, where we believe our analytical skills, claims paying history, large capacity, strong ratings and other attributes offer a competitive advantage, or where the risks or class of risks otherwise adds efficiency to our portfolio. Conversely, from time to time we may have a disproportionately low market share in certain regions or perils where we believe our capital would be less effectively deployed.

Our principal property catastrophe reinsurance products include catastrophe excess of loss reinsurance and excess of loss retrocessional reinsurance as described below.

#### Catastrophe Excess of Loss Reinsurance

We principally write catastrophe reinsurance on an excess of loss basis, which means we provide coverage to our insureds when aggregate claims and claim expenses from a single occurrence of a covered peril exceed the attachment point specified in a particular contract. Under these contracts, we indemnify an insurer for all or a specified portion of the losses on underlying insurance policies in excess of a specified amount, and up to an amount per loss specified in the contract. The coverage provided under excess of loss reinsurance contracts may be on a worldwide basis or limited in scope to selected geographic areas. Coverage can also vary from “all property” perils to limited coverage on selected perils, such as “earthquake only” coverage.

#### Excess of Loss Retrocessional Reinsurance

We also write retrocessional reinsurance contracts that provide property catastrophe coverage to other reinsurers or retrocedants. In providing retrocessional reinsurance, we focus on property catastrophe retrocessional reinsurance, which covers the retrocedant on an excess of loss basis when aggregate claims and claim expenses from a single occurrence of a covered peril and from a multiple number of reinsureds exceed a specified attachment point. The coverage provided under excess of loss retrocessional contracts may be on a worldwide basis or limited in scope to selected geographic areas. Coverage can also vary from “all property” perils to limited coverage on selected perils, such as “earthquake only” coverage. The information available to retrocessional underwriters concerning the original primary risk can be less precise than the information received from primary companies directly. Moreover, exposures from retrocessional business can change within a contract term as the underwriters of a retrocedant alter their book of business after retrocessional coverage has been bound.

#### Insurance-Linked Securities

We also invest in insurance-linked securities. Insurance-linked securities are generally privately placed fixed income securities as to which all or a portion of the repayment of the principal is linked to catastrophic events; for example, the occurrence of one or more hurricanes or earthquakes producing industry losses exceeding certain specified thresholds. We seek to underwrite, model, evaluate and monitor these





securities using similar tools and techniques used to evaluate our more traditional property catastrophe reinsurance business assumed. In addition, we may enter into derivative transactions, such as total return swaps, that are based on or referenced to underlying insurance-linked securities. Based on an evaluation of the specific features of each insurance-linked security, we account for these securities as reinsurance or at fair value, as applicable, in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (“GAAP”). In addition, in future periods we may utilize the growing market for insurance-linked securities to expand our ceded reinsurance buying if we find the pricing and terms of such coverage attractive.

Mona Lisa Re Ltd. (“Mona Lisa Re”)

On March 14, 2013, Mona Lisa Re was licensed as a Bermuda domiciled special purpose insurer (“SPI”) to provide reinsurance capacity to subsidiaries of RenaissanceRe, namely Renaissance Reinsurance and DaVinci, through reinsurance agreements which will be collateralized and funded by Mona Lisa Re through the issuance of one or more series of principal-at-risk variable rate notes (“Notes”) to third-party investors.

Upon issuance of a series of Notes by Mona Lisa Re, all of the proceeds from the issuance are expected to be deposited into collateral accounts, separated by series, to fund any potential obligation under the reinsurance agreements entered into with Renaissance Reinsurance and/or DaVinci underlying such series of Notes. The outstanding principal amount of each series of Notes generally will be returned to holders of such Notes upon the expiration of the risk period underlying such Notes, unless an event occurs which causes a loss under the applicable series of Notes, in which case the amount returned will be reduced by such noteholder’s pro rata share of such loss, as specified in the applicable governing documents of such Notes. In addition, holders of the Notes are generally entitled to interest payments, payable quarterly as determined by the applicable governing documents of each series of Notes. Mona Lisa Re meets the definition of a VIE as it does not have sufficient equity capital to finance its activities. We do not have a variable interest in Mona Lisa Re and as a result, the financial position and results of operations of Mona Lisa Re are not consolidated by the Company. The only transactions related to Mona Lisa Re that are recorded in the Company’s consolidated financial statements are the ceded reinsurance agreements entered into by Renaissance Reinsurance and DaVinci. During 2013, Renaissance Reinsurance and DaVinci have together entered into ceded reinsurance contracts with Mona Lisa Re with gross premiums ceded of \$9.2 million and \$6.5 million, respectively. We have not provided any financial or other support to Mona Lisa Re that was not contractually required to be provided.

Specialty Reinsurance Segment

We write specialty reinsurance for our own account and for DaVinci, covering principally certain targeted classes of business where we believe we have a sound basis for underwriting and pricing the risk that we assume. Our portfolio includes various classes of business, such as aviation, casualty clash, catastrophe exposed personal lines property, catastrophe exposed workers’ compensation, crop, energy, financial, mortgage guaranty, political risk, surety, terrorism, trade credit, certain other casualty lines including directors and officers liability, general liability, medical malpractice and professional indemnity, and other specialty lines of reinsurance that we collectively refer to as specialty reinsurance. We believe that we are seen as a market leader in certain of these classes of business. We are seeking to expand our specialty reinsurance operations over time. In 2013, we organized RenaissanceRe Underwriting Managers U.S. LLC (“RenaissanceRe Underwriting Managers U.S.”), a specialty reinsurance agency domiciled in Connecticut, to provide specialty treaty reinsurance solutions on both a quota share and excess of loss basis, as well as to write business on behalf of RenaissanceRe Specialty U.S., a Bermuda-domiciled reinsurer launched in June 2013 which operates subject to U.S. federal income tax, and Syndicate 1458. However, we cannot assure you that we will succeed in growing these operations or that any growth we do attain will be profitable and contribute meaningfully to our results or financial condition, particularly in light of current and forecasted market conditions. Our specialty reinsurance business is significantly impacted by a comparably small number of relatively large transactions. As with our catastrophe business, our team of experienced professionals seeks to underwrite these lines using a disciplined underwriting approach and sophisticated analytical tools.

We generally target lines of business where we believe we can adequately quantify the risks assumed and where potential losses could be characterized as low frequency and high severity, similar to our catastrophe reinsurance

coverages. However, we also provide other coverage where we believe our underwriting is

9





robust and the market is attractive, and may grow in these lines over time. We also seek to identify market dislocations and write new lines of business whose risk and return characteristics are estimated to exceed our hurdle rates. Furthermore, we also seek to manage the correlations of this business with our overall portfolio, including our aggregate exposure to single and aggregated catastrophe events. We believe that our underwriting and analytical capabilities have positioned us well to manage our specialty reinsurance business.

We offer our specialty reinsurance products principally on an excess of loss basis, as described above with respect to our catastrophe reinsurance products, and also provide proportional coverage. In a proportional reinsurance arrangement (also referred to as quota share reinsurance and pro-rata reinsurance), the reinsurer shares a proportional part of the original premiums and losses of the reinsured. The reinsurer pays the cedant a commission which is generally based on the cedant's cost of acquiring the business being reinsured (including commissions, premium taxes, assessments and miscellaneous administrative expenses) and may also include a profit factor. Our proportional reinsurance product offerings have grown in recent periods and are likely to continue to grow in the future. These products frequently include tailored features such as limits or sub-limits which we believe help us manage our exposures. Any liability exceeding, or otherwise not subject to, such limits reverts to the cedant. As with our catastrophe reinsurance business, our specialty reinsurance frequently provides coverage for relatively large limits or exposures, and thus we are subject to potential significant claims volatility.

We generally seek to write significant lines on our specialty reinsurance treaties. As a result of our financial strength, we have the ability to offer significant capacity and, for select risks, we have made available significant limits. We believe these capabilities, the strength of our specialty reinsurance underwriting team, and our demonstrated ability and willingness to pay valid claims are competitive advantages of our specialty reinsurance business. While we believe that these and other initiatives will support growth in our Specialty Reinsurance segment, we intend to continue to apply our disciplined underwriting approach which, together with currently prevailing market conditions, is likely to temper such growth in current and near-term periods.

#### Lloyd's Segment

Our Lloyd's segment includes insurance and reinsurance business written for our own account through Syndicate 1458. The syndicate enhances our underwriting platform by providing access to Lloyd's extensive distribution network and worldwide licenses. RenaissanceRe Corporate Capital (UK) Limited ("RenaissanceRe CCL"), an indirect wholly owned subsidiary of the Company, is the sole corporate member of Syndicate 1458. RenaissanceRe Syndicate Management Limited ("RSML"), a wholly owned subsidiary of RenaissanceRe, is the managing agent for Syndicate 1458. We anticipate that Syndicate 1458's absolute and relative contributions to our consolidated results of operations will have a meaningful impact over time, although we cannot assure you we will succeed in executing our growth strategy in respect of Syndicate 1458, or that its results will be favorable.

Syndicate 1458 generally targets lines of business where we believe we can adequately quantify the risks assumed. We also seek to identify market dislocations and to write new lines of business whose risk and return characteristics are attractive and add to our portfolio of risks. Furthermore, we seek to manage the correlations of this business with our overall portfolio, including our aggregate exposure to single and aggregated catastrophe events. We believe that our underwriting and analytical capabilities have positioned us well to manage this business.

Syndicate 1458 offers a range of property and casualty insurance and reinsurance products including, but not limited to, direct and facultative property, property catastrophe, agriculture, medical malpractice, general liability and professional indemnity. Syndicate 1458 may seek to expand its coverages and capacity over time. As with our catastrophe and specialty reinsurance business, Syndicate 1458 frequently provides coverage for relatively large limits or exposures, and thus it is subject to potential significant claims volatility.



## Ventures

We pursue a number of other opportunities through our ventures unit, which has responsibility for creating and managing our joint ventures, executing customized reinsurance transactions to assume or cede risk and managing certain investments directed at classes of risk other than catastrophe reinsurance.

### Property Catastrophe Managed Joint Ventures

We actively manage property catastrophe-oriented joint ventures, which provide us with an additional presence in the market, enhance our client relationships and generate fee income and profit commissions. These joint ventures allow us to leverage our access to business and our underwriting capabilities on a larger capital base. Currently, our principal joint ventures include DaVinci, Top Layer Re and Upsilon RFO. Renaissance Underwriting Managers, Ltd. (“RUM”), a wholly owned subsidiary of the Company, acts as the exclusive underwriting manager for each of these joint ventures.

### DaVinci

DaVinci was established in 2001 and principally writes property catastrophe reinsurance and certain low frequency, high severity specialty reinsurance lines of business on a global basis. In general, we seek to construct for DaVinci a property catastrophe reinsurance portfolio with risk characteristics similar to those of Renaissance Reinsurance’s property catastrophe reinsurance portfolio and a portfolio of certain lines of specialty reinsurance such as terrorism and catastrophe exposed workers’ compensation. In accordance with DaVinci’s underwriting guidelines, it can only participate in business that is underwritten by Renaissance Reinsurance. We maintain majority voting control of DaVinciRe and, accordingly, consolidate the results of DaVinciRe into our consolidated results of operations and financial position. We seek to manage DaVinci’s capital efficiently over time in light of the market opportunities and needs we perceive and believe we are able to serve. Our noncontrolling economic ownership in DaVinciRe was 27.3% at December 31, 2013 (2012 - 30.8%). During January 2014, DaVinciRe redeemed a portion of its outstanding shares from all existing DaVinciRe shareholders, including us, while a new DaVinciRe shareholder purchased new shares in DaVinciRe. The Company’s noncontrolling economic ownership in DaVinciRe subsequent to these transactions is 26.5%, effective January 1, 2014.

We expect our noncontrolling economic ownership in DaVinciRe to fluctuate over time. See “Part II, Item 7. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, Capital Resources” for additional information with respect of DaVinci.

### Top Layer Re

Top Layer Re was established in 1999 and writes high excess non-U.S. property catastrophe reinsurance. Top Layer Re is owned 50% by State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company (“State Farm”) and 50% by Renaissance Reinsurance. State Farm provides \$3.9 billion of stop loss reinsurance coverage to Top Layer Re. We account for our equity ownership in Top Layer Re under the equity method of accounting and our proportionate share of its results is reflected in equity in earnings (losses) of other ventures in our consolidated statements of operations.

### Upsilon RFO

Effective January 1, 2013, we formed and launched a managed joint venture, Upsilon RFO, a Bermuda domiciled SPI (formerly known as Upsilon Reinsurance II Ltd.), to provide additional capacity to the worldwide aggregate and per-occurrence primary and retrocessional property catastrophe excess of loss market. Upsilon RFO’s creation further enhances our efforts to match desirable reinsurance risk with efficient capital through a strategic capital structure. Original business was written directly by Upsilon RFO and included \$53.5 million of gross premiums written incepting January 1, 2013 under fully-collateralized reinsurance contracts capitalized through the sale of non-voting shares to investors and an insurance contract issued by a third party investor to the Company related to Upsilon RFO’s reinsurance portfolio. Both Upsilon RFO and the insurance participation are managed by RUM in return for an expense override. Through RUM, we are eligible to receive a potential underwriting profit commission in respect of Upsilon RFO. The Company’s participation in the original risks assumed by Upsilon RFO prior to January 1, 2014 was 25.8%, inclusive of the related insurance contract, effective December 31, 2013.



During December 2013, we raised additional capital in Upsilon RFO to provide collateral for the worldwide aggregate and per-occurrence primary and retrocessional reinsurance contracts it entered into incepting on or after January 1, 2014.

Upsilon RFO is considered a VIE as it has insufficient equity capital to finance its activities without additional financial support. We are the primary beneficiary of Upsilon RFO as we: (i) have the power over the activities that most significantly impact the economic performance of Upsilon RFO and (ii) have the obligation to absorb the losses, and right to receive the benefits, in accordance with the accounting guidance, that could be significant to Upsilon RFO. As a result, we consolidate Upsilon RFO and all significant inter-company transactions have been eliminated. We have not provided any financial or other support to Upsilon RFO that was not contractually required to be provided.

#### Medici

Medici is an exempted fund, incorporated under the laws of Bermuda. Medici's objective is to seek to invest substantially all of its assets in various insurance-based investment instruments that have returns primarily tied to property catastrophe risk. During 2013, third-party investors subscribed for a portion of the participating, non-voting common shares of Medici. We maintain majority voting control of Medici's parent, RenaissanceRe Fund Holdings Ltd. ("Fund Holdings"), as such, the results of Medici and Fund Holdings are consolidated in our financial statements.

#### Strategic Investments

Ventures also pursues strategic investments where, rather than assuming exclusive management responsibilities ourselves, we instead partner with other market participants. These investments are directed at classes of risk other than catastrophe, and at times may also be directed at non-insurance risks. We find these investments attractive both for their expected returns, and also because they provide us diversification benefits and information and exposure to other aspects of the market. Examples of these investments include our investments in Tower Hill Insurance Group, LLC. ("THIG"), Tower Hill Holdings, Inc. ("Tower Hill") and Tower Hill Signature Insurance Holdings, Inc. ("Tower Hill Signature" and, collectively, the "Tower Hill Companies"), Universal Holdings Inc. ("Universal"), Angus Partners, LLC. ("Angus") and Essent Group Ltd. ("Essent"). THIG is a managing general agency specializing in insurance coverage for site built and manufactured homes. Subsidiaries of THIG, namely Tower Hill Claims Services, LLC, and Tower Hill Claims Management, LLC, provide claim adjustment services through exclusive agreements with THIG. Tower Hill is an insurance holding company. The subsidiaries of Tower Hill, along with Tower Hill Signature, write residential property insurance. We invested in the Tower Hill Companies, which operate primarily in the State of Florida, to expand our core platforms by obtaining ownership in an additional distribution channel for the Florida homeowners market and to enhance our relationships with other stakeholders. Universal is an integrated insurance holding company performing all aspects of insurance underwriting, distribution and claims, primarily in the Florida homeowners market. Angus provides commodity related risk management products to third party customers. Essent provides mortgage insurance and reinsurance coverage for mortgages located in the U.S. On October 31, 2013, Essent's common shares began publicly trading on the NYSE. At December 31, 2013, the fair value of our investment in Essent was \$121.1 million and we have agreed, subject to certain exceptions, not to dispose of or hedge any of the common shares of Essent we hold prior to April 28, 2014. See "Part II, Item 7. Managements Discussion and Analysis, Net Investment Income" for additional information with respect to our investment in Essent. The carrying value of these investments on our consolidated balance sheet, individually or in the aggregate, may differ from the realized value we may ultimately attain, perhaps significantly so. Other than Essent and Universal, none of the securities we hold in respect of these investments are publicly traded.

#### Other Transactions

Ventures works on a range of other customized reinsurance and financing transactions. For example, we have participated in and continuously analyze other attractive opportunities in the market for insurance-linked securities and derivatives. We believe our products contain a number of customized features designed to fit the needs of our partners, as well as our risk management objectives.

Business activities that appear in our consolidated underwriting results, such as DaVinci and certain reinsurance transactions, are included in our Catastrophe Reinsurance and Specialty Reinsurance segment results as appropriate;

the results of our investments, such as Top Layer Re, and other ventures are included in the Other category of our segment results.

12





## Other

Our Other category primarily includes the results of: (1) our share of strategic investments in certain markets we believe offer attractive risk-adjusted returns or where we believe our investment adds value, and where, rather than assuming exclusive management responsibilities ourselves, we partner with other market participants; (2) our investment unit which manages and invests the funds generated by our consolidated operations; (3) corporate expenses, capital services costs and noncontrolling interests; (4) the results of our discontinued operations; and (5) the remnants of our Bermuda-based insurance operations.

## GEOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN

Our exposures are generally diversified across geographic zones, but are also a function of market conditions and opportunities. Our largest exposure has historically been to the U.S. and Caribbean market, which represented 59.9% of the Company's gross premiums written for the year ended December 31, 2013. A significant amount of our U.S. and Caribbean premium provides coverage against windstorms, mainly U.S. Atlantic hurricanes, as well as earthquakes and other natural and man-made catastrophes. The following table sets forth the percentage of our gross premiums written allocated to the territory of coverage exposure:

Year ended December 31,	2013	Percentage	2012	Percentage	2011	Percentage		
	Gross	of Gross	Gross	of Gross	Gross	of Gross		
	Premiums	Premiums	Premiums	Premiums	Premiums	Premiums		
	Written	Written	Written	Written	Written	Written		
(in thousands, except percentages)								
Catastrophe Reinsurance								
U.S. and Caribbean	\$782,211	48.7	% \$857,740	55.3	% \$786,721	54.8	%	
Worldwide (excluding U.S.) (1)	146,048	9.1	% 139,265	9.0	% 164,112	11.4	%	
Worldwide	99,179	6.2	% 81,595	5.3	% 124,797	8.7	%	
Japan	39,060	2.4	% 43,238	2.8	% 49,021	3.4	%	
Europe	25,659	1.6	% 37,113	2.4	% 31,888	2.2	%	
Australia and New Zealand	22,460	1.4	% 18,578	1.2	% 16,818	1.2	%	
Other	5,762	0.4	% 4,678	0.3	% 3,939	0.3	%	
Total Catastrophe Reinsurance	1,120,379	69.8	% 1,182,207	76.3	% 1,177,296	82.0	%	
Specialty Reinsurance								
Worldwide	151,879	9.5	% 96,081	6.2	% 91,032	6.3	%	
U.S. and Caribbean	91,203	5.7	% 69,070	4.4	% 49,832	3.5	%	
Australia and New Zealand	12,068	0.7	% 28,307	1.8	% 792	0.1	%	
Europe	2,612	0.2	% 16,429	1.1	% 3,595	0.3	%	
Worldwide (excluding U.S.) (1)	1,661	0.1	% —	—	% —	—	%	
Other	66	—	% —	—	% 640	—	%	
Total Specialty Reinsurance	259,489	16.2	% 209,887	13.5	% 145,891	10.2	%	
Lloyd's								
Worldwide	104,249	6.5	% 75,132	4.8	% 47,605	3.3	%	
U.S. and Caribbean	88,535	5.5	% 57,332	3.7	% 48,435	3.4	%	
Europe	14,763	0.9	% 14,456	0.9	% 8,044	0.6	%	
Worldwide (excluding U.S.) (1)	8,071	0.5	% 6,064	0.4	% 238	—	%	
Australia and New Zealand	2,948	0.2	% 2,152	0.1	% 2,060	0.1	%	
Other	7,966	0.5	% 4,851	0.3	% 5,202	0.4	%	

Edgar Filing: RENAISSANCERE HOLDINGS LTD - Form ARS

Total Lloyd's	226,532	14.1	%	159,987	10.2	%	111,584	7.8	%
Other category (2)	(988	)	(0.1	)	%	(490	)	—	%
Total gross premiums written	\$1,605,412	100.0	%	\$1,551,591	100.0	%	\$1,434,976	100.0	%

The category "Worldwide (excluding U.S.);" consists of contracts that cover more than one geographic region (other than the U.S.). The exposure in this category for gross premiums written to date is predominantly from Europe and Japan.

(2) The Other category consists of contracts that are primarily exposed to U.S. risks and includes inter-segment gross premiums written of \$1.0 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 (2012 - \$0.5 million, 2011 - \$0.1 million).



## NEW BUSINESS

From time to time we consider diversification into new ventures, either through organic growth, the formation of new joint ventures, or the acquisition of or the investment in other companies or books of business of other companies. This potential diversification includes opportunities to write targeted, additional classes of risk-exposed business, both directly for our own account and through possible new joint venture opportunities. We also regularly evaluate potential strategic opportunities that we believe might utilize our skills, capabilities, proprietary technology and relationships to support possible expansion into further risk-related coverages, services and products. Generally, we focus on underwriting or trading risks where reasonably sufficient data may be available, and where our analytical abilities may provide us a competitive advantage, in order for us to seek to model estimated probabilities of losses and returns in accordance with our approach in respect of our then current portfolio of risks.

We regularly review potential strategic transactions that might improve our portfolio of business, enhance or focus our strategies, expand our distribution or capabilities, or provide other benefits. In evaluating potential new ventures or investments, we generally seek an attractive estimated return on equity, the ability to develop or capitalize on a competitive advantage, and opportunities which we believe will not detract from our core operations. While we regularly review potential strategic transactions and periodically engage in discussions regarding possible transactions, there can be no assurance that we will complete any such transactions or that any such transaction would be successful or materially enhance our results of operations or financial condition. We believe that our ability to potentially attract investment and operational opportunities is supported by our strong reputation and financial resources, and by the capabilities and track record of our ventures unit.

## COMPETITION

The markets in which we operate are highly competitive, and we believe that competition is in general increasing and becoming more robust. Our competitors include independent reinsurance and insurance companies, subsidiaries and/or affiliates of globally recognized insurance companies, reinsurance divisions of certain insurance companies, domestic and international underwriting operations, and a range of entities offering forms of risk transfer protection on a collateralized or other non-traditional basis. As our business evolves over time we expect our competitors to change as well.

Hedge funds, pension funds and endowments, investment banks, exchanges and other capital market participants are increasingly active in the reinsurance market and the market for related risk. We expect competition from, or funded by, these sources to continue to increase. In addition, we continue to anticipate further, and perhaps accelerating, growth in financial products offered to the insurance market such as exchange traded catastrophe options, insurance-linked securities, unrated privately held reinsurance companies providing collateralized reinsurance, catastrophe-linked derivative agreements and other financial products, intended to compete with traditional reinsurance. We believe that competition in the markets we serve from products such as these has increased and will increase further in the future. It is possible that these changing dynamics will meaningfully impact the markets in which we participate, possibly adversely. Many of these competitors or their financial backers have greater financial, marketing and management resources than we do. Further, we believe new entrants or existing competitors may attempt to replicate all or part of our business model and provide further competition in the markets in which we participate. In addition, the tax policies of the countries where our customers operate, as well as government sponsored or backed catastrophe funds, affect demand for reinsurance, sometimes significantly. Moreover, explicitly or implicitly government-backed entities increasingly represent competition for the coverages that we provide directly, or for the business of our customers, reducing the potential amount of third party private protection our clients might need or desire. We are unable to predict the extent to which the foregoing or other new, proposed or potential initiatives may affect the demand for our products or the risks for which we seek to provide coverage.



## UNDERWRITING AND ENTERPRISE RISK MANAGEMENT

### Underwriting

Our primary underwriting goal is to construct a portfolio of reinsurance and insurance contracts and other financial risks that maximizes our return on shareholders' equity, subject to prudent risk constraints, and to generate long-term growth in tangible book value per common share plus the change in accumulated dividends. We assess each new (re)insurance contract on the basis of the expected incremental return relative to the incremental contribution to portfolio risk.

We have developed a proprietary, computer-based pricing and exposure management system, REMS<sup>©</sup>. Since inception, we have continued to invest in and improve REMS<sup>©</sup>, incorporating our underwriting and modeling experience, adding proprietary software and a significant amount of new industry data. REMS<sup>©</sup> has analytic and modeling capabilities that help us to assess the risk and return of each incremental (re)insurance contract in relation to our overall portfolio of (re)insurance contracts. We combine the analyses generated by REMS<sup>©</sup> with other information available to us, including our own knowledge of the client submitting the proposed program, to assess the premium offered against the risk of loss and the cost of utilized capital which the program presents. The REMS<sup>©</sup> framework encompasses and facilitates risk capture, analysis, correlation, portfolio aggregation and capital allocation within a single system for all of our natural hazards and non-natural hazards (re)insurance contracts.

We generally utilize a multiple model approach combining both probabilistic and deterministic techniques. The underlying risk models integrated into our underwriting and REMS<sup>©</sup> framework are a combination of internally constructed and commercially available models. We use commercially available natural hazard catastrophe models to assist with validating and stress testing our base model and REMS<sup>©</sup> results. We continually strive to improve our analytical techniques for both natural hazard and non-natural hazard models in REMS<sup>©</sup> and while our experience is most developed for analyzing natural hazard catastrophe risks, we continue to make significant advances in our capabilities for assessing non-natural hazard catastrophe risks. In addition, multiple members of our underwriting and risk management team review the models, and their respective results.

We believe that REMS<sup>©</sup> is a robust underwriting and risk management system that has been successfully integrated into our business processes and culture. Before we bind a (re)insurance risk, exposure data, historical loss information and other risk data is gathered from customers. Using a combination of proprietary software, underwriting experience, actuarial techniques and engineering expertise where we deem appropriate, the exposure data is reviewed and augmented. We use this data as primary inputs into the REMS<sup>©</sup> modeling system as a base to create risk distributions to represent the risk being evaluated. We believe that the REMS<sup>©</sup> modeling system helps us to analyze each policy on a consistent basis, assisting our determination of what we believe to be an appropriate price to charge for each policy based upon the risk to be assumed. REMS<sup>©</sup> combines computer-generated statistical simulations that estimate loss and event probabilities with exposure and coverage information on each client's (re)insurance contract to produce expected claims for (re)insurance programs submitted to us. Operationally, on a deal-by-deal basis, our models employ simulation techniques that have the ability to generate 40,000 years of loss activity. When deemed necessary, we stress test the 40,000 year simulations with simulations of up to 1,000,000 years. At a consolidated level, we frequently utilize simulations of 500,000 years to incorporate reserve risk, investment risk, expenses, and operational and other risks at a portfolio and risk assuming entity level. For natural hazards, we simulate a large range of potential industry losses in respect of events by region and peril. For some regions and perils, the extreme tails of these simulations include industry losses in excess of \$600 billion. From these simulations, we generate a probability distribution of potential outcomes for each policy in our portfolio and for our total portfolio. In part, through the process described above and the utilization of REMS<sup>©</sup>, we seek to compare our estimate of the expected returns in respect of a contract with the amount of capital that we notionally allocate to the contract based on our estimate of its marginal impact on our portfolio of risks. A key advantage of our REMS<sup>©</sup> framework is our ability to include additional perils, risks and geographic areas that may not be captured in commercially available natural hazards risk models.

We periodically review the estimates and assumptions that are reflected in REMS<sup>©</sup> and our other tools. For example, the 2011 and 2010 New Zealand Earthquakes and the Tohoku Earthquake provided new insight on certain aspects of

hazard and vulnerability to the global earthquake science community. Utilizing internal

15





research capabilities from our team of scientists at Weather Predict Consulting Inc. (“Weather Predict”) and new research from the global earthquake science community, we updated several of our internal regional representations of earthquake risk in advance of the commercially available models. In late 2012, Storm Sandy gave rise to new data relating to storm surge, flood persistence and mid-Atlantic tropical storm meteorology.

Our underwriters use this combination of our risk assessment and underwriting process, REMS© and other tools in their pricing decisions, which we believe provides them with several competitive advantages. These include the ability to:

- simulate a range of potential outcomes that adequately represents the risk to an individual contract;
- analyze the incremental impact of an individual reinsurance contract on our overall portfolio;
- better assess the underlying exposures associated with assumed retrocessional business;
- price contracts within a short time frame;
- capture various classes of risk, including catastrophe and other insurance risks;
- assess risk across multiple entities (including our various joint ventures) and across different components of our capital structure; and
- provide consistent pricing information.

As part of our risk management process, we also use REMS© to assist us, as a retrocedant, with the purchase of reinsurance coverage for our own account.

Our underwriting and risk management process, in conjunction with REMS©, quantifies and manages our exposure to claims from single events and the exposure to losses from a series of events. As part of our pricing and underwriting process, we also assess a variety of other factors, including:

- the reputation of the proposed cedant and the likelihood of establishing a long-term relationship with the cedant;
- the geographic area in which the cedant does business and its market share;
- historical loss data for the cedant and, where available, for the industry as a whole in the relevant regions and lines of business, in order to compare the cedant’s historical catastrophe loss experience to industry averages;
- the cedant’s pricing strategies; and
- the perceived financial strength of the cedant and factors such as the cedant’s historical record of making premium payments in full and on a timely basis.

In order to estimate the risk profile of each line of non-natural hazard reinsurance (i.e., our specialty and casualty lines of business), we establish probability distributions and assess the correlations with the rest of our portfolio. In lines with catastrophe risk, such as excess workers’ compensation and terrorism, we seek to directly leverage our skill in modeling for our property catastrophe reinsurance risks, and seek to appropriately estimate and manage the correlations between these specialty lines and our catastrophe reinsurance portfolio. For other classes of business, in which we believe we have little or no natural catastrophe exposure, and therefore less correlation with our property catastrophe reinsurance coverages, we derive probability distributions from a variety of underlying information sources, including recent historical experience, and the application of judgment as appropriate. The nature of some of these businesses lends itself less to the analysis that we use for our property catastrophe (re)insurance coverages, reflecting both the nature of available exposure information, and the impact of human factors such as tort exposure. We produce probability distributions to represent our estimates of the related underlying risks which our products cover, which we believe helps us to make consistent underwriting decisions and to manage our total risk portfolio. In addition, we also produce, utilize and report on models which measure our utilization of capital in light of regulatory capital considerations and constraints. Our position in respect of these regulatory capital models are reviewed by our risk management professional staff and periodically reported to and reviewed by senior underwriting personnel and executive management with responsibility for our regulated operating entities.



### Enterprise Risk Management (“ERM”)

We believe that high-quality and effective risk management is best achieved through it being a shared cultural value throughout the organization. We have sought to develop and utilize a series of tools and processes that support a culture of risk management and to create a robust framework of ERM within our organization. We consider ERM to be a key process which is the responsibility of every individual within the Company. ERM is managed by our senior executive team under the oversight of our Board of Directors, and implemented by personnel from across our organization. We believe that ERM helps us to identify potential events that may affect us, to quantify, evaluate and manage the risks to which we are exposed, and to provide reasonable assurance regarding the achievement of our objectives. We believe that effective ERM can provide us with a significant competitive advantage. We also believe that effective ERM assists our efforts to minimize the likelihood of suffering financial outcomes in excess of the ranges which we have estimated in respect of specific investments, underwriting decisions, or other operating or business activities, although we do not believe this risk can be eliminated. We believe that our risk management tools support our strategy of pursuing opportunities and help us to identify opportunities that we believe to be the most attractive. In particular, we utilize our risk management tools to support our efforts to monitor our capital position, on a consolidated basis and for each of our major operating subsidiaries, and to allocate an appropriate amount of capital to support the risks that we have assumed in the aggregate and for each of our major operating subsidiaries. We believe that our risk management efforts are essential to our corporate strategy and our goal of achieving long-term growth in tangible book value per share plus the change in accumulated dividends for our shareholders.

Our ERM framework comprises three primary areas of focus, as set forth below:

**Assumed Risk.** We define assumed risk as activities where we deliberately take risk against the Company’s capital base, including underwriting risks and other quantifiable risks such as credit risk and interest rate risk as they relate to investments, ceded reinsurance credit risk and strategic investment risk, each of which can be analyzed in substantial part through quantitative tools and techniques. Of these, we believe underwriting risk to be the most material to us. In order to understand, monitor, quantify and proactively assess underwriting risk, we seek to develop and deploy appropriate tools to, among other things, estimate the comparable expected returns on potential business opportunities, and estimate the impact that such incremental business could have on our overall risk profile. We use the tools and methods described above in “Underwriting” to seek to achieve these objectives.

Embedded within our consideration of assumed risk is our management of the Company’s aggregate, consolidated (1) risk profile. In part through the utilization of REMS© and our other systems and procedures, we seek to analyze our in-force aggregate assumed risk portfolio on a daily basis. We believe this capability helps us to manage our aggregate exposures, as well as to rigorously analyze individual proposed transactions and evaluate them in the context of our in-force portfolio. This aggregation process captures line of business, segment and corporate risk profiles, calculates internal and external capital tests and explicitly models ceded reinsurance. Generally, additional data is added quarterly to our aggregate risk framework to reflect updated or new information or estimates relating to matters such as interest rate risk, credit risk, capital adequacy and liquidity. This information is used in day-to-day decision making for underwriting, investments and operations and is also reviewed quarterly from both a unit level and in respect of our consolidated financial position. We also regularly assess, monitor and review our regulatory risk capital and related constraints.

**Business Environment Risk.** We define this as the risk of changes in the business, political or regulatory environment that could negatively impact our short term or long-term financial results or the markets in which we (2) operate. Accordingly, these risks are predominately extrinsic to the Company and in general, our ability to alter or eliminate these risks is limited. Rather, our efforts focus on monitoring developments, assessing potential impacts of any such changes, and investing in cost effective means to attempt to mitigate the consequences of and ensure compliance with any new requirements applicable to us.

**Operational Risk.** We are subject to a number of additional risks arising out of operational, regulatory, and other (3) matters. We define operational risk to include the risk that we fail to create, manage, control or mitigate the people, processes, structures or functions required to execute our strategic and tactical plans and assemble an optimized portfolio of assumed risk, and to adjust to





and comply with the evolving requirements of business environment risk applicable to us. In light of the rapid evolution of our markets, business environment, and business initiatives, we seek to continually invest in the tools, processes and procedures to mitigate our exposure to operational risk on a cost-effective basis. As with assumed risk and business environment risk, operational risk presents intrinsic uncertainties, and we may fail to appropriately identify or mitigate applicable operational risk.

Identification and monitoring of business environment risk and operational risk is coordinated by senior personnel including our Chief Financial Officer (“CFO”), General Counsel and Chief Compliance Officer (“CCO”), Corporate Controller and Chief Accounting Officer (“CAO”), Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Risk Officer (“CRO”), Chief Information Officer and Head of Internal Audit, utilizing resources throughout the Company.

Although financial reporting is a key area of our focus, other operational risks are addressed through our disaster recovery program, human resource practices such as motivating and retaining top talent, our strict tax protocols and our legal and regulatory policies and procedures.

**Controls and Compliance Committee.** We believe that a key component of our current operational risk management platform is our Controls and Compliance Committee. The Controls and Compliance Committee is comprised of our CFO, CCO, CAO, Chief Administrative Officer, CRO, Head of Internal Audit, staff compliance professionals and representatives from our business units. The purpose of the Controls and Compliance Committee is to establish, assess the effectiveness of, and enforce policies, procedures and practices relating to accounting, financial reporting, internal controls, regulatory, legal, compliance and related matters, and for striving to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations, the Company’s Code of Ethics and Conduct (the “Code of Ethics”), and other relevant standards. In addition, the Controls and Compliance Committee is charged with reviewing certain transactions that potentially raise complex and/or significant tax, legal, accounting, regulatory, financial reporting, reputational or compliance issues.

**Ongoing Development and Enhancement.** We seek to reflect and categorize risks we monitor in part through quantitative risk distributions, even where we believe that such quantitative analysis is not as robust or well developed as our tools and models for measuring and evaluating other risks, such as catastrophe and market risks. We also seek to improve the methods by which we measure risks. We believe effective risk management is a core attribute of our culture and is a continual process that requires ongoing improvement and development. We seek from time to time to identify effective new practices or additional developments both from within our industry and from other sectors. We believe that our ongoing efforts to embed ERM throughout our organization are important to our efforts to produce and maintain a competitive advantage to achieve our corporate goals.

#### RATINGS

Financial strength ratings are an important factor in respect of the competitive position of reinsurance and insurance companies. Rating organizations continually review the financial positions of our reinsurers and insurers. We continue to receive high claims-paying and financial strength ratings from A.M. Best Co. (“A.M. Best”), Standard and Poor’s Rating Services (“S&P”), Moody’s Investors Service (“Moody’s”) and Fitch Ratings Ltd. (“Fitch”). These ratings represent independent opinions of an insurer’s financial strength, operating performance and ability to meet policyholder obligations, and are not an evaluation directed toward the protection of investors or a recommendation to buy, sell or hold any of our securities. See “Part II, Item 7. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, Capital Resources, Ratings” for the ratings of our principal operating subsidiaries and joint ventures by segment, and details of recent ratings actions. In addition, S&P assesses companies’ ERM practices, which is an opinion on the many critical dimensions of risk that determine overall creditworthiness. RenaissanceRe has been assigned an ERM rating of “Very Strong”, which is the highest rating assigned by S&P, and indicates that S&P believes RenaissanceRe has very strong capabilities to consistently identify, measure, and manage risk exposures and losses within RenaissanceRe’s predetermined tolerance guidelines.



## RESERVES FOR CLAIMS AND CLAIM EXPENSES

We believe the most significant accounting judgment made by management is our estimate of claims and claim expense reserves. Claims and claim expense reserves represent estimates, including actuarial and statistical projections at a given point in time, of the ultimate settlement and administration costs for unpaid claims and claim expenses arising from the insurance and reinsurance contracts we sell. We establish our claims and claim expense reserves by taking claims reported to us by insureds and ceding companies, but which have not yet been paid (“case reserves”), adding the costs for additional case reserves (“additional case reserves”) which represent our estimates for claims previously reported to us which we believe may not be adequately reserved as of that date, and adding estimates for the anticipated cost of claims incurred but not yet reported to us (“IBNR”).

The following table summarizes our claims and claim expense reserves by line of business and split between case reserves, additional case reserves and IBNR:

At December 31, 2013 (in thousands)	Case Reserves	Additional Case Reserves	IBNR	Total
Catastrophe Reinsurance	\$430,166	\$177,518	\$173,303	\$780,987
Specialty Reinsurance	113,188	81,251	311,829	506,268
Lloyd’s	45,355	14,265	158,747	218,367
Other	14,915	2,324	40,869	58,108
Total	\$603,624	\$275,358	\$684,748	\$1,563,730
At December 31, 2012 (in thousands)				
Catastrophe Reinsurance	\$706,264	\$222,208	\$255,786	\$1,184,258
Specialty Reinsurance	111,234	80,971	286,108	478,313
Lloyd’s	29,260	10,548	109,662	149,470
Other	17,016	8,522	41,798	67,336
Total	\$863,774	\$322,249	\$693,354	\$1,879,377

Our estimates of claims and claim expense reserves are not precise in that, among other matters, they are based on predictions of future developments and estimates of future trends and other variable factors. Some, but not all, of our reserves are further subject to the uncertainty inherent in actuarial methodologies and estimates. Because a reserve estimate is simply an insurer’s estimate at a point in time of its ultimate liability, and because there are numerous factors which affect reserves and claims payments that cannot be determined with certainty in advance, our ultimate payments will vary, perhaps materially, from our estimates of reserves. If we determine in a subsequent period that adjustments to our previously established reserves are appropriate, such adjustments are recorded in the period in which they are identified. During 2013, changes to prior year estimated claims reserves increased our net income by \$144.0 million (2012 - increased our net income by \$158.0 million, 2011 - decreased our net loss by \$132.0 million), excluding the consideration of changes in reinstatement premium, profit commissions, redeemable noncontrolling interest - DaVinciRe, equity in net claims and claim expenses of Top Layer Re and income tax.





The following table presents an analysis of our paid, unpaid and incurred losses and loss expenses and a reconciliation of beginning and ending reserves for claims and claim expenses for the years indicated:

Year ended December 31, (in thousands)	2013	2012	2011
Net reserves as of January 1	\$1,686,865	\$1,588,325	\$1,156,132
Net incurred related to:			
Current year	315,241	483,180	993,168
Prior years	(143,954)	(157,969)	(131,989)
Total net incurred	171,287	325,211	861,179
Net paid related to:			
Current year	32,212	84,056	299,299
Prior years	363,235	142,615	129,687
Total net paid	395,447	226,671	428,986
Total net reserves as of December 31	1,462,705	1,686,865	1,588,325
Reinsurance recoverable as of December 31	101,025	192,512	404,029
Total gross reserves as of December 31	\$1,563,730	\$1,879,377	\$1,992,354

Refer to “Part II, Item 7. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, Summary of Critical Accounting Estimates, Claims and Claim Expense Reserves” for additional discussion regarding the Company’s reserving methodologies, including key assumptions and sensitivity analysis and a discussion regarding the Company’s accounting treatment and favorable development on prior years net claims and claim expenses.

Our reserving methodology for each line of business uses a loss reserving process that calculates a point estimate for the Company’s ultimate settlement and administration costs for claims and claim expenses. We do not calculate a range of estimates. We use this point estimate, along with paid claims and case reserves, to record our best estimate of additional case reserves and IBNR in our consolidated financial statements. Under GAAP, we are not permitted to establish estimates for catastrophe claims and claim expense reserves until an event occurs that gives rise to a loss. Reserving for our reinsurance claims involves other uncertainties, such as the dependence on information from ceding companies, which among other matters, includes the time lag inherent in reporting information from the primary insurer to us or to our ceding companies and differing reserving practices among ceding companies. The information received from ceding companies is typically in the form of bordereaux, broker notifications of loss and/or discussions with ceding companies or their brokers. This information can be received on a monthly, quarterly or transactional basis and normally includes estimates of paid claims and case reserves. We sometimes also receive an estimate or provision for IBNR. This information is often updated and adjusted from time to time during the loss settlement period as new data or facts in respect of initial claims, client accounts, industry or event trends may be reported or emerge in addition to changes in applicable statutory and case laws.

Our estimates of losses from large events are based on factors including currently available information derived from the Company’s claims information from certain customers and brokers, industry assessments of losses from the events, proprietary models, and the terms and conditions of our contracts. The uncertainty of our estimates for certain of these large events is additionally impacted by the preliminary nature of the information available, the magnitude and relative infrequency of the events, the expected duration of the respective claims development period, inadequacies in the data provided to the relevant date by industry participants and the potential for further reporting lags or insufficiencies (particularly in respect of our current reserves arising from the Chilean, 2010 New Zealand, 2011 New Zealand and Tohoku Earthquakes); and in the case of Storm Sandy and the Thailand Floods, significant uncertainty as to the form of the claims and legal issues, under the relevant terms of insurance and reinsurance contracts. In addition, a significant portion of the net claims and claim expenses associated with Storm Sandy and the New Zealand and Tohoku Earthquakes are concentrated with a few large clients and therefore the loss estimates for these events may vary significantly based on the claims experience of those clients. Loss reserve estimation in respect of our

retrocessional contracts poses further challenges compared to directly

20



assumed reinsurance. A significant portion of our reinsurance recoverable relates to the New Zealand and Tohoku Earthquakes. There is inherent uncertainty and complexity in evaluating loss reserve levels and reinsurance recoverable amounts, due to the nature of the losses relating to earthquake events, including that loss development time frames tend to take longer with respect to earthquake events. The contingent nature of business interruption and other exposures will also impact losses in a meaningful way, especially in respect of our current reserves with regard to Storm Sandy, the Tohoku Earthquake and the Thailand Floods, which we believe may give rise to significant complexity in respect of claims handling, claims adjustment and other coverage issues, over time. Given the magnitude and relatively recent occurrence of these large events, meaningful uncertainty remains regarding total covered losses for the insurance industry and, accordingly, several of the key assumptions underlying our loss estimates. In addition, our actual net losses from these events may increase if our reinsurers or other obligors fail to meet their obligations.

Because of the inherent uncertainties discussed above, we have developed a reserving philosophy which attempts to incorporate prudent assumptions and estimates, and we have generally experienced favorable net development on prior year reserves in the last several years. However, there is no assurance that this will occur in future periods. Our reserving techniques, assumptions and processes differ among our Catastrophe Reinsurance, Specialty Reinsurance and Lloyd's segments, and Other category. Refer to "Part II, Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, Summary of Critical Accounting Estimates, Claims and Claim Expense Reserves" for more information on the risks we insure and reinsure, the reserving techniques, assumptions and processes we follow to estimate our claims and claim expense reserves, and our current estimates versus our initial estimates of our claims reserves, for each of these units.

The following table represents the development of our GAAP balance sheet reserves for December 31, 2003 through December 31, 2013. This table does not present accident or policy year development data. The top line of the table shows the gross reserves for claims and claim expenses at the balance sheet date for each of the indicated years. This represents the estimated amounts of claims and claim expenses arising in the current year and all prior years that are unpaid at the balance sheet date, including additional case reserves and IBNR reserves. The table also shows the re-estimated amount of the previously recorded reserves based on experience as of the end of each succeeding year. The estimate changes as more information becomes known about the frequency and severity of claims for individual years. The "cumulative redundancy on net reserves" represents the aggregate change to date from the indicated estimate of the gross reserve for claims and claim expenses, net of reinsurance recoverable on the second line of the table. The table also shows the cumulative net paid amounts as of successive years with respect to the net reserve liability. At the bottom of the table is a reconciliation of the gross reserve for claims and claim expenses to the net reserve for claims and claim expenses, the gross re-estimated liability to the net re-estimated liability for claims and claim expenses, and the cumulative redundancy on gross reserves.



Edgar Filing: RENAISSANCERE HOLDINGS LTD - Form ARS

With respect to the information in the table below, note that each amount includes the effects of all changes in amounts for prior periods, including the effect of foreign exchange rates.

Year ended December 31, (in millions)	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Gross reserve for claims and claim expenses	\$924.4	\$1,295.0	\$2,381.4	\$1,811.0	\$1,717.2	\$1,758.8	\$1,344.4	\$1,257.8	\$1,992.3	\$1,879.4	\$1,563.7
Reserve for claims and claim expenses, net of reinsurance recoverable	\$810.6	\$1,099.2	\$1,742.2	\$1,591.3	\$1,609.5	\$1,565.2	\$1,260.3	\$1,156.1	\$1,588.3	\$1,686.9	\$1,462.7
1 Year Later	661.5	878.6	1,610.7	1,368.3	1,412.6	1,299.0	958.2	1,024.1	1,430.3	1,543.0	—
2 Years Later	379.5	844.0	1,449.1	1,225.9	1,199.0	1,045.1	857.6	895.8	1,345.5	—	—
3 Years Later	362.8	749.1	1,333.7	1,092.2	997.8	961.4	770.8	849.5	—	—	—
4 Years Later	332.9	717.2	1,231.6	911.1	923.0	888.7	727.4	—	—	—	—
5 Years Later	312.2	683.7	1,077.8	847.2	878.5	849.2	—	—	—	—	—
6 Years Later	301.5	628.9	1,022.7	823.5	858.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
7 Years Later	266.2	609.2	1,002.8	819.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8 Years Later	251.2	604.5	1,009.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9 Years Later	241.2	612.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10 Years Later	244.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cumulative redundancy on net reserves	\$565.7	\$486.8	\$732.8	\$772.2	\$750.9	\$716.0	\$532.9	\$306.6	\$242.8	\$143.9	\$—
Cumulative Net Paid Losses											
1 Year Later	58.0	302.8	354.8	247.6	337.1	191.5	182.8	129.7	142.6	363.2	—
2 Years Later	100.6	370.8	548.4	435.8	469.5	369.1	301.5	301.5	484.5	—	—
3 Years Later	107.5	395.7	712.6	529.5	553.0	471.6	420.6	379.3	—	—	—
4 Years Later	96.4	446.8	782.9	569.4	605.7	585.8	456.2	—	—	—	—
5 Years Later	129.8	472.7	812.0	594.2	690.4	615.3	—	—	—	—	—
6 Years Later	136.1	482.7	833.1	656.1	703.2	—	—	—	—	—	—
7 Years Later	137.3	492.2	879.1	668.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8 Years Later	139.2	527.6	890.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9 Years Later	152.1	533.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10 Years Later	156.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gross reserve for claims and claim expenses	\$924.4	\$1,295.0	\$2,381.4	\$1,811.0	\$1,717.2	\$1,758.8	\$1,344.4	\$1,257.8	\$1,992.3	\$1,879.4	\$1,563.7
Reinsurance recoverable on unpaid losses	113.8	195.8	639.2	219.7	107.7	193.6	84.1	101.7	404.0	192.5	101.0

Edgar Filing: RENAISSANCERE HOLDINGS LTD - Form ARS

Net reserve for claims and claim expenses	\$810.6	\$1,099.2	\$1,742.2	\$1,591.3	\$1,609.5	\$1,565.2	\$1,260.3	\$1,156.1	\$1,588.3	\$1,686.9	\$1,462.7
Gross liability re-estimated	\$359.0	\$809.6	\$1,619.7	\$1,025.2	\$925.4	\$987.7	\$774.0	\$929.5	\$1,744.3	\$1,711.3	\$—
Reinsurance recoverable on unpaid losses re-estimated	114.1	197.2	610.3	206.1	66.8	138.5	46.6	80.0	398.8	168.3	—
Net liability re-estimated	\$244.9	\$612.4	\$1,009.4	\$819.1	\$858.6	\$849.2	\$727.4	\$849.5	\$1,345.5	\$1,543.0	\$—
Cumulative redundancy on gross reserves	\$565.4	\$485.4	\$761.7	\$785.8	\$791.8	\$771.1	\$570.4	\$328.3	\$248.0	\$168.1	\$—





## INVESTMENTS

Our investment guidelines stress preservation of capital, market liquidity, and diversification of risk. The majority of our investments consist of highly rated fixed income securities. We also hold a significant amount of short term investments. Short term investments are managed as part of our investment portfolio and have a maturity of one year or less when purchased. In addition, we have an allocation to other investments including private equity partnerships, senior secured bank loan funds, catastrophe bonds, and hedge funds, and to certain equity securities. We may from time to time re-evaluate our investment guidelines and explore investment allocations to other asset classes. Our investments are subject to market-wide risks and fluctuations, as well as to risks inherent in particular securities. The table below shows the aggregate amounts of our invested assets:

At December 31, (in thousands, except percentages)	2013		2012		
U.S. treasuries	\$1,352,413	19.8	% \$1,254,547	19.8	%
Agencies	186,050	2.7	% 315,154	5.0	%
Non-U.S. government (Sovereign debt)	334,580	4.9	% 133,198	2.1	%
Non-U.S. government-backed corporate	237,479	3.5	% 349,514	5.5	%
Corporate	1,803,415	26.4	% 1,615,207	25.4	%
Agency mortgage-backed	341,908	5.0	% 408,531	6.4	%
Non-agency mortgage-backed	257,938	3.8	% 248,339	3.9	%
Commercial mortgage-backed	314,236	4.6	% 406,166	6.4	%
Asset-backed	15,258	0.2	% 12,954	0.2	%
Total fixed maturity investments, at fair value	4,843,277	70.9	% 4,743,610	74.7	%
Short term investments, at fair value	1,044,779	15.3	% 821,163	12.9	%
Equity investments trading, at fair value	254,776	3.7	% 58,186	0.9	%
Other investments, at fair value	573,264	8.5	% 644,711	10.1	%
Total managed investment portfolio	6,716,096	98.4	% 6,267,670	98.6	%
Investments in other ventures, under equity method	105,616	1.6	% 87,724	1.4	%
Total investments	\$6,821,712	100.0	% \$6,355,394	100.0	%

For additional information regarding the investment portfolio, refer to “Part II, Item 7. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, Liquidity and Capital Resources, Investments”.

## MARKETING

We believe that our modeling and technical expertise, the risk management products that we provide to our customers, and our reputation for paying claims promptly has enabled us to become a provider of first choice in many lines of business to our customers worldwide. We market our products worldwide primarily through reinsurance brokers and we focus our marketing efforts on targeted brokers and partners. We believe that our existing portfolio of business is a valuable asset and, therefore, we attempt to continually strengthen relationships with our existing brokers and customers. We target prospects that are capable of supplying detailed and accurate underwriting data and that potentially add further diversification to our book of business.

We believe that primary insurers’ and brokers’ willingness to use a particular reinsurer is based not just on pricing, but also on the financial security of the reinsurer, its claim paying ability ratings and demonstrated willingness to promptly pay valid claims, the quality of a reinsurer’s service, the reinsurer’s willingness and ability to design customized programs, its long-term stability and its commitment to provide reinsurance capacity. We believe we have established a reputation with our brokers and customers for prompt response on underwriting submissions, for fast claims payments and for providing creative solutions to our customers’ needs. Since we selectively write large lines on a limited number of property catastrophe and specialty reinsurance contracts, we can establish terms and conditions on those contracts that are attractive





in our judgment, make large commitments to the most attractive programs and provide superior client responsiveness. We believe that our willingness and ability to design customized programs and to provide bespoke risk management products has helped us to develop long-term relationships with brokers and customers.

Our brokers assess client needs and perform data collection, contract preparation and other administrative tasks, enabling us to market our products cost effectively by maintaining a smaller staff. We believe that by maintaining close relationships with brokers, we are able to obtain access to a broad range of potential reinsureds. In recent years, our distribution has become increasingly reliant on a small and relatively decreasing number of such relationships reflecting consolidation in the broker sector. We expect this concentration to continue and perhaps increase.

The following table shows the percentage of our Catastrophe Reinsurance and Specialty Reinsurance segments' gross premiums written generated through our largest brokers:

Year ended December 31,	Catastrophe Reinsurance			Specialty Reinsurance			
	2013	2012	2011	2013	2012	2011	
AON Benfield	50.6	% 54.0	% 56.7	% 40.0	% 37.4	% 31.9	%
Marsh Inc.	21.5	% 20.3	% 21.0	% 27.5	% 30.4	% 33.7	%
Willis Group	14.9	% 8.6	% 9.8	% 25.4	% 26.6	% 33.3	%
Total of largest brokers	87.0	% 82.9	% 87.5	% 92.9	% 94.4	% 98.9	%
All others	13.0	% 17.1	% 12.5	% 7.1	% 5.6	% 1.1	%
Total percentage of segment gross premiums written	100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	%

The following table shows the number of brokers for which we issued authorization for coverage on programs, the number of program submissions received and the number and percent of authorizations issued, split between our Catastrophe Reinsurance, Specialty Reinsurance and Lloyd's segments for 2013:

Year ended December 31, 2013	Catastrophe Reinsurance	Specialty Reinsurance	Lloyd's	
Number of brokers	16	12	42	
Program submissions	2,863	402	3,459	
Programs authorized	876	184	875	
Programs authorized as a percentage of program submissions	31	% 46	% 25	%

## EMPLOYEES

At February 19, 2014, we employed 285 people worldwide (February 20, 2013 - 309, February 15, 2012 - 311). As part of the sale of REAL, which closed on October 1, 2013, our overall headcount was reduced by 31 employees. We believe our strong employee relations are among our most significant strengths. None of our employees are subject to collective bargaining agreements. We are not aware of any current efforts to implement such agreements at any of our subsidiaries. The Company has historically looked for opportunities to strengthen its operations during periods of softening markets in anticipation of improving market conditions, however, we may from time to time reevaluate our operational needs based on various factors, including the changing nature of such market conditions and changes in our strategy or tactical plans. We currently expect to continue to experience a degree of employee growth in the U.K. and other markets outside Bermuda, which may lead to, in certain cases, new or expanded human resource requirements.



## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Our information technology infrastructure is important to our business. Our information technology platform, supported by a team of professionals, is maintained across various office locations. Additional information technology assets are maintained at the other office locations of our operating subsidiaries. We have implemented backup procedures that seek to ensure that our key business systems and data are backed up, generally on a daily basis, and can be restored promptly if and as needed. In addition, we generally store backup information at off-site locations, in order to seek to minimize our risk of loss of key data in the event of a disaster.

We depend on the proper functioning and availability of our information technology platform. This includes communications and data processing systems used in operating our business. These systems consist of proprietary software programs that are integral to the efficient operation of our business (including REMS©, our proprietary computer-based pricing and exposure management system). In addition, we frequently transmit and receive personal, confidential and proprietary information by email and other electronic means, as required in connection with our business, with our internal operations and with facilitating the oversight conducted by our Board of Directors. Computer viruses, hackers, employee misuse or misconduct and other external hazards could expose our data systems to security breaches, cyber attacks or other disruptions.

We believe that the preponderance of our business and support functions utilize information systems that provide critical services to both our employees and our customers. We are also required to effect electronic transmissions with third parties including brokers, clients, vendors and others with whom we do business. While we seek to ensure that our information is appropriately protected by these parties by performing third party risk assessments, we may be unable to establish secure capabilities with all of them; in addition, these third parties may not have appropriate controls in place to protect the confidentiality of the information.

Cyber incidents that impact the availability, reliability, speed, accuracy or other proper functioning of these systems could have a significant impact on our operations, and potentially on our results. Publicly reported instances of cyber security threats and incidents have increased over recent periods, and it is possible that cyber-related risks for us or the costs to us of complying with new or developing regulatory requirements has or will increase. In 2011, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC") drafted informal staff-level guidance for public companies to use when considering whether to disclose cyber attacks and their impact on a company's financial condition, and it is possible that the SEC or other agencies which regulate or oversee us will adopt new standards or requirements with which we would be required to comply. We also operate in a number of jurisdictions with strict data privacy and other related laws, which could be violated in the event of a significant cybersecurity incident, or by our personnel. Failure to comply with these obligations can give rise to monetary fines and other penalties, which could be significant.

We seek to protect our information systems through physical and electronic safeguards as well as backup systems considered appropriate by management. However, it is not practicable to protect against every potential power loss, telecommunications failure, cybersecurity attack or similar event that may arise. Moreover, the safeguards we have chosen to utilize are subject to human implementation and maintenance and to other uncertainties.

A significant cyber incident, including system failure, security breach, disruption by malware or other damage could interrupt or delay our operations. Cyber incidents may result in a violation of applicable privacy and other laws and could damage our reputation potentially causing a loss of customers. Management is not aware of a cybersecurity incident that has had a material effect on our operations, although there can be no assurances that a cyber incident that could have a material impact on us will not occur in the future. We do however periodically perform security penetration test scenarios and provide regular security risk staff education awareness sessions, to evaluate our preparedness and enhance both our system and user ability to detect, alert and respond to such an incident.





We have implemented and periodically test our disaster recovery plans with respect to our information technology infrastructure. Among other things, our recovery plans involve arrangements with off-site, secure data centers in alternative locations. We believe we will be able to access our systems from these facilities in the event that our primary systems are unavailable due to various scenarios, such as natural disasters. However, we have not prepared for every conceivable disaster or every scenario which might arise in respect of the disaster for which we have prepared, and cannot assure you our efforts in respect of disaster recovery will succeed, or will be sufficiently rapid to avoid harm to our business.

## REGULATION

### U.S. Regulation

**Dodd-Frank Act.** On July 21, 2010, President Obama signed into law the Dodd-Frank Act which effects sweeping reforms of the financial services industries. Although the Dodd-Frank Act does not change the state-based system of insurance regulation in the U.S., it does establish federal measures that will impact the U.S. insurance business and preempt certain state insurance laws. Over time, the Dodd-Frank Act or those agencies responsible for its enforcement may lay the foundation for ultimately establishing some form of U.S. federal regulation of insurance.

The Dodd-Frank Act created the Financial Stability Oversight Council (“FSOC”) to identify and respond to risks to the financial stability of the U.S. and to promote market discipline. FSOC is authorized to designate a nonbank financial company as “systemically significant” if its material financial distress could threaten the financial stability of the U.S. In 2013, FSOC designated three nonbank financial companies, including two insurance groups, as systemically significant. Those designated entities will be subject to supervision by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as well as enhanced prudential standards, including stress tests, liquidity requirements, annual resolution plans or “living wills,” and enhanced public disclosures. FSOC’s potential recommendation of measures to address systemic risk in the insurance industry could affect our insurance and reinsurance operations as could a determination that we or our counterparties are systemically significant.

The Dodd-Frank Act also created the first office in the Federal government focused on insurance - the Federal Insurance Office (“FIO”). Although FIO has preemption authority over state insurance laws that conflict with certain international agreements, FIO does not have general supervisory or regulatory authority over the business of insurance. Certain functions of FIO relate to systemic risk. Specifically, FIO is authorized to monitor the U.S. insurance industry and identify potential regulatory gaps that could contribute to systemic risk. In addition, FIO may recommend to FSOC the designation of systemically important insurers.

FIO has a particular role in connection with international insurance matters. FIO represents the U.S. at the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (“IAIS”); in 2012, FIO participated in IAIS’s Financial Stability Committee and joined IAIS’s Executive Committee. The Dodd-Frank Act authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury and U.S. Trade Representative to enter into international agreements of mutual recognition regarding the prudential regulation of insurance (a “Covered Agreement”). Significantly, FIO is authorized to preempt state measures that (i) are inconsistent with a Covered Agreement and (ii) disfavor non-U.S. insurers subject to a Covered Agreement.

FIO is required to report to Congress annually on the insurance industry and any preemption actions regarding Covered Agreements. A FIO report to Congress describing the breadth of the global reinsurance market and its critical role in supporting the U.S. insurance system scheduled for September 2012 has not yet been produced. On December 12, 2013, however, FIO delivered a report to Congress on how to modernize and improve the system of insurance regulation in the U.S. The report recommended that, in the short term, the U.S. system of insurance regulation can be modernized through state-based improvements combined with certain federal actions. The report identified areas for direct federal involvement in international standard setting, FIO participation in supervisory colleges which monitor the regulation of large national and internationally active insurance groups and federal pursuit of Covered Agreements to afford nationally uniform treatment of reinsurance collateral requirements. The report also made several recommendations for state reform of insurance regulation, including changes to the state regulation of insurance company solvency, group supervision and corporate governance. The FIO report stated that the system of U.S. insurance regulation can be modernized and improved in the short-term, while warning that





if the various U.S. states do not act in the near term to effectively regulate matters on a consistent and cooperative basis, in FIO's view, there will be a greater role for federal regulation of insurance. The potential impact of the Dodd-Frank Act on our U.S. cedants and on the U.S. treatment of global reinsurance matters is not clear at this time. We are monitoring developments at FSOC and FIO in connection with the possible impact on our U.S. insurance and reinsurance business. It is possible FIO will issue recommendations in respect of the reinsurance market that would, if enacted, impact our markets or our operations significantly, perhaps adversely. The Dodd-Frank Act also provides for the specific preemption of certain state insurance laws in the areas of reinsurance and surplus insurance regulation. At this time, it is difficult to predict the extent to which the Dodd-Frank Act or the resulting regulations will impact our business. However, compliance with these new laws and regulations has resulted in additional costs. Although we do not expect these costs to be material to us as a whole, we cannot be certain that this expectation will prove accurate or that the Dodd-Frank Act will not impact our business more adversely than we currently estimate.

**Reinsurance Regulation.** Our Bermuda-domiciled insurance operations and joint ventures principally consist of Renaissance Reinsurance, DaVinci, Top Layer Re, RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks, RenaissanceRe Specialty U.S. and Upsilon RFO. All are admitted to transact insurance business in Bermuda. The insurance laws of each state of the U.S. regulate the sale of reinsurance to ceding insurers authorized in the state by non-admitted alien reinsurers, acting from locations outside the state. With some exceptions, the sale of insurance or reinsurance within a jurisdiction where the insurer is not admitted to do business is prohibited. Our Bermuda-domiciled insurance operations and joint ventures do not maintain an office or solicit, advertise, settle claims or conduct other insurance activities in any jurisdiction, other than Bermuda, where the conduct of such activities would require that any company be so admitted.

In 2013, we organized RenaissanceRe Underwriting Managers U.S., a specialty reinsurance agency domiciled in Connecticut, to provide specialty treaty reinsurance solutions on both a quota share and excess of loss basis, as well as to write business on behalf of RenaissanceRe Specialty U.S., a Bermuda-domiciled reinsurer launched in 2013 which operates subject to U.S. federal income tax, and Syndicate 1458. RenaissanceRe Underwriting Managers U.S. is licensed by the Connecticut Department of Insurance as a reinsurance intermediary broker and is required to maintain its reinsurance intermediary broker license in force in order to conduct its reinsurance operations in Connecticut.

Although, in general, reinsurance contract terms and rates are not subject to regulation by state insurance authorities, a primary U. S. insurer ordinarily will enter into a reinsurance agreement only if it can obtain credit on its statutory financial statements for the reinsurance ceded. State insurance regulators permit U.S. ceding insurers to take credit for reinsurance ceded to non-admitted, non-U.S. (alien) reinsurers if the reinsurance contract contains certain minimum provisions and if the reinsurance obligations of the non-U.S. reinsurer are appropriately collateralized. Qualifying collateral may be established by an alien reinsurer exclusively for a single U.S. ceding company. Alternatively, an alien reinsurer that is accredited by a state may establish a multi-beneficiary trust with qualifying assets equal to its reinsurance obligations to all U.S. ceding insurers, plus a trustee surplus amount. Renaissance Reinsurance and DaVinci are each an accredited reinsurer in New York and Florida and have established multi-beneficiary trusts with a qualifying financial institution in New York for the benefit of their U.S. cedants.

States have generally required alien reinsurers to provide collateral equal to one hundred percent of their reinsurance obligations to U.S. ceding insurers. However, recently eighteen states have changed their credit for reinsurance laws to permit US ceding insurers to take full credit for reinsurance when a "certified" reinsurer posts reduced collateral amounts. Under these amended credit for reinsurance laws, qualifying alien reinsurers may reduce their collateral for future reinsurance agreements based on a secure rating assigned by the U.S. insurance regulator. The secure rating is assigned by the state upon an assessment of the reinsurer's financial condition, financial strength ratings and other factors. In addition, the alien reinsurer must be domiciled in a jurisdiction that is "qualified" under state law. In February 2014, Bermuda was the first foreign jurisdiction to be added to the National Association of Insurance Commissioners' (the "NAIC") list of conditional qualified jurisdictions, and states that have amended their credit for reinsurance laws may accept such conditional qualification in assessing reinsurers for certification. Of the eighteen states that have changed their credit for reinsurance laws, only Connecticut, New York and Florida have approved any reinsurers for collateral reduction. Florida has approved Renaissance Reinsurance and DaVinci for collateral reduction.





The Dodd-Frank Act also addresses states' extraterritorial regulation of credit for reinsurance and the solvency regulation of U.S. reinsurers. The Dodd-Frank Act prohibits a state in which a U.S. ceding insurer is licensed, but not domiciled, from denying credit for reinsurance if the ceding insurer's domestic state recognizes credit for reinsurance for the insurer's ceded risk and is a state accredited by the NAIC (or has substantially similar financial solvency requirements). With limited exceptions, the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act affecting reinsurance became effective July 21, 2011.

Although these changes may benefit our Bermuda based reinsurers by prohibiting states' extraterritorial application of credit for reinsurance laws and streamlining the credit for reinsurance process, states may also impose heightened standards on U.S. ceding insurers' in their selection of reinsurers which could have an adverse impact on our business. Excess and Surplus Lines Regulation. RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks, domiciled in Bermuda, is not licensed in the U.S. but is eligible to offer coverage in the U.S. exclusively in the surplus lines market. RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks is listed on the NAIC's International Insurers Department's Quarterly List of Alien Insurers as an eligible alien surplus lines insurer. Under the Dodd Frank Act, states may not prohibit a surplus lines broker from placing insurance with an alien insurer that appears in the Quarterly List of Alien Insurers maintained by the International Insurers Department. In accordance with certain provisions of the NAIC Nonadmitted Insurance Model Act, which provisions have been adopted by a number of states, RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks has established, and is required to maintain, a trust funded to a minimum amount as a condition of its status as an eligible, non-admitted insurer in the U.S. Although surplus lines business is generally less regulated than the admitted market, strict regulations apply to surplus lines placements under the laws of every state, and the regulation of surplus lines insurance may undergo changes in the future.

Legislative and Regulatory Proposals. Government intervention in the insurance and reinsurance markets in the U.S. continues to evolve. Although U.S. state regulation is currently the primary form of regulation of insurance and reinsurance, in addition to changes brought about by the Dodd-Frank Act, Congress has considered over the past years various proposals relating to the creation of an optional federal charter, repeal of the insurance company antitrust exemption from the McCarran Ferguson Act, and tax law changes, including changes to increase the taxation of reinsurance premiums paid to off-shore affiliates with respect to U.S. risks. We are unable to predict what reforms will be proposed or adopted or the effect, if any, that such reforms would have on our operations and financial condition. In 2007, Florida enacted legislation which enabled the FHCF to offer increased amounts of coverage in addition to the mandatory coverage amount, at below-market rates. Further, the legislation expanded the ability of the state-sponsored insurer, Citizens, to compete with private insurance companies, and other companies that cede business to us. This legislation reduced the role of the private insurance and reinsurance markets in Florida, a key target market of ours. In May 2009, the Florida legislature took steps to strengthen the financial condition of FHCF and Citizens, which a government-appointed task force determined to have been impaired by issues including the crisis in the credit markets, widespread rate inadequacy, and issues arising out of the application of discounts for housing retrofits and mitigation features. A bill was passed in 2009 permitting Citizens to raise its rates by up to 10% starting in 2010 and every year thereafter until its current shortfall is corrected and Citizens has sufficient funds to pay its claims and expenses. The bill provided for the gradual phase out of \$12.0 billion in optional reinsurance coverage under the FHCF over the succeeding five years. The rate increases and cut back on coverage by FHCF and Citizens have supported, over this period, a relatively increased role for private insurers in Florida, a market in which we have established substantial market share. However, we cannot assure you that this increased role will continue or be maintained, or that adverse new legislation will not be passed.

It is possible that other states, particularly those with Atlantic or Gulf Coast exposures, may enact new or expanded legislation based on the earlier Florida precedent, or may otherwise enact legislation which would further diminish aggregate private market demand for our products. Alternatively, legislation adversely impacting the private markets could be enacted on a regional or Federal level. For example, in the past, federal bills have been proposed in Congress (and, in prior Congressional sessions, passed by the House of Representatives) which would, if enacted, create a federal reinsurance backstop or guarantee mechanism for catastrophic risks, including those we currently insure and reinsure in the private markets. In 2009, the Catastrophe Obligation Guarantee Act was introduced in the Senate and

House (S. 886) to federally guarantee bond issuances by certain government entities, potentially including the FHCF, the

28





Texas Windstorm Insurance Association, the California Earthquake Authority, and others. In August 2012, Congressman Albio Sires introduced the Taxpayers' Protection Act (HR 6477). The bill would establish a federal catastrophe fund where eligible states can purchase reinsurance directly from the federal government. In January 2013, Congresswoman Frederica Wilson introduced the Homeowners' Defense Act which would, if enacted, provide for the creation of (i) a federal reinsurance catastrophe fund; (ii) a federal consortium to facilitate qualifying state residual markets and catastrophe funds in securing reinsurance; and (iii) a federal bond guarantee program for state catastrophe funds in qualifying state residual markets. In January 2013, Congressman Dennis Ross introduced the Homeowners' Insurance Protection Act (HR 240), which would create a federal catastrophe reinsurance program to back up federal reinsurance programs. If enacted, any of these bills, or legislation similar to these proposals, would, we believe, likely contribute to the growth of state entities offering below market priced insurance and reinsurance in a manner adverse to us and market participants more generally, and could accordingly adversely impact our financial results, perhaps materially. Moreover, we believe that numerous modeled potential catastrophes could exceed the actual or politically acceptable bonded capacity of Citizens and of the FHCF, which could lead either to a severe dislocation or the increased likelihood of federal intervention in the Florida market, either of which would adversely impact the private insurance and reinsurance industry. See "Part II, Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, Current Outlook, Legislative and Regulatory Update" for further information regarding recent legislative and regulatory proposals.

The potential for further expansion into additional insurance markets could expose us or our subsidiaries to increasing regulatory oversight, including the oversight of countries other than Bermuda and the U.S. However, we intend to continue to conduct our operations so as to minimize the likelihood that Renaissance Reinsurance, DaVinci, Top Layer Re, RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks, RenaissanceRe Specialty U.S., Upsilon RFO, or any of our other Bermudian subsidiaries will become subject to direct U.S. regulation.

#### Bermuda Regulation

All Bermuda companies must comply with the provisions of the Companies Act 1981. In addition, the Insurance Act 1978 and related regulations (collectively the "Insurance Act"), regulate the business of our Bermuda insurance, reinsurance and management company subsidiaries.

As a holding company, RenaissanceRe is not currently subject to the Insurance Act. However, the Insurance Act regulates the insurance and reinsurance business of our operating insurance companies. RenaissanceRe's most significant operating subsidiaries include Renaissance Reinsurance and DaVinci which are registered as Class 4 general business insurers, RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks and RenaissanceRe Specialty U.S. which are registered as Class 3B general business insurers, and Top Layer Re which is registered as a Class 3A general business insurer under the Insurance Act. RenaissanceRe also has operating subsidiaries registered as SPIs under the Insurance Act, including most recently, Upsilon RFO. RUM and RenaissanceRe Underwriting Management Ltd. are each registered as insurance managers under the Insurance Act.

The Insurance Act imposes solvency and liquidity standards as well as auditing and reporting requirements and confers on the Bermuda Monetary Authority (the "BMA") powers to supervise, investigate and intervene in the affairs of insurance companies. Significant requirements of the Insurance Act include the appointment of an independent auditor and loss reserve specialist (both of whom must be approved by the BMA), the filing of an annual financial return and provisions relating to the payment of distributions and dividends. In particular:

Each Class 3A, Class 3B and Class 4 general business insurer is required to submit annual statutory financial statements as part of its statutory financial return no later than four months after the insurer's financial year end (unless specifically extended). The annual statutory financial statements give detailed information and analyses regarding premiums, claims, reinsurance, reserves and investments. The statutory financial return includes, among other items: a report of the approved independent auditor on the statutory financial statements; a declaration of statutory ratios; a solvency certificate; the statutory financial statements themselves; the opinion of the approved loss reserve specialist; and details concerning ceded reinsurance.



In addition to preparing statutory financial statements, all Class 3A, Class 3B and Class 4 insurers must prepare financial statements in respect of their insurance business in accordance with GAAP, International Financial Reporting Standards (“IFRS”) or other acceptable accounting standards.

A general business insurer’s statutory assets must exceed its statutory liabilities by an amount, equal to or greater than the prescribed minimum solvency margin, which varies with the category of its registration and net premiums written and loss reserves posted (“Minimum Solvency Margin”). The Minimum Solvency Margin that must be maintained by a Class 4 insurer is the greater of (i) \$100.0 million, or (ii) 50% of net premiums written (with a credit for reinsurance ceded not exceeding 25% of gross premiums) or (iii) 15% of net aggregate loss and loss expense provisions and other insurance reserves. The Minimum Solvency Margin for a Class 3A or Class 3B insurer is the greater of (i) \$1.0 million, or (ii) 20% of the first \$6.0 million of net premiums written; if in excess of \$6.0 million, the figure is \$1.2 million plus 15% of net premiums written in excess of \$6.0 million, or (iii) 15% of net aggregate loss and loss expense provisions and other insurance reserves.

In addition, each Class 3A, Class 3B and Class 4 insurer must maintain its capital at a level equal to its enhanced capital requirement (“ECR”) which is established by reference to the Bermuda Solvency Capital Requirement (“BSCR”) model. Alternatively, under the Insurance Act, insurers may, subject to the terms of the Insurance Act and to the BMA’s oversight, elect to utilize an approved internal capital model to determine regulatory capital. In either case, the ECR shall at all times equal or exceed the respective Class 3A, Class 3B and Class 4 insurer’s Minimum Solvency Margin and may be adjusted in circumstances where the BMA concludes that the insurer’s risk profile deviates significantly from the assumptions underlying its ECR or the insurer’s assessment of its risk management policies and practices used to calculate the ECR applicable to it. While not specifically referred to in the Insurance Act, the BMA has also established a target capital level (“TCL”) for each Class 3A, Class 3B and Class 4 insurer equal to 120% of the respective ECR. While a Class 3A, Class 3B and Class 4 insurer is not currently required to maintain its statutory capital and surplus at this level, the TCL serves as an early warning tool for the BMA and failure to maintain statutory capital at least equal to the TCL will likely result in increased BMA regulatory oversight.

An insurer engaged in general business is required to maintain the value of its relevant assets at not less than 75% of the amount of its relevant liabilities (“Minimum Liquidity Ratio”).

Class 3A, Class 3B and Class 4 insurers are prohibited from declaring or paying any dividends if in breach of the required Minimum Solvency Margin or Minimum Liquidity Ratio (the “Relevant Margins”) or if the declaration or payment of such dividend would cause the insurer to fail to meet the Relevant Margins. Further, Class 3B and Class 4 insurers are prohibited from declaring or paying in any financial year dividends of more than 25% of its total statutory capital and surplus (as shown on its previous financial year’s statutory balance sheet) unless it files (at least seven days before payment of such dividends) with the BMA an affidavit stating that it will continue to meet its Relevant Margins. Class 3A, Class 3B and Class 4 insurers must obtain the BMA’s prior approval for a reduction by 15% or more of the total statutory capital as set forth in its previous year’s financial statements. These restrictions on declaring or paying dividends and distributions under the Insurance Act are in addition to the solvency requirements under the Companies Act which apply to all Bermuda companies.

Unlike other (re)insurers, SPIs are fully funded to meet their (re)insurance obligations and are not exposed to insolvency, therefore the application and supervision processes are streamlined to facilitate the transparent structure. Further, SPIs are currently not required to file annual loss reserve specialist opinions and the BMA has the discretion to modify such insurer’s accounting requirements under the Insurance Act. Like other (re)insurers, the principal representative of an SPI has a duty to inform the BMA in relation to solvency matters, where applicable. In December 2013, the BMA issued a notice in which it proposed to amend the statutory reporting requirements for SPIs. Under this notice, the BMA will likely require SPIs to submit additional schedules together with the existing statutory financial return. These enhancements are likely to be effective for the 2013 statutory financial return, to be filed on or before April 30, 2014.

The BMA maintains supervision over the controllers (as defined herein) of all Bermuda registered insurers. Currently the Insurance Act states that no person shall become a controller of any description of a registered insurer unless he has first served the BMA notice in writing stating that he intends to become such a controller. A controller includes

the managing director and chief executive

30



of the registered insurer or its parent company; a 10%, 20%, 33% or 50% shareholder controller; and any person in accordance with whose directions or instructions the directors of the registered insurer or of its parent company are accustomed to act. In addition, all Bermuda insurers are also required to give the BMA written notice of the fact that a person has become, or ceased to be, a controller or officer of the registered insurer within 45 days of becoming aware of such fact. An officer in relation to a registered insurer includes a director, secretary, chief executive or senior executive by whatever name called.

All registered insurers are required to give the BMA 14 days' notice of certain matters that are likely to be of material significance (each a "Material Change") to the BMA in carrying out its supervisory function under the Insurance Act. All Bermuda insurers are required to comply with the BMA's Insurance Code of Conduct which establishes duties, requirements and standards to be complied with to ensure each insurer implements sound corporate governance, risk management and internal controls. Failure to comply with these requirements will be a factor taken into account by the BMA in determining whether an insurer is conducting its business in a sound and prudent manner under the Insurance Act.

Pursuant to the Insurance Act, the BMA acts as the group supervisor of the RenaissanceRe group of companies (the "RenaissanceRe Group") and it has designated Renaissance Reinsurance to be the "designated insurer" in respect of the RenaissanceRe Group. The designated insurer is required to ensure that the RenaissanceRe Group complies with the provisions of the Insurance Act pertaining to groups and all related group solvency and group supervision rules (together, the "Group Rules"). Under the Group Rules, the RenaissanceRe Group is required to annually prepare and submit to the BMA group GAAP financial statements, group statutory financial statements, a group statutory financial return and a group capital and solvency return. Further, our Board of Directors has established solvency self assessment procedures for the RenaissanceRe Group that factor in all foreseeable material risks; Renaissance Reinsurance must ensure that the RenaissanceRe Group's assets exceed the amount of the RenaissanceRe Group's liabilities by the aggregate minimum margin of solvency of each qualifying member; and our Board of Directors has established and effectively implement corporate governance policies and procedures designed to ensure they support the overall organizational strategy of the RenaissanceRe Group. In addition, the RenaissanceRe Group is required to prepare and submit a quarterly financial return comprising unaudited consolidated group financial statements, a schedule of intra-group transactions and a schedule of risk concentrations.

The BMA has certain powers of investigation and intervention relating to insurers and their holding companies, subsidiaries and other affiliates, which it may exercise in the interest of such insurer's policyholders or if there is any risk of insolvency or of a breach of the Insurance Act or the insurer's license conditions.

Under the provisions of the Insurance Act, the BMA may, from time to time, conduct "on site" visits at the offices of insurers it regulates. Over the past several years, the BMA has conducted several "on site" reviews in respect of our Bermuda-domiciled operating insurers. No remedial actions were communicated to us as a result of any of the on-site reviews to date.

The BMA may cancel an insurer's registration on certain grounds specified in the Insurance Act.

Given the delays announced in late 2012 in respect of the implementation timetable related to Solvency II, as discussed below, the BMA has indicated that it will remain committed to the regulatory equivalence process in relation to Solvency II for Bermuda's commercial insurance sector. However, the BMA has noted that its overall adoption of progressive, risk-based supervision will go beyond this single regulatory initiative. The BMA has expressed its desire to implement changes to Bermuda's regulatory regime on a schedule that enables Bermuda's (re)insurers to transition to enhanced requirements on a phased basis where appropriate.

At the present time, there is no Bermuda income or profits tax, withholding tax, capital gains tax, capital transfer tax, estate duty or inheritance tax payable by us or by our shareholders in respect of our shares. We have obtained an assurance from the Minister of Finance of Bermuda under the Exempted Undertakings Tax Protection Act 1966 that, in the event that any legislation is enacted in Bermuda imposing any tax computed on profits or income, or computed on any capital asset, gain or appreciation or any tax in





the nature of estate duty or inheritance tax, such tax shall not, until March 31, 2035, be applicable to us or to any of our operations or to our shares, debentures or other obligations except insofar as such tax applies to persons ordinarily resident in Bermuda or is payable by us in respect of real property owned or leased by us in Bermuda.

#### U.K. Regulation

##### Lloyd's Regulation

**General.** The operations of RSML are subject to oversight by Lloyd's, substantially effected through the Lloyd's Franchise Board, which was formally constituted on January 1, 2003. The Franchise Board establishes guidelines and operates a business planning and monitoring process for all Lloyd's syndicates. RSML's business plan for Syndicate 1458 requires annual approval by the Lloyd's Franchise Board including maximum underwriting capacity. The Lloyd's Franchise Board may require changes to any business plan presented to it or additional capital to be provided to support the underwriting plan. Lloyd's also imposes various charges and assessments on its members. If material changes in the business plan for Syndicate 1458 were required by the Lloyd's Franchise Board, or if charges and assessments payable to Lloyd's by RenaissanceRe CCL were to increase significantly, these events could have an adverse effect on the operations and financial results of RSML. The Company has deposited certain assets with Lloyd's to support RenaissanceRe CCL's underwriting business at Lloyd's. Dividends from a Lloyd's managing agent and a Lloyd's corporate member can be declared and paid provided the relevant company has sufficient profits available for distribution.

By entering into a membership agreement with Lloyd's, RenaissanceRe CCL has undertaken to comply with all Lloyd's bye-laws and regulations as well as the provisions of the Lloyd's Acts and the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000, as amended by the Financial Services Act 2012 (the "FSMA"), in particular that are applicable to it.

**Capital Requirements.** Capital is supplied on the basis of an annual venture, with continuing support from capital providers and the members of Lloyd's, and requires affirmation each year. The underwriting capacity of a member of Lloyd's must be supported by providing a deposit (referred to as "Funds at Lloyd's") in the form of cash, securities or letters of credit in an amount determined under the Individual Capital Adequacy regime of the U.K.'s Prudential Regulation Authority (the "PRA"). The amount of such deposit is calculated for each member through the completion of an annual capital adequacy exercise. Under these requirements, Lloyd's must demonstrate that each member has sufficient assets to meet its underwriting liabilities plus a required solvency margin.

**Restrictions.** A Reinsurance to Close ("RITC") generally is put in place after the third year of operations of a syndicate year of account. On successful conclusion of a RITC, any profit from the syndicate's operations for that year of account can be remitted by the managing agent to the syndicate's members. If the syndicate's managing agency concludes that an appropriate RITC cannot be determined or negotiated on commercially acceptable terms in respect of a particular underwriting year, it must determine that the underwriting year remain open and be placed into run-off. During this period, there cannot be a release of the Funds at Lloyd's of a member of that syndicate without the consent of Lloyd's and such consent will only be considered where the member has surplus Funds at Lloyd's over and above the capital requirement.

The financial security of the Lloyd's market is regularly assessed by three independent rating agencies (A.M. Best, S&P and Fitch). A satisfactory credit rating issued by an accredited rating agency is necessary for Lloyd's syndicates to be able to trade in certain classes of business at current levels. RSML and RenaissanceRe CCL would be adversely affected if Lloyd's current ratings were downgraded.

**Intervention Powers.** The Council of Lloyd's has wide discretionary powers to regulate members' underwriting at Lloyd's. It may, for instance, change the basis on which syndicate expenses are allocated or vary the Funds at Lloyd's requirements or the investment criteria applicable to the provision of Funds at Lloyd's. Exercising any of these powers might affect the return on the corporate member's participation in a given underwriting year. If a member of Lloyd's is unable to pay its debts to policyholders, the member may obtain financial assistance from the Lloyd's Central Fund, which in many respects acts as an equivalent to a state guaranty fund in the U.S. If Lloyd's determines that the Central Fund needs to be increased, it has the power to assess premium levies on current Lloyd's members. The Council of Lloyd's has discretion to call or assess up to 3% of a member's underwriting capacity in any one year as a Central Fund contribution.





#### PRA and FCA Regulation

The PRA currently has ultimate responsibility for the prudential supervision of the Lloyd's market and the Financial Conduct Authority (the "FCA") has responsibility for market conduct regulation. Both the PRA and FCA have substantial powers of intervention in relation to Lloyd's managing agents, such as RSML, including the power to remove an agent's authorization to manage Lloyd's syndicates. In addition, each year the PRA requires Lloyd's to satisfy an annual solvency test which measures whether Lloyd's has sufficient assets in the aggregate to meet all outstanding liabilities of its members, both current and run-off. If Lloyd's fails this test, the PRA may require the entire Lloyd's market to cease underwriting or individual Lloyd's members may be required to cease or reduce their underwriting.

Lloyd's as a whole is authorized by the PRA and regulated by both the FCA and PRA. Lloyd's is required to implement certain rules prescribed by the PRA and by the FCA; such rules are to be implemented by Lloyd's pursuant to its powers under the Lloyd's Act 1982 relating to the operation of the Lloyd's market. Lloyd's prescribes, in respect of its managing agents and corporate members, certain minimum standards relating to their management and control, solvency and various other requirements. The PRA and FCA directly monitor Lloyd's managing agents' compliance with the systems and controls prescribed by Lloyd's. If it appears to either the PRA or the FCA that either Lloyd's is not fulfilling its delegated regulatory responsibilities or that managing agents are not complying with the applicable regulatory rules and guidance, the PRA or the FCA may intervene at their discretion. Future regulatory changes or rulings by the PRA or FCA could impact RSML's business strategy or financial assumptions, possibly resulting in an adverse effect on RSML's financial condition and operating results.

**Change of Control.** The PRA and the FCA currently regulate the acquisition of control of any Lloyd's managing agent which is authorized under the FSMA. Any company or individual that, together with its or his associates, directly or indirectly acquires 10% or more of the shares in a Lloyd's managing agent or its parent company, or is entitled to exercise or control the exercise of 10% or more of the voting power in such Lloyd's managing agent or its parent company, would be considered to have acquired control for the purposes of the relevant legislation, as would a person who had significant influence over the management of such Lloyd's managing agent or its parent company by virtue of his shareholding or voting power in either. A purchaser of 10% or more of RenaissanceRe's common shares or voting power would therefore be considered to have acquired control of RSML. Under the FSMA, any person or entity proposing to acquire control over a Lloyd's managing agent must give prior notification to the PRA and the FCA of his or the entity's intention to do so. The PRA and FCA would then have sixty working days to consider the application to acquire control. Failure to make the relevant prior application could result in action being taken against RSML by the PRA or the FCA of both of them. Lloyd's approval is also required before any person can acquire control (using the same definition as for the PRA and FCA) of a Lloyd's managing agent or Lloyd's corporate member.

**Other Applicable Laws.** Lloyd's worldwide insurance and reinsurance business is subject to various regulations, laws, treaties and other applicable policies of the EU, as well as of each nation, state and locality in which it operates. Material changes in governmental requirements and laws could have an adverse effect on Lloyd's and its member companies, including RSML and RenaissanceRe CCL.

#### Solvency II

Solvency II was adopted by the European Parliament in April of 2009. The timing for the implementation of Solvency II in European Member States by the European Commission ("EC"), previously scheduled for January 1, 2014, has been delayed so that a start date for full implementation of Solvency II of January 1, 2016 seems increasingly likely, although as yet still not certain. In the meantime, the Lloyd's Solvency II implementation plans are designed to facilitate a January 1, 2016 implementation date, however Lloyd's has noted to its managing agents that this is a planning assumption only and is subject to change as further clarification from the EC emerges. Upon its adoption, Solvency II will replace the current solvency requirements and implement a risk-based approach to insurance regulation. Its principal goals are to improve the correlation between capital and risk, effect group supervision of insurance and reinsurance affiliates, implement a uniform capital adequacy structure for (re)insurers across the EU Member States, establish consistent corporate governance standards for insurance and reinsurance companies, and establish transparency through standard reporting of insurance operations. Under Solvency II, an insurer's or reinsurer's

capital adequacy in relation to various insurance and business risks may be measured with

33



an internal model developed by the insurer or reinsurer and approved for use by the Member State's regulator or pursuant to a standard formula developed by the EC. Lloyd's requires all managing agents to develop internal models for the syndicate they manage. The 2014 capital requirement for Syndicate 1458 was based on RSML's internal model in line with this process. We continue to monitor the ongoing legislative and regulatory steps in relation to the adoption of Solvency II.

#### Singapore Regulation

A branch of Renaissance Reinsurance based in the Republic of Singapore (the "Singapore Branch") received a license to carry on insurance business as a general reinsurer on October 28, 2013. The activities of the Singapore Branch are primarily regulated by the Monetary Authority of Singapore pursuant to Singapore's Insurance Act. Additionally, the Singapore Branch is regulated by the Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority (the "ACRA") as a foreign company pursuant to Singapore's Companies Act. Prior to the establishment of the Singapore Branch, Renaissance Reinsurance had maintained a representative office in Singapore since April 2012. In addition, an application for a branch of DaVinci in the Republic of Singapore to carry on insurance business as a general reinsurer is under review by the Monetary Authority of Singapore and approval is anticipated in early 2014.

Renaissance Services of Asia Pte. Ltd., our Singapore-based service company, was established as a private company limited by shares in Singapore on March 15, 2012 and is registered with the ACRA and subject to Singapore's Companies Act.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE CHANGE MATTERS

Our principal coverages and services relate to natural disasters and catastrophes, such as earthquakes and hurricanes. We believe, and believe the consensus view of current scientific studies substantiates, that changes in climate conditions, primarily global temperatures and expected sea levels are likely to increase the severity, and possibly the frequency, of weather related natural disasters and catastrophes relative to the historical experience over the past 100 years. Coupled with currently projected demographic trends in catastrophe-exposed regions, we currently estimate that this expected increase in severe weather, such as tropical cyclone intensity, over coming periods will increase the average economic value of expected losses, increase the number of people exposed per year to natural disasters and in general exacerbate disaster risk, including risks to infrastructure, global supply chains and agricultural production. Accordingly, we currently estimate that these trends will increase the risk of claims arising from our property and casualty lines of business, particularly with respect to properties located in coastal areas, among others. While a substantial portion of our coverages may be adversely impacted by climate change, we have taken certain measures, to the extent permissible by law and prevailing market conditions, to mitigate against such losses by giving consideration to these risks in our underwriting decisions. We seek to continuously monitor and adjust, as we believe appropriate, our risk management models to reflect our judgment of how to interpret current developments and information such as the studies referred to above. However, it is possible that, even after these assessments, we will have underestimated the frequency or severity of tropical cyclones or of other catastrophes. To the extent broad environmental factors, exacerbated by climate change or otherwise, lead to increases in insured losses, particularly if those losses exceed expectations and the prior estimates of market participants, regulators or other stakeholders, the markets and clients we serve may be disrupted and adversely impacted, and we may be adversely affected, directly or indirectly. Further, certain of our investments such as catastrophe-linked securities and property catastrophe managed joint ventures related to hurricane coverage, could also be adversely impacted by climate change.

An increasing number of federal, state, local and foreign government requirements and international agreements apply to environmental and climate change, in particular by seeking to limit or penalize the discharge of materials such as greenhouse gas ("GHG") into the environment or otherwise relating to the protection of the environment. Although our operations are characterized by a small number of professional office facilities, and we have not been directly, materially impacted by these changes to date, it is our policy to monitor and seek to ensure compliance with these requirements, as applicable. We believe that, as a general matter, our policies, practices and procedures are properly designed to identify and manage environmental and climate-related risks, particularly the risks of potential financial liability in connection with our reinsurance, insurance and trading businesses. However, we believe that some risk of environmental







damage is inherent in respect of any commercial operation, and may increase for us if our business continues to expand and diversify by business we write or investments we make. Certain of our investments may also be adversely affected by climate change and increased governmental regulation of, or international agreements pertaining to, GHG emissions. Moreover, our evaluation may be flawed or may reflect inaccurate or incomplete information, and it is possible our exposure to climate change or other environmental risks is greater than we have currently estimated. At this time, we do not believe that any existing or currently pending climate change legislation, regulation, or international treaty or accord known to us would be reasonably likely to have a material effect in the foreseeable future on our business or on our results of operations, capital expenditures or financial position. However, it is possible that future developments, such as increasingly strict environmental laws and standards and enforcement policies, could give rise to more severe exposure, more costly compliance requirements, or otherwise bring into question our current policies and practices. In addition, it is possible that state insurance regulation could impact the ability of our insurance and reinsurance customers, or of the Company, to manage property exposures in areas vulnerable to significant climate-driven losses. For example, if our insurance and reinsurance customers or operations are unable to utilize actuarially sound, risk-based pricing, to modify policy terms if necessary to reflect changes in the underlying risks, or to otherwise manage exposures appropriately to reflect the risk of increased loss from both large scale natural catastrophes and smaller scale weather events, our markets, customers, or our own financial results may all be adversely affected. We will continue to monitor emerging developments in this area.

#### GLOSSARY OF SELECTED INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE TERMS

Accident year	Year of occurrence of a loss. Claim payments and reserves for claims and claim expenses are allocated to the year in which the loss occurred for losses occurring contracts and in the year the loss was reported for claims made contracts.
Acquisition expenses	The aggregate expenses incurred by a company for acquiring new business, including commissions, underwriting expenses, premium taxes and administrative expenses.
Additional case reserves	Additional case reserves represent management's estimate of reserves for claims and claim expenses that are allocated to specific contracts, less paid and reported losses by the client.
Attachment point	The dollar amount of loss (per occurrence or in the aggregate, as the case may be) above which excess of loss reinsurance becomes operative.
Bordereau	A report providing premium or loss data with respect to identified specific risks. This report is periodically furnished to a reinsurer by the ceding insurers or reinsurers.
Bound	A (re)insurance policy is considered bound, and the (re)insurer responsible for the risks of the policy, when both parties agree to the terms and conditions set forth in the policy.
Broker	An intermediary who negotiates contracts of insurance or reinsurance, receiving a commission for placement and other services rendered, between (1) a policy holder and a primary insurer, on behalf of the insured party, (2) a primary insurer and reinsurer, on behalf of the primary insurer, or (3) a reinsurer and a retrocessionaire, on behalf of the reinsurer.
Capacity	The percentage of surplus, or the dollar amount of exposure, that an insurer or reinsurer is willing or able to place at risk. Capacity may apply to a single risk, a program, a line of business or an entire book of business. Capacity may be constrained by legal restrictions, corporate restrictions or indirect restrictions.



Case reserves	Loss reserves, established with respect to specific, individual reported claims.
Casualty insurance or reinsurance	Insurance or reinsurance that is primarily concerned with the losses caused by injuries to third persons and their property (in other words, persons other than the policyholder) and the legal liability imposed on the insured resulting there from. Also referred to as liability insurance.
Catastrophe	A severe loss, typically involving multiple claimants. Common perils include earthquakes, hurricanes, hailstorms, severe winter weather, floods, fires, tornadoes, explosions and other natural or man-made disasters. Catastrophe losses may also arise from acts of war, acts of terrorism and political instability.
Catastrophe excess of loss reinsurance	A form of excess of loss reinsurance that, subject to a specified limit, indemnifies the ceding company for the amount of loss in excess of a specified retention with respect to an accumulation of losses resulting from a "catastrophe."
Catastrophe-linked securities; cat-linked securities	Cat-linked securities are generally privately placed fixed income securities where all or a portion of the repayment of the principal is linked to catastrophic events. This includes securities where the repayment is linked to the occurrence and/or size of, for example, one or more hurricanes or earthquakes, or insured industry losses associated with these catastrophic events.
Cede; cedant; ceding company	When a party reinsures its liability with another, it "cedes" business and is referred to as the "cedant" or "ceding company."
Claim	Request by an insured or reinsured for indemnification by an insurance company or a reinsurance company for losses incurred from an insured peril or event.
Claims made contracts	Contracts that cover claims for losses occurring during a specified period that are reported during the term of the contract.
Claims and claim expense ratio, net	The ratio of net claims and claim expenses to net premiums earned determined in accordance with either statutory accounting principles or GAAP.
Claim reserves	Liabilities established by insurers and reinsurers to reflect the estimated costs of claim payments and the related expenses that the insurer or reinsurer will ultimately be required to pay in respect of insurance or reinsurance policies it has issued. Claims reserves consist of case reserves, established with respect to individual reported claims, additional case reserves and "IBNR" reserves. For reinsurers, loss expense reserves are generally not significant because substantially all of the loss expenses associated with particular claims are incurred by the primary insurer and reported to reinsurers as losses.
Combined ratio	The combined ratio is the sum of the net claims and claim expense ratio and the underwriting expense ratio. A combined ratio below 100% generally indicates profitable underwriting prior to the consideration of investment income. A combined ratio over 100% generally indicates unprofitable underwriting prior to the consideration of investment income.
Decadal	Refers to events occurring over a 10-year period, such as an oscillation whose period is roughly 10 years.



Excess and surplus lines reinsurance	Any type of coverage that cannot be placed with an insurer admitted to do business in a certain jurisdiction. Risks placed in excess and surplus lines markets are often substandard as respects adverse loss experience, unusual, or unable to be placed in conventional markets due to a shortage of capacity. Reinsurance or insurance that indemnifies the reinsured or insured against all or a specified portion of losses on underlying insurance policies in excess of a specified amount, which is called a “level” or “retention.” Also known as non-proportional reinsurance.
Excess of loss	Excess of loss reinsurance is written in layers. A reinsurer or group of reinsurers accepts a layer of coverage up to a specified amount. The total coverage purchased by the cedant is referred to as a “program” and will typically be placed with predetermined reinsurers in pre-negotiated layers. Any liability exceeding the outer limit of the program reverts to the ceding company, which also bears the credit risk of a reinsurer’s insolvency.
Exclusions	Those risk, perils, or classes of insurance with respect to which the reinsurer will not pay loss or provide reinsurance, notwithstanding the other terms and conditions of reinsurance.
Expense override	An amount paid to a ceding company in addition to the acquisition cost to compensate for overhead expenses.
Frequency	The number of claims occurring during a given coverage period.
Funds at Lloyd’s	Funds of an approved form that are lodged and held in trust at Lloyd’s as security for a member’s underwriting activities. They comprise the members’ deposit, personal reserve fund and special reserve fund and may be drawn down in the event that the member’s syndicate level premium trust funds are insufficient to cover its liabilities. The amount of the deposit is related to the member’s premium income limit and also the nature of the underwriting account.
Generally Accepted Accounting Principles in the United States (“GAAP”)	Accounting principles as set forth in opinions of the Accounting Principles Board of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and/or statements of the Financial Accounting Standards Board and/or their respective successors and which are applicable in the circumstances as of the date in question.
Gross premiums written	Total premiums for insurance written and assumed reinsurance during a given period.
Incurred but not reported (“IBNR”)	Reserves for estimated losses that have been incurred by insureds and reinsureds but not yet reported to the insurer or reinsurer, including unknown future developments on losses that are known to the insurer or reinsurer.
Insurance-linked securities	Financial instruments whose values are driven by (re)insurance loss events. For the Company, insurance-linked securities are generally linked to property losses due to natural catastrophes.
International Financial Reporting Standards (“IFRS”)	Accounting principles, standards and interpretations as set forth in opinions of the International Accounting Standards Board which are applicable in the circumstances as of the date in question.
Layer	The interval between the retention or attachment point and the maximum limit of indemnity for which a reinsurer is responsible.
Line	The amount of excess of loss reinsurance protection provided to an insurer or another reinsurer, often referred to as limit.



Line of business	The general classification of insurance written by insurers and reinsurers, e.g. fire, allied lines, homeowners and surety, among others.
Lloyd's	Depending on the context, this term may refer to (a) the society of individual and corporate underwriting members that insure and reinsure risks as members of one or more syndicates (i.e., Lloyd's is not an insurance company); (b) the underwriting room in the Lloyd's building in which managing agents underwrite insurance and reinsurance on behalf of their syndicate members (in this sense Lloyd's should be understood as a market place); or (c) the Corporation of Lloyd's which regulates and provides support services to the Lloyd's market.
Loss; losses	An occurrence that is the basis for submission and/or payment of a claim. Whether losses are covered, limited or excluded from coverage is dependent on the terms of the policy.
Loss reserve	For an individual loss, an estimate of the amount the insurer expects to pay for the reported claim. For total losses, estimates of expected payments for reported and unreported claims. These may include amounts for claims expenses.
Managing agent	An underwriting agent which has permission from Lloyd's to manage a syndicate and carry on underwriting and other functions for a member.
Net claims and claim expenses	The expenses of settling claims, net of recoveries, including legal and other fees and the portion of general expenses allocated to claim settlement costs (also known as claim adjustment expenses or loss adjustment expenses) plus losses incurred with respect to net claims.
Net claims and claim expense ratio	Net claims and claim expenses incurred expressed as a percentage of net earned premiums.
Net premiums earned	The portion of net premiums written during or prior to a given period that was actually recognized as income during such period.
Net premiums written	Gross premiums written for a given period less premiums ceded to reinsurers and retrocessionaires during such period.
Non-proportional reinsurance	See "Excess of loss."
Perils	This term refers to the causes of possible loss in the property field, such as fire, windstorm, collision, hail, etc. In the casualty field, the term "hazard" is more frequently used.
Profit commission	A provision found in some reinsurance agreements that provides for profit sharing. Parties agree to a formula for calculating profit, an allowance for the reinsurer's expenses, and the cedant's share of such profit after expenses.
Property insurance or reinsurance	Insurance or reinsurance that provides coverage to a person with an insurable interest in tangible property for that person's property loss, damage or loss of use.
Property per risk	Reinsurance on a treaty basis of individual property risks insured by a ceding company.





Proportional reinsurance	A generic term describing all forms of reinsurance in which the reinsurer shares a proportional part of the original premiums and losses of the reinsured. (Also known as pro-rata reinsurance, quota share reinsurance or participating reinsurance.) In proportional reinsurance, the reinsurer generally pays the ceding company a ceding commission. The ceding commission generally is based on the ceding company's cost of acquiring the business being reinsured (including commissions, premium taxes, assessments and miscellaneous administrative expense) and also may include a profit factor. See also "Quota Share Reinsurance".
Quota share reinsurance	A form of proportional reinsurance in which the reinsurer assumes an agreed percentage of each insurance policy being reinsured and shares all premiums and losses according with the reinsured. See also "Proportional Reinsurance".
Reinstatement premium	The premium charged for the restoration of the reinsurance limit of a catastrophe contract to its full amount after payment by the reinsurer of losses as a result of an occurrence.
Reinsurance	An arrangement in which an insurance company, the reinsurer, agrees to indemnify another insurance or reinsurance company, the ceding company, against all or a portion of the insurance or reinsurance risks underwritten by the ceding company under one or more policies. Reinsurance can provide a ceding company with several benefits, including a reduction in net liability on insurances and catastrophe protection from large or multiple losses. Reinsurance also provides a ceding company with additional underwriting capacity by permitting it to accept larger risks and write more business than would be possible without an equivalent increase in capital and surplus, and facilitates the maintenance of acceptable financial ratios by the ceding company. Reinsurance does not legally discharge the primary insurer from its liability with respect to its obligations to the insured.
Reinsurance to Close	Also referred to as a RITC, it is a contract to transfer the responsibility for discharging all the liabilities that attach to one year of account of a syndicate into a later year of account of the same or different syndicate in return for a premium.
Retention	The amount or portion of risk that an insurer retains for its own account. Losses in excess of the retention level are paid by the reinsurer. In proportional treaties, the retention may be a percentage of the original policy's limit. In excess of loss business, the retention is a dollar amount of loss, a loss ratio or a percentage.
Retrocedant	A reinsurer who cedes all or a portion of its assumed insurance to another reinsurer.
Retrocessional reinsurance; Retrocessionaire	A transaction whereby a reinsurer cedes to another reinsurer, the retrocessionaire, all or part of the reinsurance that the first reinsurer has assumed. Retrocessional reinsurance does not legally discharge the ceding reinsurer from its liability with respect to its obligations to the reinsured. Reinsurance companies cede risks to retrocessionaires for reasons similar to those that cause primary insurers to purchase reinsurance: to reduce net liability on insurances, to protect against catastrophic losses, to stabilize financial ratios and to obtain additional underwriting capacity.
Risks	A term used to denote the physical units of property at risk or the object of insurance protection that are not perils or hazards. Also defined as chance of loss or uncertainty of loss.
Risks attaching contracts	Contracts that cover claims that arise on underlying insurance policies that incept during the term of the reinsurance contract.





Solvency II	A proposed set of regulatory requirements that would codify and harmonize the EU insurance and reinsurance regulation. Among other things, these requirements would impact the amount of capital that EU insurance and reinsurance companies would be required to hold. Solvency II was scheduled to come into effect on January 1, 2014, however this is expected to be delayed until at least January 1, 2016.
Specialty lines	Lines of insurance and reinsurance that provide coverage for risks that are often unusual or difficult to place and do not fit the underwriting criteria of standard commercial products carriers.
Statutory accounting principles	Recording transactions and preparing financial statements in accordance with the rules and procedures prescribed or permitted by Bermuda, U.S. state insurance regulatory authorities including the NAIC and/or in accordance with Lloyd's specific principles, all of which generally reflect a liquidating, rather than going concern, concept of accounting.
Stop loss	A form of reinsurance under which the reinsurer pays some or all of a cedant's aggregate retained losses in excess of a predetermined dollar amount or in excess of a percentage of premium.
Submission	An unprocessed application for (i) insurance coverage forwarded to a primary insurer by a prospective policyholder or by a broker on behalf of such prospective policyholder, (ii) reinsurance coverage forwarded to a reinsurer by a prospective ceding insurer or by a broker or intermediary on behalf of such prospective ceding insurer or (iii) retrocessional coverage forwarded to a retrocessionaire by a prospective ceding reinsurer or by a broker or intermediary on behalf of such prospective ceding reinsurer.
Syndicate	A member or group of members underwriting (re)insurance business at Lloyd's through the agency of a managing agent or substitute agent to which a syndicate number is assigned.
Treaty	A reinsurance agreement covering a book or class of business that is automatically accepted on a bulk basis by a reinsurer. A treaty contains common contract terms along with a specific risk definition, data on limit and retention, and provisions for premium and duration.
Underwriting	The insurer's or reinsurer's process of reviewing applications submitted for insurance coverage, deciding whether to accept all or part of the coverage requested and determining the applicable premiums.
Underwriting capacity	The maximum amount that an insurance company can underwrite. The limit is generally determined by a company's retained earnings and investment capital. Reinsurance serves to increase a company's underwriting capacity by reducing its exposure from particular risks.
Underwriting expense ratio	The ratio of the sum of the acquisition expenses and operational expenses to net premiums earned.
Underwriting expenses	The aggregate of policy acquisition costs, including commissions, and the portion of administrative, general and other expenses attributable to underwriting operations.
Unearned premium	The portion of premiums written representing the unexpired portions of the policies or contracts that the insurer or reinsurer has on its books as of a certain date.



#### AVAILABLE INFORMATION

We maintain a website at <http://www.renre.com>. The information on our website is not incorporated by reference in this Form 10-K.

We make available, free of charge through our website, our Annual Reports on Form 10-K, Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, Current Reports on Form 8-K and amendments to those reports filed or furnished pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act as soon as reasonably practicable after we electronically file such material with, or furnish such material to, the SEC. We also make available, free of charge from our website, our Audit Committee Charter, Compensation and Corporate Governance Committee Charter, Corporate Governance Guidelines, and Code of Ethics. Such information is also available in print for any shareholder who sends a request to RenaissanceRe Holdings Ltd., Attn: Office of the Corporate Secretary, P.O. Box HM 2527, Hamilton, HMGX, Bermuda. Reports filed with the SEC may also be viewed or obtained at the SEC Public Reference Room at 100 F Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20549. Information on the operation of the SEC Public Reference Room may be obtained by calling the SEC at 1-800-SEC-0330. The SEC maintains an internet site that contains reports, proxy and information statements, and other information regarding issuers, including the Company, that file electronically with the SEC. The address of the SEC's website is <http://www.sec.gov>.

#### ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS

Factors that could cause our actual results to differ materially from those in the forward-looking statements contained in this Form 10-K and other documents we file with the SEC include the following:

##### Risks Related to Our Company

Our exposure to catastrophic events and other exposures that we cover could cause our financial results to vary significantly from one period to the next.

Our largest product based on total gross premiums written is property catastrophe reinsurance. We also sell lines of specialty reinsurance products and insurance products that are exposed to catastrophe risk. We therefore have a large overall exposure to natural and man-made disasters, such as earthquakes, hurricanes, tsunamis, winter storms, freezes, floods, fires, tornadoes, hailstorms, drought and other natural or man-made disasters, such as acts of terrorism. Our relative exposure to catastrophe risk has recently increased, including as a result of the sale of substantially all of our U.S.-based insurance operations in early 2011 and our sale of REAL in October 2013, which diminished the diversification of our exposure to non-catastrophe perils to a degree. As a result, our operating results have historically been, and we expect will continue to be, significantly affected by loss events of low frequency and high severity. We expect claims from catastrophic events to cause substantial volatility in our financial results for any fiscal quarter or year; moreover, catastrophic claims could adversely affect our financial condition, results of operations and cash flows. Our ability to write new business could also be affected. We believe that factors including increases in the value and geographic concentration of insured property, particularly along coastal regions, the increasing risk of extreme weather events reflecting changes in climate, ocean temperatures and sea levels, and the effects of inflation may continue to increase the severity of claims from catastrophic events in the future.

From time to time, we expect to have greater exposures in one or more specific geographic areas than our overall share of the worldwide market would otherwise suggest. Accordingly, when and if catastrophes occur in these areas, we may experience relatively more severe net negative impacts from such events than our competitors. In particular, we have historically had a relatively large percentage of our coverage exposures concentrated in the U.S. southeast, and may develop other significant exposures in catastrophe-exposed zones in the future.

Our claims and claim expense reserves are subject to inherent uncertainties.

Our claims and claim expense reserves reflect our estimates, using actuarial and statistical projections at a given point in time, of our expectations of the ultimate settlement and administration costs of claims incurred. Although we use actuarial and computer models as well as historical reinsurance and insurance industry loss statistics, we also rely heavily on management's experience and judgment to assist in the establishment of appropriate claims and claim expense reserves. However, because of the many





assumptions and estimates involved in establishing reserves, the reserving process is inherently uncertain. Our estimates and judgments are based on numerous factors, and may be revised as additional experience and other data become available and are reviewed, as new or improved methodologies are developed, as loss trends and claims inflation impact future payments, or as current laws or interpretations thereof change.

Our specialty reinsurance operations are expected to produce claims which at times can only be resolved through lengthy and unpredictable litigation or other dispute resolution processes. The measures required to resolve such claims, including the adjudication process, present different and potentially more varied reserve challenges than property losses (which, on the whole, tend to be reported comparatively more promptly and to be settled within a relatively shorter period of time, although every catastrophic event is comprised of a unique set of circumstances). Actual net claims and claim expenses paid and reported may deviate, perhaps materially, from the reserve estimates reflected in our financial statements.

We expect that some of our assumptions or estimates will prove to be inaccurate, and that our actual net claims and claim expenses paid and reported will differ, perhaps materially, from the reserve estimates reflected in our financial statements. To the extent that our actual claims and claim expenses exceed our expectations, we would be required to increase claims and claim expense reserves. This would reduce our net income by a corresponding amount in the period in which the deficiency is identified. To the extent that our actual claims and claim expenses are lower than our expectations, we would be required to decrease claims and claim expense reserves and this would increase our net income.

Estimates of losses are based on, among other things, a review of potentially exposed contracts, information reported by and discussions with counterparties, and our estimate of losses related to those contracts and are subject to change as more information is reported and becomes available.

As an example, our estimates of losses from catastrophic events are based on factors including currently available information derived from claims information from certain customers and brokers, industry assessments of losses from the events, proprietary models, and the terms and conditions of our contracts. Due to the magnitude and unusual complexity of the legal and claims issues relating to these events, particularly Storm Sandy, the Thailand Floods, and the major earthquakes which occurred in 2011 and 2010, meaningful uncertainty remains regarding total covered losses for the insurance industry and, accordingly, several of the key assumptions underlying our loss estimates. In addition, actual losses from these events may increase if our reinsurers or other obligors fail to meet their obligations to us. Our actual losses from these events will likely vary, perhaps materially, from these current estimates due to the inherent uncertainties in reserving for such losses, including the nature of the available information, the potential inaccuracies and inadequacies in the data provided by customers and brokers, the potential lengthy claims development period, the inherent uncertainty of modeling techniques and the application of such techniques, the effects of any demand surge on claims activity and complex coverage and other legal issues.

As described in more detail herein, we have made substantial investments to develop proprietary analytic and modeling capabilities to facilitate our underwriting, risk management, capital modeling and allocation, and risk assessments relating to the risks we assume. See “Part I, Item 1. Business, Underwriting and Enterprise Risk Management.” These models and other tools help us to manage our risks, understand our capital utilization and risk aggregation, inform management and other stakeholders of capital requirements and seek to improve the risk/return profile or optimize the efficiency of the amount of capital we apply to cover the risks in the individual contracts we sell and in our portfolio as a whole. However, given the inherent uncertainty of modeling techniques and the application of such techniques, the possibility of human or systems error, the challenges inherent in consistent application of complex methodologies in a fluid business environment and other factors, our models, tools and databases may not accurately address the risks we currently cover or the emergence of new matters which might be deemed to impact certain of our coverages. Accordingly, our models may understate the exposures we are assuming and our results from operations and financial condition may be adversely impacted, perhaps significantly.

Conversely, our models may prove too conservative and contribute to factors which would impede our ability to grow in respect of new markets or perils or in connection with our current portfolio of coverages. In general, our techniques for evaluating catastrophe risk are much better developed than those for other classes of risk in businesses that we

have entered into more recently. Accordingly, these risks may increase if we succeed in

42



increasing the contributions from our Specialty Reinsurance segment or from our Lloyd's segment, either on an absolute or relative basis.

A decline in the ratings assigned to our financial strength may adversely impact our business, perhaps materially so. Third party rating agencies assess and rate the financial strength, claims paying ability and enterprise wide risk management of reinsurers and insurers, such as Renaissance Reinsurance, DaVinci, RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks, Top Layer Re and certain of our other operating subsidiaries and joint ventures. These ratings are based upon criteria established by the rating agencies. Periodically, the rating agencies evaluate us and may downgrade or withdraw their financial strength ratings in the future if we do not continue to meet the criteria of the ratings previously assigned to us. The financial strength and claims paying ratings assigned by rating agencies to reinsurance or insurance companies are based upon factors relevant to policyholders and are not directed toward the protection of investors.

These ratings are subject to periodic review and may be revised or revoked by the agencies which issue them. In addition, from time to time one or more rating agencies have effected changes in their capital models and rating methodologies, which have generally served to increase the amounts of capital required to support the ratings, and it is possible that legislation arising as a result of the financial crisis that preceded the recent period of relative economic weakness may result in additional changes. Negative ratings actions in the future could have an adverse effect on our ability to fully realize the market opportunities we currently expect to participate in. In addition, many reinsurance contracts contain provisions permitting cedants to cancel coverage pro-rata if the reinsurer is downgraded below a certain rating level. Whether a client would exercise this right would depend, among other factors, on the reason for such a downgrade, the extent of the downgrade, the prevailing market conditions and the pricing and availability of replacement reinsurance coverage. Therefore, in the event of a downgrade, it is not possible to predict in advance the extent to which this cancellation right would be exercised, if at all, or what effect such cancellations would have on our financial condition or future operations, but such effect potentially could be material. To date, we are not aware that we have experienced such a cancellation.

Our ability to compete with other reinsurers and insurers, and our results of operations, could be materially adversely affected by any such ratings downgrade. For example, following a ratings downgrade we might lose customers to more highly rated competitors or retain a lower share of the business of our customers.

For the current ratings of certain of our subsidiaries and joint ventures, refer to "Part II, Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, Liquidity and Capital Resources, Ratings" for additional information.

The emergence of matters which may impact certain of our coverages, such as the asserted trend toward potentially significant climate change, could cause us to underestimate our exposures and potentially adversely impact our financial results, perhaps significantly.

We use analytic and modeling capabilities that help us to assess the risk and return of each reinsurance contract in relation to our overall portfolio of reinsurance contracts. See "Part I, Item 1. Business, Underwriting and Enterprise Risk Management."

We believe, and believe the consensus view of current scientific studies substantiates, that changes in climate conditions, primarily increasing global temperatures and expected sea levels, are likely to increase the severity and possibly the frequency of natural catastrophes relative to the historical experience over the past 100 years. Coupled with currently projected demographic trends in catastrophe-exposed regions, we currently estimate that this expected increase in tropical cyclone intensity over coming periods may significantly increase the average economic value of expected losses, increase the number of people exposed per year to natural disasters and in general exacerbate disaster risk, including risks to infrastructure, global supply chains and agricultural production.

Accordingly, we currently estimate that these trends may increase claims under our property and casualty lines of business, particularly with respect to properties located in coastal and flood-exposed areas, among others. While we believe a substantial portion of our insureds may be adversely impacted by climate change, we have taken certain measures, to the extent permissible by law and prevailing market conditions, to mitigate against such losses by giving consideration to these risks in our underwriting decisions. We continuously monitor and adjust, as we believe appropriate, our risk management models to reflect our





judgment of how to interpret current developments and information such as these studies. However, it is possible that, even after these assessments, we will have underestimated the scale of the risks, such as the frequency or severity of hurricanes or other catastrophes or may have failed to identify new or increased risks. To the extent broad environmental factors, exacerbated by climate change or otherwise, lead to increases in likely insured losses, particularly if those losses exceed expectations and the prior estimates of market participants, regulators or other stakeholders, the markets and clients we serve may be disrupted and adversely impacted, and we may be adversely affected, directly or indirectly. Further, certain of our investments such as insurance-linked securities and property catastrophe managed joint ventures related to hurricane coverage could also be adversely impacted by climate change. Emerging claim and coverage issues, or other litigation, could adversely affect us.

Unanticipated developments in the law as well as changes in social and environmental conditions could potentially result in unexpected claims for coverage under our insurance and reinsurance contracts. These developments and changes may adversely affect us, perhaps materially so. For example, we could be subject to developments that impose additional coverage obligations on us beyond our underwriting intent, or to increases in the number or size of claims to which we are subject. We believe our property catastrophe results have been adversely impacted over recent periods by increasing primary claims level fraud and abuses, as well as other forms of social inflation, and that these trends may continue, particularly in certain U.S. jurisdictions in which we focus, including Florida and Texas. With respect to our specialty reinsurance operations, these legal, social and environmental changes may not become apparent until some point in time after their occurrence. For example, we could be deemed liable for losses arising out of a matter, such as the potential for industry losses arising out of a pandemic illness that we had not anticipated or had attempted to contractually exclude. Moreover, irrespective of the clarity and inclusiveness of policy language, there can be no assurance that a court or arbitration panel will limit enforceability of policy language or not issue a ruling adverse to us. Our exposure to these uncertainties could be exacerbated by the increased willingness of some market participants to dispute insurance and reinsurance contract and policy wordings. Alternatively, potential efforts by us to exclude such exposures could, if successful, reduce the market's acceptance of our related products. The full effects of these and other unforeseen emerging claim and coverage issues are extremely hard to predict. As a result, the full extent of our liability under our coverages may not be known for many years after a contract is issued. We expect that our exposure to this uncertainty will grow as our "long-tail" casualty businesses grow, because in these lines claims can typically be made for many years, making them more susceptible to these trends than our traditional catastrophe business, which is typically more "short-tail." While we continually seek to improve the effectiveness of our contracts and claims capabilities, we may fail to mitigate our exposure to these growing uncertainties. We are also subject to indemnification obligations and unknown liabilities relating to businesses and assets that we have disposed; such liabilities may exceed our estimated exposures or otherwise result in a loss which could have a material adverse effect on us.

Because we depend on a few insurance and reinsurance brokers in our Catastrophe Reinsurance and Specialty Reinsurance segments for a preponderance of our revenue, loss of business provided by them could adversely affect us.

Our Catastrophe Reinsurance and Specialty Reinsurance markets insurance and reinsurance products worldwide exclusively through a limited number of insurance and reinsurance brokers. Three brokerage firms accounted for 88.2% of our aggregate Catastrophe Reinsurance and Specialty Reinsurance segments' gross premiums written for the year ended December 31, 2013 (2012 - 84.6%). Subsidiaries and affiliates of AON Benfield, Marsh Inc. and the Willis Group accounted for approximately 48.6%, 22.7% and 16.9%, respectively, of our aggregate Catastrophe Reinsurance and Specialty Reinsurance segments' gross premiums written in 2013 (2012 - 51.5%, 21.4% and 11.7%, respectively). As our business is heavily reliant on the use of brokers, the loss of a broker through a merger or other business combination could result in the loss of a substantial portion of our business which would have a material adverse effect on us. Our ability to market our products could decline as a result of any loss of the business provided by these brokers and it is possible that our premiums written would decrease. Further, due to the concentration of our brokers, our brokers may have increasing power to dictate the terms and conditions of our arrangements with them, which could have a negative impact on our business.







We are exposed to counterparty credit risk, including with respect to reinsurance brokers.

In accordance with industry practice, we pay virtually all amounts owed on claims under our policies to reinsurance brokers, and these brokers, in turn, pay these amounts over to the insurers that have reinsured a portion of their liabilities with us (we refer to these insurers as ceding insurers). Likewise, premiums due to us by ceding insurers are virtually all paid to brokers, who then pass such amounts on to us. In many jurisdictions, we have contractually agreed that if a broker were to fail to make such a payment to a ceding insurer, we would remain liable to the ceding insurer for the deficiency. Conversely, in many jurisdictions, when the ceding insurer pays premiums for these policies to reinsurance brokers for payment over to us, these premiums are considered to have been paid by the cedants and the ceding insurer will no longer be liable to us for those amounts, whether or not we have actually received the premiums. Consequently, in connection with the settlement of reinsurance balances, we assume a substantial degree of credit risk associated with brokers around the world.

We are also exposed to the credit risk of our customers, who, pursuant to their contracts with us, frequently pay us over time. Our premiums receivable at December 31, 2013 totaled \$474.1 million, and these amounts are generally not collateralized. At December 31, 2013, we had recorded \$101.0 million of reinsurance recoverables, net of a valuation allowance of \$1.7 million for uncollectible recoverables, a significant portion of which are not collateralized. We cannot assure you that such receivables or recoverables will ever be collected or that additional amounts will not be required to be written down in 2014 or future periods. To the extent our customers or retrocedants become unable to pay future premiums, we would be required to recognize a downward adjustment to our premiums receivable or reinsurance recoverables, as applicable, in our financial statements.

As a result of the recent period of relative economic weakness, our consolidated credit risk, reflecting our counterparty dealings with agents, brokers, customers, retrocessionaires, capital providers, parties associated with our investment portfolio, and others has increased, perhaps materially so.

Weakness in business and economic conditions generally or specifically in the principal markets in which we do business could adversely affect our business and operating results.

The U.S. and numerous other leading markets around the world continue to experience slow recoveries or more challenging economic conditions, and we believe meaningful risk remains of returned deterioration in economic conditions and of substantial and continuing financial market disruptions in certain large economies. While many governments, including the U.S. federal government, have taken substantial steps to stabilize economic conditions in an effort to increase liquidity and capital availability, if economic conditions should weaken, the business environment in our principal markets would be adversely affected, which accordingly could adversely affect demand for the products sold by us or our customers. In addition, adverse conditions of volatility in the U.S. and other securities markets may adversely affect our investment portfolio or the investment results of our clients, potentially impeding their operations or their capacity to invest in our products. Conditions in the global financial markets and economic and geopolitical conditions throughout the world are outside of our control and difficult to predict, being influenced by factors such as national and international political circumstances (including governmental instability, wars, terrorist acts or security operations), interest rates, market volatility, asset or market correlations, equity prices, availability of credit, inflation rates, economic uncertainty, changes in laws or regulation including as regards taxation, trade barriers, commodity prices, interest rates, currency exchange rates and controls. In addition, during an economic downturn we believe our consolidated credit risk, reflecting our counterparty dealings with agents, brokers, customers, retrocessionaires, capital providers and parties associated with our investment portfolio, among others, is likely to be increased.

U.S. taxing authorities could contend that one or more of our Bermuda subsidiaries are subject to U.S. corporate income tax, as a result of changes in law or regulations, or otherwise.

If the IRS were to contend successfully that one or more of our Bermuda subsidiaries is engaged in a trade or business in the U.S., such subsidiary would, to the extent not exempted from tax by the U.S.-Bermuda income tax treaty, be subject to U.S. corporate income tax on that portion of its net income treated as effectively connected with a U.S. trade or business, as well as the U.S. corporate branch profits tax. Although we would vigorously contest such an assertion, if we were ultimately held to be subject to taxation, our earnings would correspondingly decline.





In addition, benefits of the U.S.-Bermuda income tax treaty which may limit any such tax to income attributable to a permanent establishment maintained by one or more of our Bermuda subsidiaries in the U.S. are only available to any of such subsidiaries if more than 50% of its shares are beneficially owned, directly or indirectly, by individuals who are Bermuda residents or U.S. citizens or residents. Our Bermuda subsidiaries may not be able to continually satisfy such beneficial ownership test or be able to establish it to the satisfaction of the IRS. Finally, it is unclear whether the U.S.-Bermuda income tax treaty (assuming satisfaction of the beneficial ownership test) applies to income other than premium income, such as investment income.

Changes in U.S. tax law or regulations could increase the costs of our products and services or otherwise reduce our profitability.

Congress is reported to be considering legislation relating to the tax treatment of offshore insurance that would adversely affect reinsurance between affiliates and offshore insurance and reinsurance more generally. In past Congressional sessions, U.S. Rep. Richard Neal introduced one such proposal, H.R. 3424 (the "Neal Bill") which would have provided that foreign insurers and reinsurers would be capped in deducting reinsurance premiums ceded from U.S. units to offshore affiliates. The Obama Administration has included similar provisions in its formal budgetary proposals. We believe that passage of such legislation could adversely affect us, perhaps materially, depending on various factors, including the magnitude of our U.S.-based operations. We could also be adversely impacted if final legislation actually enacted, if any, differs from the proposed language previously introduced or described.

On February 7, 2013, U.S. Senator Bernard Sanders introduced legislation in the U.S. Senate entitled the "Corporate Tax Dodging Prevention Act". Similar legislation was also proposed in 2012, 2011 and 2010. If enacted, this legislation would, among other things, cause to be treated as a U.S. corporation for U.S. tax purposes generally, certain corporate entities if the "management and control" of such a corporation is, directly or indirectly, treated as occurring primarily within the U.S. The proposed legislation provides that a corporation will be so treated if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the corporation who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the corporation are located primarily within the U.S. To date, this legislation has not been approved by either the House of Representatives or the Senate. However, we can provide no assurance that this legislation or similar legislation will not ultimately be adopted. While we do not believe that the legislation would negatively impact us, it is possible that an adopted bill would include additional or expanded provisions which could negatively impact us, or that the interpretation or enforcement of the current proposal, if enacted, would be more expansive or adverse than we currently estimate.

A decline in our investment performance could reduce our profitability and hinder our ability to pay claims promptly in accordance with our strategy.

We have historically derived a meaningful portion of our income from our invested assets, which are comprised of, among other things, fixed maturity securities, such as bonds, asset-backed securities, mortgage-backed securities, equity securities and investments in bank loan funds, hedge funds and private equity partnerships. Accordingly, our financial results are subject to a variety of investment risks, including risks relating to general economic conditions, market volatility, interest rate fluctuations, foreign currency risk, liquidity risk and credit and default risk.

Additionally, with respect to certain of our investments, we are subject to pre-payment or reinvestment risk.

A failure to successfully execute our investment strategy could have a material adverse effect on our overall results. In the event of a significant or total loss in our investment portfolio, our ability to pay any claims promptly in accordance with our strategy could be adversely affected.

The market value of our fixed maturity investments is subject to fluctuation depending on changes in various factors, including prevailing interest rates and widening credit spreads.

Increases in interest rates could cause the market value of our investment portfolio to decrease, perhaps substantially. Conversely, a decline in interest rates could reduce our investment yield, which would reduce our overall profitability.

Interest rates are highly sensitive to many factors, including governmental monetary policies, domestic and international economic and political conditions and other factors beyond our control. Any measures we take that are intended to manage the risks of operating in a changing interest rate environment may not effectively mitigate such

interest rate sensitivity.

46



A portion of our investment portfolio is allocated to other classes of investments which we expect to have different risk characteristics than our investments in traditional fixed maturity securities and short term investments. These other classes of investments include equity securities and interests in alternative investment vehicles such as private equity partnerships, hedge funds, senior secured bank loan funds and catastrophe bonds, and are recorded on our consolidated balance sheet at fair value. For the aforementioned classes of investments, the fair value of the assets comprising the portfolio of an investment vehicle, and likewise the net asset value of the investment vehicle itself, are generally established on the basis of the valuation criteria applied by the investment managers as set forth in the governing documents of such investment vehicles. Such valuations may differ significantly from the values that would have been used had ready markets existed for the shares, partnership interests, notes or other securities representing interests in the relevant investment vehicles. Interests in many of the investment classes described above are subject to restrictions on redemptions and sales which are determined by the governing documents or otherwise by contract and limit our ability to liquidate these investments in the short term. These classes of investments expose us to market risks including interest rate risk, foreign currency risk, equity price risk and credit risk. The performance of these classes of investments is also dependent on the individual investment managers and the investment strategies. It is possible that the investment managers will leave and/or the investment strategies will become ineffective or that such managers will fail to follow our investment guidelines. Any of the foregoing could result in a material adverse change to our investment performance, and accordingly adversely affect our financial results.

In addition to the foregoing, we may from time to time re-evaluate our investment approach and guidelines and explore investment opportunities in respect of other asset classes not previously discussed above, including, without limitation, by expanding our relatively small portfolio of direct investments in the equity markets. Any such investments could expose us to systemic and price volatility risk, interest rate risk and other market risks. Any investment in equity securities carries with it inherent volatility and there can be no assurance that such an investment will prove profitable and we could, in fact, lose the value of our investment. Accordingly, any such investment could impact our financial results, perhaps materially, over both the short and the long term.

We may from time to time modify our business and strategic plan, and these changes could adversely affect us and our financial condition.

We regularly evaluate our business plans and strategies. These evaluations often result in changes to our business plans and initiatives, some of which may be material. Given the increasing importance of strategic execution in our industry, we are subject to increasing risks related to our ability to successfully implement our evolving plans and strategies, particularly as the pace of change in our industry continues to increase. Changing plans and strategies requires significant management time and effort, and may divert management's attention from our core and historically successful operations and competencies. Moreover, modifications we undertake to our operations may not be immediately reflected in our financial statements. Therefore, risks associated with implementing or changing our business strategies and initiatives, including risks related to developing or enhancing the operations, controls and other infrastructure necessary in respect of our more recent, new or proposed initiatives, may not have an impact on our publicly reported results until many years after implementation. The risk that we may fail to have the ability to carry out our business plans may have an adverse effect on our long-term results of operations and financial condition.

The loss of key senior members of management could adversely affect us.

Our success has depended, and will continue to depend, in substantial part upon our ability to attract and retain our senior officers. The loss of services of members of our senior management team in the future, and the uncertain transition of new members of our senior management team, as applicable, may strain our ability to execute our strategic initiatives. Given our reliance on a relatively small management team, the loss of one or more of our senior officers could adversely impact our business, by, for example, making it more difficult to retain customers, attract or maintain our capital support, or other needs of our business, which depend in part on the service of the departing officer. While we seek to engage in robust organizational development, we may encounter unforeseen, or fail to adequately address potential, difficulties associated with the transition of members of our senior management team for new or expanded roles necessary to execute our strategic and tactical plans, including in connection with our anticipated geographic diversification as well as those which may arise from the senior management transition we







announced during the second quarter of 2013. We do not currently maintain key man life insurance policies with respect to any of our employees.

In addition, our ability to execute our business strategy is dependent on our ability to attract and retain a staff of qualified underwriters and service personnel. The location of our global headquarters in Bermuda may impede our ability to recruit and retain highly skilled employees. Under Bermuda law, non-Bermudians (other than spouses of Bermudians, holders of Permanent Residents' Certificates and holders of Working Residents' Certificates) may not engage in any gainful occupation in Bermuda without a valid government work permit. Substantially all of our officers are working in Bermuda under work permits that will expire over the next three to five years. The Bermuda government could refuse to extend these work permits, which would adversely impact us. A work permit is issued with an expiry date (up to ten years) and no assurances can be given that any work permit will be issued or, if issued, renewed upon the expiration of the relevant term. If any of our senior officers or key contributors were not permitted to remain in Bermuda, or if we experience delays or failures to obtain permits for a number of our professional staff, our operations could be disrupted and our financial performance could be adversely affected as a result.

In late 2011, the Bermuda Parliament passed the Incentives for Job Makers Act 2011 (the "Job Makers Act"), which provides that a limited number of non-Bermudian executives of Bermuda companies may, subject to their and their company meeting the requirements under the Job Makers Act, apply for permission to reside and work in Bermuda exempt from the requirement for a work permit. At this time we cannot assure you that the Job Makers Act diminishes our risks of retaining and attracting senior executives to our Bermuda headquarters location.

Some of our investments are relatively illiquid and are in asset classes that may experience significant market valuation fluctuations.

Although we invest primarily in highly liquid securities in order to ensure our ability to pay valid claims in a prompt manner, we do hold certain investments subject to transfer restrictions, or that may lack liquidity, such as certain of our equity securities, investments in other ventures and alternative investments, which include, but are not limited to, private equity investments, hedge funds, bank loan fund investments, insurance-linked securities and certain high-yield debt securities. If we require significant amounts of cash on short notice in excess of our normal cash requirements or are required to post or return collateral in connection with our investment portfolio we may, be restricted from, have difficulty selling these investments in a timely manner, or be forced to sell them for less than we otherwise would have been able to realize, or both.

At times, the reported value of our relatively illiquid types of investments and of our high quality, generally more liquid asset classes, do not necessarily reflect the lowest current market price for the asset. If we were forced to sell certain of our assets in the current market, there can be no assurance that we will be able to sell them for the prices at which we have recorded them and we may be forced to sell them at significantly lower prices. Certain of our investments are held subject to contractual or regulatory transfer restrictions and may not be sold in a timely manner; thus, upon a sale we may not be able to recognize the current market price of these investments.

A reduction in market liquidity may make it difficult to value certain of our securities as trading becomes less frequent. As such, valuations may include assumptions or estimates that may be more susceptible to significant period-to-period changes which could have a material adverse effect on our consolidated results of operations or financial condition.

The determination of impairments taken on our investments, investments in other ventures, under equity method, goodwill and other intangible assets and loans is highly subjective and could materially impact our financial position or results of operations.

The determination of impairments taken varies by type of asset and is based upon our periodic evaluation and assessment of known and inherent risks associated with the respective asset class. Such evaluations and assessments are revised as conditions change and new information becomes available. Management updates its evaluations regularly and reflects impairments in operations as such evaluations are revised. There can be no assurance that our management has accurately assessed the level of impairments taken in our financial statements. Furthermore, additional impairments may need to be taken in the future, which could materially impact our financial position or results of operations. Historical trends may not be indicative of future impairments.





Retrocessional reinsurance may become unavailable on acceptable terms, or may not provide the coverage we intended to obtain.

As part of our risk management, we buy reinsurance for our own account. This type of insurance when purchased to protect reinsurance companies is known as “retrocessional reinsurance.” From time to time, market conditions have limited, and in some cases have prevented, insurers and reinsurers from obtaining reinsurance. Accordingly, we may not be able to obtain our desired amounts of retrocessional reinsurance. In addition, even if we are able to obtain such retrocessional reinsurance, we may not be able to negotiate terms as favorable to us as in the past. This could limit the amount of business we are willing to write, or decrease the protection available to us as a result of large loss events. When we purchase reinsurance or retrocessional reinsurance for our own account, the insolvency of any of our reinsurers, or inability or reluctance of any of our reinsurers to make timely payments to us under the terms of our reinsurance agreements could have a material adverse effect on us. Generally, we believe that the “willingness to pay” of some reinsurers and retrocessionaires is declining. This risk may be more significant to us at present than at many times in the past. Complex coverage issues or coverage disputes may impede our ability to collect amounts we believe we are owed. A large portion of our reinsurance protection is concentrated with a relatively small number of reinsurers. The risk of such concentration of retrocessional coverage may be increased by recent and future consolidation within the industry.

We may be adversely impacted by inflation.

We monitor the risk that the principal markets in which we operate could experience increased inflationary conditions, which would, among other things, cause loss costs to increase, and impact the performance of our investment portfolio. The onset, duration and severity of an inflationary period cannot be estimated with precision.

Our utilization of third parties to support our business exposes us to operational and financial risks.

With respect to our reinsurance operations, we do not separately evaluate each primary risk assumed under our reinsurance contracts and, accordingly, like other reinsurers, are heavily dependent on the original underwriting decisions made by our ceding companies. We are therefore subject to the risk that our customers may not have adequately evaluated the risks to be reinsured, or that the premiums ceded to us will not adequately compensate us for the risks we assume, perhaps materially so. We have recently increased, and are seeking to continue to increase, the absolute and, potentially, the relative amount of proportional coverages we offer, which will increase our aggregate exposure to risks of this nature.

Operational risks, including systems or human failures, are inherent in business, including ours.

We are subject to operational risks including fraud, employee errors, failure to document transactions properly or to obtain proper internal authorization, failure to comply with regulatory requirements or obligations under our agreements, failure of our service providers, such as investment custodians, actuaries, information technology providers, etc., to comply with our service agreements, or information technology failures. Losses from these risks may occur from time to time and may be significant.

We are exposed to risks in connection with our management of capital on behalf of investors in joint ventures or other entities we manage.

Our operating subsidiaries may owe certain legal duties and obligations to third party investors (including reporting obligations) and are subject to a variety of often complex laws and regulations relating to the management of third party capital. Compliance with some of these laws and regulations, all of which are subject to change, requires significant management time and attention. Although we seek to continually monitor our policies and procedures to attempt to ensure compliance, faulty judgments, simple errors or mistakes, or the failure of our personnel to adhere to established policies and procedures, could result in our failure to comply with applicable laws or regulations which could result in significant liabilities, penalties or other losses to the Company, and seriously harm our business and results of operations. In connection with our goal of matching well-structured risk with capital whose owners would find the risk-return trade-off attractive, we may invest capital in new and increasingly complex ventures in which we do not have a significant amount of experience, which may increase our exposure to legal, regulatory and reputational risks.







In addition to the foregoing, our third party capital providers may redeem their interests in our joint ventures, which could materially impact the financial condition of such joint ventures, and could in turn materially impact our financial condition and results of operations. Certain of our joint venture capital providers provide significant capital investment and other forms of capital support in respect of our joint ventures; the loss, or alternation, of any of this capital support could be detrimental to our financial condition and results of operations. Moreover, we can provide no assurance that we may be able to attract and raise additional third party capital for our existing joint ventures or for potential new joint ventures and therefore we may forego existing and/or potential attractive fee income and other income generating opportunities.

We may be adversely affected by foreign currency fluctuations.

Our functional currency is the U.S. dollar; however, as we expand geographically, an increasing portion of our premium is, and likely will be, written in currencies other than the U.S. dollar and a portion of our claims and claim expense reserves is also in non-U.S. dollar currencies. Moreover, we maintain a portion of our cash and investments in currencies other than the U.S. dollar. Although we generally seek to hedge significant non-U.S. dollar positions, we may, from time to time, experience losses resulting solely from fluctuations in the values of these foreign currencies, which could cause our consolidated earnings to decrease. In addition, failure to manage our foreign currency exposures could cause our results of operations to be more volatile. Adverse, unforeseen or rapidly shifting currency valuations in key markets for us, such as the Eurozone jurisdictions or Japan, may magnify these risks over time.

We may require additional capital in the future, which may not be available or only available on unfavorable terms.

We monitor our capital adequacy on a regular basis. The capital requirements of our business depend on many factors, including our ability to write new business successfully and to establish premium rates and reserves at levels sufficient to cover losses. Our ability to sell our reinsurance, insurance and other products is largely dependent upon the quality of our claims paying and financial strength ratings as evaluated by independent rating agencies. To the extent that our existing capital is insufficient to support our future operating requirements, we may need to raise additional funds through financings or limit our growth. While we do not currently expect to require additional external capital in the near term due to our strong current capital position, our operations are subject to the ever present potential for significant volatility in capital due to our exposure to potentially significant catastrophic events. Any further equity or debt financing, or capacity needed for letters of credit, if available at all, may be on terms that are unfavorable to us.

Our ability to raise such capital successfully would depend upon the facts and circumstances at the time, including our financial position and operating results, market conditions, and applicable legal issues. If we are unable to obtain adequate capital if and when needed, our business, results of operations and financial condition would be adversely affected. In addition, in the future we may be unable to raise new capital for our managed joint ventures and other private alternative investment vehicles, which would reduce our future fee income and market capacity.

The covenants in our debt agreements limit our financial and operational flexibility, which could have an adverse effect on our financial condition.

We have incurred indebtedness, and may incur additional indebtedness in the future. At December 31, 2013, we had an aggregate of \$249.4 million of indebtedness outstanding and \$584.4 million of outstanding letters of credit. In addition, we have in place committed debt facilities which would permit us to borrow, subject to their respective terms and conditions, up to another \$250.0 million. Our indebtedness primarily consists of publicly traded notes and letter of credit and revolving credit facilities. For more details on our indebtedness, see “Part II, Item 7. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, Capital Resources”.

The agreements covering our indebtedness, particularly our bank loans, contain covenants that limit our ability, among other things, to borrow money, make particular types of investments or other restricted payments, sell assets, merge or consolidate. These agreements also require us to maintain specific financial ratios. If we fail to comply with these covenants or meet these financial ratios, the lenders under our credit facilities could declare a default and demand immediate repayment of all amounts owed to them, cancel their commitments to lend or issue letters of credit, or both, and require us to pledge additional or a different type of collateral.



Regulatory challenges in the U.S. or elsewhere to our Bermuda operations' claims of exemption from certain insurance regulation could restrict our ability to operate, increase our costs, or otherwise adversely impact us.

Certain of our operating subsidiaries are not licensed or admitted in any jurisdiction except Bermuda, conduct business only from their principal offices in Bermuda and do not maintain offices in the U.S. The insurance and reinsurance regulatory framework continues to be subject to increased scrutiny in many jurisdictions, including the U.S. and Europe. If our Bermuda insurance or reinsurance operations become subject to the insurance laws of any state in the U.S., jurisdictions in the EU, or elsewhere, we could face inquiries or challenges to the future operations of these companies.

Moreover, we could be put at a competitive disadvantage in the future with respect to competitors that are licensed and admitted in U.S. jurisdictions. Among other things, jurisdictions in the U.S. do not permit insurance companies to take credit for reinsurance obtained from unlicensed or non-admitted insurers on their statutory financial statements unless security is posted. Our contracts generally require us to post a letter of credit or provide other security (e.g., through a multi-beneficiary reinsurance trust) after a reinsured reports a claim. In order to post these letters of credit, issuing banks generally require collateral. It is possible that the EU or other countries might adopt a similar regime in the future, or that U.S. regulations could be altered in a way that treats Bermuda-based companies disproportionately. Any such development, or if we are unable to post security in the form of letters of credit or trust funds when required, could significantly and negatively affect our operations.

RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks is currently an eligible, non-admitted excess and surplus lines insurer in 49 States within the U.S., the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and is subject to certain regulatory and reporting requirements of these jurisdictions. However, RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks is not admitted or licensed in any U.S. jurisdiction; moreover, RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks only conducts business from Bermuda.

Accordingly, the scope of RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks' activities in the U.S. is limited, which could adversely affect its ability to compete. Although surplus lines business is generally less regulated than the admitted market, the regulation of surplus lines insurance may undergo changes in the future. Federal and/or state measures may be introduced and promulgated that could result in increased oversight and regulation of surplus lines insurance.

Our current or future business strategy could cause one or more of our currently unregulated subsidiaries to become subject to some form of regulation. Any failure to comply with applicable laws could result in the imposition of significant restrictions on our ability to do business, and could also result in fines and other sanctions, any or all of which could adversely affect our financial results and operations.

We could be required to allocate considerable time and resources to comply with any new or additional regulatory requirements, and any such requirements may impact the operations of our insurance and/or non-insurance subsidiaries and ultimately could impact our financial condition as well. In addition, we could be adversely affected if a regulatory authority believed we had failed to comply with applicable law or regulation.

Because we are a holding company, we are dependent on dividends and payments from our subsidiaries.

As a holding company with no direct operations, we rely on investment income, cash dividends and other permitted payments from our subsidiaries to make principal and interest payments on our debt and to pay dividends to our shareholders. The holding company does not have any operations and from time to time may not have significant liquid assets. Bermuda law and various U.S. insurance regulations may limit the ability of our subsidiaries to pay dividends. If our subsidiaries are restricted from paying dividends to us, we may be unable to pay dividends or to repay our indebtedness.

Acquisitions or strategic investments that we have made or may make could turn out to be unsuccessful.

As part of our strategy, we frequently monitor and analyze opportunities to acquire or make a strategic investment in new or other businesses that will not detract from our core operations. The negotiation of potential acquisitions or strategic investments as well as the integration of an acquired business or new personnel could result in a substantial diversion of management resources. Acquisitions could involve numerous additional risks such as potential losses from unanticipated litigation or levels of claims and inability to generate sufficient revenue to offset acquisition costs. Should we pursue or consummate a strategic transaction or investment, we may mis-value the acquired or funded company or operations, fail to





integrate the acquired operations appropriately into our own operations, expend unforeseen costs during the acquisition or integration process, or encounter other unanticipated risks or challenges. Having consummated a strategic investment, should we succeed in doing so, we may fail to value it accurately or succeed in divesting it or otherwise realizing the value which we originally invested or have subsequently reflected in our consolidated financial statements. Any failure by us to effectively limit such risks or implement our acquisitions or strategic investment strategies could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition or results of operations. We are subject to cybersecurity risks and may incur increasing costs in an effort to minimize those risks. We depend on the proper functioning and availability of our information technology platform, including communications and data processing systems, in operating our business. These systems include proprietary software programs that are integral to the efficient operation of our business, including our proprietary pricing and exposure management system. We are also required to effect electronic transmissions with third parties including brokers, clients vendors and others with whom we do business, and to facilitate the oversight conducted by our Board of Directors. Security breaches could expose us to a risk of loss or misuse of our information, litigation and potential liability. In addition, cyber incidents that impact the availability, reliability, speed, accuracy or other proper functioning of these systems could have a significant impact on our operations, and potentially on our results. We may not have the resources or technical sophistication to anticipate or prevent rapidly evolving types of cyber attacks. A significant cyber incident, including system failure, security breach, disruption by malware or other damage could interrupt or delay our operations, result in a violation of applicable privacy and other laws, damage our reputation, cause a loss of customers or give rise to monetary fines and other penalties, which could be significant. See “Part I, Item 1. Business, Information Technology”.

Some aspects of our corporate structure may discourage third party takeovers and other transactions or prevent the removal of our current board of directors and management.

Some provisions of our Amended and Restated Bye-Laws have the effect of making more difficult or discouraging unsolicited takeover bids from third parties or preventing the removal of our current board of directors and management. In particular, our Bye-Laws prohibit transfers of our capital shares if the transfer would result in a person owning or controlling shares that constitute 9.9% or more of any class or series of our shares. In addition, our Bye-Laws reduce the total voting power of any shareholder owning, directly or indirectly, beneficially or otherwise, as described in our Bye-laws, more than 9.9% of our common shares to not more than 9.9% of the total voting power of our capital stock unless otherwise waived at the discretion of the Board. The primary purpose of these provisions is to reduce the likelihood that we will be deemed a “controlled foreign corporation” within the meaning of the Internal Revenue Code for U.S. federal tax purposes. However, these provisions may also have the effect of deterring purchases of large blocks of common shares or proposals to acquire us, even if some or a majority of our shareholders might deem these purchases or acquisition proposals to be in their best interests.

In addition, our Bye-Laws provide for, among other things:

- a classified Board, whose size is fixed and whose members may be removed by the shareholders only for cause upon a 66 2/3% vote;
- restrictions on the ability of shareholders to nominate persons to serve as directors, submit resolutions to a shareholder vote and requisition special general meetings;
- a large number of authorized but unissued shares which may be issued by the Board without further shareholder action; and
- a 66 2/3% shareholder vote to amend, repeal or adopt any provision inconsistent with several provisions of the Bye-Laws.

These Bye-Law provisions make it more difficult to acquire control of us by means of a tender offer, open market purchase, proxy contest or otherwise. These provisions are designed to encourage persons seeking to acquire control of us to negotiate with our directors, which we believe would generally best serve the interests of our shareholders. However, these provisions could have the effect of discouraging a prospective acquirer from making a tender offer or otherwise attempting to obtain control of us. In addition, these Bye-Law provisions could prevent the removal of our current board of directors and management. To the extent







these provisions discourage takeover attempts, they could deprive shareholders of opportunities to realize takeover premiums for their shares or could depress the market price of the shares.

In respect of our ownership of RSML, our Lloyd's managing agent, the PRA and FCA regulate the acquisition of control of any Lloyd's managing agent which is authorized under the FSMA. Any company or individual that, together with its or his associates, directly or indirectly acquires 10% or more of the shares in a Lloyd's managing agent or its parent company, or is entitled to exercise or control the exercise of 10% or more of the voting power in such Lloyd's managing agent or its parent company, would be considered to have acquired control for the purposes of the relevant legislation, as would a person who had significant influence over the management of such Lloyd's managing agent or its parent company by virtue of his shareholding or voting power in either. Lloyd's approval is also required before any person can acquire control (using the same definition as for the PRA and FCA) of a Lloyd's managing agent or Lloyd's corporate member.

Investors may have difficulties in serving process or enforcing judgments against us in the U.S.

We are a Bermuda company. In addition, certain of our officers and directors reside in countries outside the U.S. All or a substantial portion of our assets and the assets of these officers and directors are or may be located outside the U.S. Investors may have difficulty effecting service of process within the U.S. on our directors and officers who reside outside the U.S. or recovering against us or these directors and officers on judgments of U.S. courts based on civil liabilities provisions of the U.S. federal securities laws whether or not we appoint an agent in the U.S. to receive service of process.

#### Risks Related to Our Industry

The reinsurance and insurance businesses are historically cyclical and the pricing and terms for our products may decline, which would affect our profitability.

The reinsurance and insurance industries have historically been cyclical, characterized by periods of decreasing prices followed by periods of increasing prices. Reinsurers have experienced significant fluctuations in their results of operations due to numerous factors, including the frequency and severity of catastrophic events, perceptions of risk, levels of capacity, general economic conditions and underwriting results of other insurers and reinsurers. All of these factors may contribute to price declines generally in the reinsurance and insurance industries. Following an increase in capital in our industry after the 2005 catastrophe events and the subsequent period of substantial dislocation in the financial markets, the reinsurance and insurance markets have experienced a prolonged period of generally softening markets.

The catastrophe-exposed lines in which we are a market leader are affected significantly by volatile and unpredictable developments, including natural and man-made disasters. The occurrence, or nonoccurrence, of catastrophic events, the frequency and severity of which are inherently unpredictable, affects both industry results and consequently prevailing market prices of our products.

We expect premium rates and other terms and conditions of trade to vary in the future. If demand for our products falls or the supply of competing capacity rises, our prospects for potential growth, due in part to our disciplined approach to underwriting, may be adversely affected. In particular, we might lose existing customers or decline business, which we might not regain when industry conditions improve.

In recent years, hedge funds, pension funds, endowments and investment banks have been increasingly active in the reinsurance market and markets for related risks. Further, we believe new entrants or existing competitors may attempt to replicate all or part of our business model and provide further competition in the markets in which we participate. We generally expect increased competition from a wider range of entrants over time. It is possible that such new or alternative capital could cause reductions in prices of our products, or reduce the duration or amplitude of attractive portions of the historical market cycles. Moreover, explicitly or implicitly government-backed entities increasingly represent competition for the coverages that we provide directly, or for the business of our customers, reducing the potential amount of third party private protection our clients might need or desire. To the extent that industry pricing of our products does not meet our hurdle rate, we would generally expect to reduce our future underwriting activities thus resulting in reduced premiums and a reduction in expected earnings.





Recent or future legislation may decrease the demand for our property catastrophe reinsurance products and adversely affect our business and results of operations.

In 2007, the State of Florida enacted legislation to expand the FHCF's provision of below-market rate reinsurance to up to \$28.0 billion per season (the "2007 Florida Bill"). We believe that the 2007 Florida Bill and other regulatory actions since the introduction of the 2007 Florida Bill contributed to instability in the Florida primary insurance market, where many insurers reported substantial and continuing losses from 2009 through 2012, despite an unusually low period for catastrophe losses in the state. Because of our position as one of the largest providers of catastrophe-exposed coverage, both on a global basis and in respect of the Florida market, the 2007 Florida Bill and the weakened financial position of Florida insurers may have a disproportionate adverse impact on us compared to other reinsurance market participants. In addition, it is possible that other regulatory or legislative changes in, or impacting, Florida could affect our ability to sell certain of our products and could therefore have a material adverse effect on our operations.

It is also possible that other states, particularly those with Atlantic or Gulf Coast exposures, may enact new or expanded legislation based on the Florida precedent, or may otherwise enact legislation, which would further diminish aggregate private market demand for our products. Alternatively, legislation adversely impacting the private markets could be enacted on a regional or at the federal level. For example, in the past, federal bills have been proposed in Congress (and, in prior congressional sessions, passed by the House of Representatives) which would, if enacted, create a federal reinsurance backstop or guarantee mechanism for catastrophic risks, including those we currently insure and reinsure in the private markets. Such legislation, if enacted, would, we believe, likely contribute to growth of state insurance entities or to their inception or alteration in a manner adverse to us. If enacted, bills of this nature would likely further erode the role of private market catastrophe reinsurers and could adversely impact our financial results, perhaps materially. Moreover, we believe that numerous modeled potential catastrophes could exceed the actual or politically acceptable bonded capacity of Citizens and of the FHCF, which could lead either to a severe dislocation or the necessity of federal intervention in the Florida market, either of which would adversely impact the private insurance and reinsurance industry.

In June 2012, Congress passed the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act of 2012 (the "Biggert-Waters Bill"), which provided for a five-year renewal of the National Flood Insurance Program (the "NFIP") and effected substantial reforms in the program. Among other things, the bill increased the annual limitation on program premium increases from 10% to 20% of the average of the risk premium rates for certain properties; established a four-year phase-in, after the first year, in annual 20% increments, of full actuarial rates for a newly mapped risk premium rate area; instructed FEMA to establish new flood insurance rate maps; allowed multi-family properties to purchase NFIP policies; and introduced minimum deductibles for flood claims. Many market participants anticipated that these reforms could increase the role of private risk-bearing capital in respect of U.S. flood perils, a coverage we provide globally, perhaps significantly. However, in February 2014, legislation was passed in the U.S. Senate, entitled the "Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014", which would, if enacted into law, impose a four-year delay in most rate reforms required by the enacted version of the Biggert-Waters Bill, and would require FEMA, which administers the flood program, to complete an affordability study and propose regulations that address affordability issues. Subsequently, members of the House of Representatives have announced that the House will consider a bill which may have a substantially similar impact as the Senate legislation, and potentially could be more adverse than the Senate bill. It is likely that a version of this legislation, or broader alternatives, will be adopted by Congress and adversely impact the prospects for increased U.S. private flood insurance demand, as well as adversely impacting the stability of the NFIP, the primary insurers that produce policies for the NFIP or offer private coverages, or the communities they serve.

Internationally, in the wake of recent large natural catastrophes, a number of proposals have been introduced to alter the financing of natural catastrophes in several of the markets in which we operate. For example, the Thailand government has announced it is studying proposals for a natural catastrophe fund, under which the government would provide coverage for natural disasters in excess of an industry retention and below a certain limit, after which private reinsurers would continue to participate. The government of the Philippines has announced that it is considering

similar proposals. A range of proposals from varying stakeholders have been reported to have been made to alter the current regimes for insuring flood risk in the U.K., flood risk in Australia and earthquake risk in New Zealand. If these proposals are enacted and reduce market opportunities for our clients or for the reinsurance industry, we could be adversely impacted.



See “Part II, Item 7. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, Current Outlook, Legislative and Regulatory Update” for further information.

Other political, regulatory and industry initiatives could adversely affect our business.

The insurance and reinsurance regulatory framework is subject to heavy scrutiny by the U.S. and individual state governments as well as an increasing number of international authorities. Government regulators are generally concerned with the protection of policyholders to the exclusion of other constituencies, including shareholders. Governmental authorities in both the U.S. and worldwide seem increasingly interested in the potential risks posed by the reinsurance industry as a whole, and to commercial and financial systems in general. While we do not believe these inquiries have identified meaningful new risks posed by the reinsurance industry, and we cannot predict the exact nature, timing or scope of possible governmental initiatives, we believe it is likely there will be increased regulatory intervention in our industry in the future. For example, the U.S. federal government has increased its scrutiny of the insurance regulatory framework in recent years (including as specifically addressed in the Dodd-Frank Act), and some state legislators have considered or enacted laws that will alter and likely increase state regulation of insurance and reinsurance companies and holding companies. Moreover, the NAIC, which is an association of the insurance commissioners of all 50 states and the District of Columbia and state insurance regulators, regularly reexamine existing laws and regulations. Due to this increased legislative and regulatory scrutiny on the reinsurance industry, our cost of compliance with applicable laws may increase, which could result in a decrease to both our profitability and the amount of time that our senior management allocates to running the day-to-day operations of the Company.

For example, we could be adversely affected by proposals or enacted legislation to:

- provide insurance and reinsurance capacity in markets and to consumers that we target, such as the legislation enacted in Florida in 2007 or the proposed federal legislation described above;
- expand the scope of coverage under existing policies for perils such as hurricanes or earthquakes or for a pandemic disease outbreak;
- increasingly mandate the terms of insurance and reinsurance policies;
- expand the proposed scope of the FIO or establish a new federal insurance regulator;
- revise laws, regulations, or contracts under which we operate;
- disproportionately benefit the companies of one country over those of another; or
- repeal or diminish the insurance company antitrust exemption from the McCarran Ferguson Act.

With respect to the Dodd-Frank Act, it is difficult to predict the extent to which this Act or the regulations resulting therefrom will impact our business. However, compliance with these new laws and regulations will result in additional costs, which may adversely impact our results of operations, financial condition or liquidity. Although we do not expect these costs to be material to the Company as a whole, we cannot assure you this expectation will prove accurate or that the Dodd-Frank Act or other legislation will not impact our business more adversely than we currently estimate.

While the timing for the implementation of Solvency II in the EU Member States by the European Commission remains uncertain, implementation of Solvency II will also require us to utilize a significant amount of resources to ensure compliance. The EU is in the process of considering the Solvency II equivalence of Bermuda’s insurance regulatory and supervisory regime. The EU equivalence assessment considers whether Bermuda’s regulatory regime provides a similar level of policyholder protection as provided under Solvency II. While we currently expect that Bermuda’s insurance regulatory regime will be found equivalent in respect of oversight of internationally operating reinsurers and insurers such as RenaissanceRe, an adverse or highly qualified finding could have an adverse effect on our reinsurance operations and on our group solvency calculations. We are monitoring the ongoing legislative and regulatory steps following adoption of Solvency II. The principles, standards and requirements of Solvency II may also, directly or indirectly, impact the future supervision of additional operating subsidiaries of ours.

We are incorporated in Bermuda and are therefore subject to changes in Bermuda law and regulation that may have an adverse impact on our operations, including imposition of tax liability or increased regulatory supervision or change in

regulation. In addition, we are subject to changes in the political environment in

55





Bermuda, which could make it difficult to operate in, or attract talent to, Bermuda. The Bermuda insurance and reinsurance regulatory framework recently has become subject to increased scrutiny in many jurisdictions, including in the U.S. and in various states within the U.S. We are unable to predict the future impact on our operations of changes in the laws and regulations to which we are or may become subject. Moreover, our exposure to potential regulatory initiatives could be heightened by the fact that our principal operating companies are domiciled in, and operate exclusively from, Bermuda. For example, Bermuda, a small jurisdiction, may be disadvantaged in participating in global or cross border regulatory matters as compared with larger jurisdictions such as the U.S. or the leading EU and Asian countries. In addition, Bermuda, which is currently an overseas territory of the U.K., may consider changes to its relationship with the U.K. in the future. These changes could adversely affect Bermuda or the international reinsurance market focused there, either of which could adversely impact us commercially. Further, as we continue to expand our business operations to different regions of the world outside of Bermuda, we are increasingly subject to new and additional regulations with respect to our operations, including, for example, laws relating to anti-corruption and anti-bribery which have received increasing scrutiny in recent years. We operate in a highly competitive environment.

The reinsurance industry is highly competitive. We compete, and will continue to compete, with major U.S. and non-U.S. insurers and property catastrophe reinsurers, including other Bermuda-based reinsurers. Many of our competitors have greater financial, marketing and management resources than we do. Historically, periods of increased capacity levels in our industry generally have led to increased competition, and decreased prices for our products.

We believe that our principal competitors in the property catastrophe reinsurance market include other companies active in the Bermuda market, currently including ACE Limited, Allied World Assurance Company, AG, Arch Capital Group Ltd., Aspen Insurance Holdings Limited, Axis Capital Holdings Limited, Endurance Specialty Holdings Ltd., Everest Re Group, Ltd., Hamilton Re Ltd. (“Hamilton Re”), Montpelier Re Holdings Ltd., PartnerRe Ltd., Platinum Underwriters Holdings, Ltd. (“Platinum”), Third Point Reinsurance Ltd. (“Third Point”), Validus Holdings, Ltd., White Mountains Insurance Group, Ltd. and XL Group plc, as well as a growing number of private, unrated reinsurers offering predominately collateralized reinsurance. We also compete with certain Lloyd’s syndicates active in the London market, as well as with a number of other industry participants, such as American International Group, Inc., Berkshire Hathaway Inc., Hannover Rückversicherung AG (“Hannover Re”), Ironshore Inc., Münchener Rückversicherungs-Gesellschaft Aktiengesellschaft in München (“Munich Re”) and Swiss Re Ltd. As our business evolves over time, we expect our competitors to change as well. Also, hedge funds, pension funds, endowments, investment banks and investment managers (such as Nephila Capital Ltd.) are increasingly active in the reinsurance market, either through the formation of reinsurance companies (which include Greenlight Reinsurance Ltd. and new Bermuda-based entrants, including Aeolus Re Ltd., AQR Re Management Ltd., Hamilton Re (formerly known as SAC Re), Swan Re Ltd. and Third Point) or through the use of other financial products, such as catastrophe bonds, other insurance-linked securities and collateralized reinsurance investment funds. In addition, we may not be aware of other companies that may be planning to enter the reinsurance market or of existing companies that may be planning to raise additional capital. We cannot predict what effect any of these developments may have on our businesses. Consolidation in the (re) insurance industry could adversely impact us.

The (re)insurance industry has been consolidating and we believe that several (re)insurance industry participants are seeking to consolidate. Should the market continue to consolidate, there can be no assurance that we would remain a leading insurer and property catastrophe reinsurer. These consolidated competitor enterprises may try to use their enhanced market power to negotiate price reductions for our products and services and/or obtain a larger market share through increased line sizes. If competitive pressures reduce our prices, we would generally expect to reduce our future underwriting activities thus resulting in reduced premiums and a reduction in expected earnings. As the insurance industry consolidates, competition for customers will become more intense and the importance of acquiring and properly servicing each customer will become greater. We could incur greater expenses relating to customer acquisition and retention, further reducing our operating margins. In addition, insurance companies that merge may be able to spread their risks across a consolidated, larger capital base so that they require less reinsurance. The number of

companies offering retrocessional reinsurance may decline. Reinsurance intermediaries could also continue to consolidate, potentially adversely impacting our ability to



access business and distribute our products. We could also experience more robust competition from larger, better capitalized competitors. Any of the foregoing could adversely affect our business or our results of operation. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (the "OECD") and the EU may pursue measures that might increase our taxes and reduce our net income.

The OECD has published reports and launched a global dialogue among member and non-member countries on measures to limit harmful tax competition. These measures are largely directed at counteracting the effects of jurisdictions perceived by the OECD to be tax havens or to offer preferential tax regimes. The OECD has not listed Bermuda as an uncooperative tax haven jurisdiction because Bermuda has committed to eliminate harmful tax practices and to embrace international tax standards for transparency, exchange of information and the elimination of any aspects of the regimes for financial and other services that attract business with no substantial domestic activity. We are not able to predict what changes will arise from the commitment or whether such changes will subject us to additional taxes.

Regulatory regimes and changes to accounting rules may adversely impact financial results irrespective of business operations.

Accounting standards and regulatory changes may require modifications to our accounting principles, both prospectively and for prior periods and such changes could have an adverse impact on our financial results. In particular, the SEC continues to discuss the potential to either converge or transition to an international set of accounting standards that would be applied to financial statements filed with the SEC. Such changes, if ultimately adopted, could have a significant impact on our financial reporting, impacting key matters such as our loss reserving policies and premium and expense recognition. For example, the Financial Accounting Standards Board and the International Accounting Standards Board are considering adopting respective accounting standards that would require all reinsurance and insurance contracts to be accounted for under a new measurement basis, which standards are considered to be more closely related to fair value than the current measurement basis. We are currently evaluating how the above initiatives will impact us, including with respect to our loss reserving policy and the effect it might have on recognizing premium revenue and policy acquisition costs. Required modification of our existing principles, either with respect to these issues or other issues in the future, could have an impact on our results of operations, including changing the timing of the recognition of underwriting income, increasing the volatility of our reported earnings and changing our overall financial statement presentation and increasing our expenses in order to implement and comply with any new requirements.

Heightened scrutiny of issues and practices in the insurance industry may adversely affect our business.

Certain government authorities, including state officials in Florida, New York and Connecticut, as well as U.S. federal agencies, have from time to time scrutinized and investigated a number of issues and practices within the insurance and reinsurance industry. It is possible such scrutiny could expand to include us in the future, and it is also possible that these investigations or related regulatory developments will mandate or otherwise give rise to changes in industry practices in a fashion that increases our costs or requires us to alter how we conduct our business.

We cannot predict the ultimate effect that these investigations, and any changes in industry practice, including future legislation or regulations that may become applicable to us, will have on the insurance industry, the regulatory framework, or our business.

As noted above, because we frequently assume the credit risk of the counterparties with whom we do business throughout our insurance and reinsurance operations, our results of operations could be adversely affected if the credit quality of these counterparties is severely impacted by investigations in the insurance industry or by changes to industry practices.

**ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS**

None.



## ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

We lease office space in Bermuda, which houses our executive offices and operations for our Catastrophe Reinsurance, Specialty Reinsurance and Lloyd's segments. Certain U.S. based subsidiaries lease office space in a number of U.S. states. Certain of our subsidiaries also lease office space in London, U.K., Dublin, Ireland and Singapore. While we believe that for the foreseeable future our current office space is sufficient for us to conduct our operations, it is likely that we will expand into additional facilities and perhaps new locations to accommodate future growth. To date, the cost of acquiring and maintaining our office space has not been material to us as a whole.

## ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

We and our subsidiaries are subject to lawsuits and regulatory actions in the normal course of business that do not arise from or directly relate to claims on reinsurance treaties or contracts or direct surplus lines insurance policies. This category of business litigation may involve allegations of underwriting or claims-handling errors or misconduct, employment claims, regulatory actions or disputes arising from our business ventures. Our operating subsidiaries are subject to claims litigation involving, among other things, disputed interpretations of policy coverages. Generally, our direct surplus lines insurance operations are subject to greater frequency and diversity of claims and claims-related litigation than our reinsurance operations and, in some jurisdictions, may be subject to direct actions by allegedly injured persons or entities seeking damages from policyholders. These lawsuits, involving claims on policies issued by our subsidiaries which are typical to the insurance industry in general and in the normal course of business, are considered in its loss and loss expense reserves which are discussed in its loss reserves discussion. In addition, we may from time to time engage in litigation or arbitration related to claims for payment in respect of ceded reinsurance, including disputes that challenge our ability to enforce our underwriting intent. Such matters could result, directly or indirectly, in providers of protection not meeting their obligations to us or not doing so on a timely basis. We may also be subject to other disputes from time to time, relating to operational or other matters distinct from insurance or reinsurance claims. Any litigation or arbitration, or regulatory process, contains an element of uncertainty, and the value of an exposure or a gain contingency related to a dispute is difficult to estimate accordingly. Currently, we believe that no individual litigation or arbitration to which we are presently a party is likely to have a material adverse effect on our financial condition, business or operations.

## ITEM 4. MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURES

Not applicable.





## PART II

## ITEM 5. MARKET FOR REGISTRANT'S COMMON EQUITY, RELATED SHAREHOLDER MATTERS AND ISSUER REPURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES

## PRICE RANGE OF COMMON SHARES

Our common shares began publicly trading on June 27, 1995 on the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE") under the symbol "RNR." The following table sets forth, for the periods indicated, the high and low prices per share of our common shares as reported in composite NYSE trading:

	Price Range of Common Shares	
	High	Low
2013		
First Quarter	\$92.23	\$79.83
Second Quarter	95.00	82.50
Third Quarter	90.68	83.19
Fourth Quarter	97.53	89.90
2012		
First Quarter	\$79.11	\$71.18
Second Quarter	80.53	72.41
Third Quarter	78.39	70.00
Fourth Quarter	82.76	75.29

On February 19, 2014, the last reported sale price for our common shares was \$93.80 per share and there were 124 holders of record of our common shares.



#### PERFORMANCE GRAPH

The following graph compares the cumulative return on our common shares including reinvestment of our dividends on our common shares to such return for the S&P 500 Composite Stock Price Index (“S&P 500”) and S&P’s Property-Casualty Industry Group Stock Price Index (“S&P P/C”), for the five-year period commencing January 1, 2009 and ending December 31, 2013, assuming \$100 was invested on January 1, 2009. Each measurement point on the graph below represents the cumulative shareholder return as measured by the last sale price at the end of each calendar year during the period from January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2013. As depicted in the graph below, during this period, the cumulative return was (1) 93.4% on our common shares; (2) 127.2% for the S&P 500; and (3) 100.9% for the S&P P&C.

#### COMPARISON OF FIVE YEAR CUMULATIVE TOTAL RETURN

##### DIVIDEND POLICY

Historically, we have paid dividends on our common shares every quarter, and have increased our dividend during each year since our initial public offering. The Board of Directors declared regular quarterly dividends of \$0.28 per common share to shareholders of record on March 15, June 14, September 13 and December 13, 2013, respectively. The Board of Directors declared regular quarterly dividends of \$0.27 per common share to shareholders of record on March 15, June 15, September 14 and December 14, 2012, respectively. On February 19, 2014, RenaissanceRe’s Board of Directors approved an increased dividend of \$0.29 per common share, payable on March 31, 2014, to shareholders of record on March 14, 2014. The declaration and payment of dividends are subject to the discretion of the Board and depend on, among other things, our financial condition, general business conditions, legal, contractual and regulatory restrictions regarding the payment of dividends by us and our subsidiaries and other factors which the Board may in the future consider to be relevant.



## ISSUER REPURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES

The Company's share repurchase program may be effected from time to time, depending on market conditions and other factors, through open market purchases and privately negotiated transactions. On February 19, 2014, RenaissanceRe's Board of Directors approved a renewal of the authorized share repurchase program for an aggregate amount of \$500.0 million. Unless terminated earlier by resolution of RenaissanceRe's Board of Directors, the program will expire when the Company has repurchased the full value of the shares authorized. The table below details the repurchases that were made under the program during the three months ended December 31, 2013, and also includes other shares purchased which represents withholdings from employees surrendered in respect of withholding tax obligations on the vesting of restricted stock, or in lieu of cash payments for the exercise price of employee stock options.

	Total shares purchased		Other shares purchased		Shares purchased under repurchase program		Dollar amount still available under repurchase program (in millions)
	Shares purchased	Average price per share	Shares purchased	Average price per share	Shares purchased	Average price per share	
Beginning dollar amount available to be repurchased							\$ 489.2
October 1 - 31, 2013	—	\$—	—	\$—	—	\$—	—
November 1 - 14, 2013	461	\$92.99	461	\$92.99	—	\$—	—
November 14, 2013 - renewal of authorized share repurchase program of \$500.0 million							10.8
Dollar amount available to be repurchased							500.0
November 14 - 30, 2013	9,243	\$92.35	1,895	\$92.74	7,348	\$92.25	(0.7 )
December 1 - 31, 2013	727,470	\$91.82	5,447	\$97.28	722,023	\$91.78	(66.3 )
Total	737,174	\$91.83	7,803	\$95.92	729,371	\$91.78	\$ 433.1

In the future, the Company may adopt additional trading plans or authorize purchase activities under the remaining authorization, which the Board may increase in the future. During 2013, the Company repurchased an aggregate of 2.5 million common shares in open market transactions and a privately negotiated transaction at an aggregate cost of \$207.9 million and at an average share price of \$84.80.

Subsequent to December 31, 2013 and through the period ended February 19, 2014, the Company repurchased 2.0 million common shares in open market transactions at an aggregate cost of \$185.8 million and at an average share price of \$91.66.



## ITEM 6. SELECTED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL DATA

The following tables set forth our selected consolidated financial data and other financial information at the end of and for each of the years in the five-year period ended December 31, 2013. Comparative figures for 2010 and 2009 have not been reclassified for discontinued operations. See “Note 3. Discontinued Operations in our Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements” for additional information regarding discontinued operations. The selected consolidated financial data should be read in conjunction with our consolidated financial statements and related notes thereto and “Part II, Item 7. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” included in this filing and all other information appearing elsewhere or incorporated into this filing by reference.

Year ended December 31, (in thousands, except share and per share data and percentages)	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	
Statements of Operations Data:						
Gross premiums written	\$1,605,412	\$1,551,591	\$1,434,976	\$1,165,295	\$1,228,881	
Net premiums written	1,203,947	1,102,657	1,012,773	848,965	838,333	
Net premiums earned	1,114,626	1,069,355	951,049	864,921	882,204	
Net investment income	208,028	165,725	146,871	212,081	313,271	
Net realized and unrealized gains on investments	35,076	163,121	43,956	136,318	98,587	
Net other-than-temporary impairments	—	(343)	(552)	(829)	(22,450)	
Net claims and claim expenses incurred	171,287	325,211	861,179	129,345	(70,698)	
Acquisition expenses	125,501	113,542	97,376	94,961	104,150	
Operational expenses	191,105	179,151	169,661	166,042	153,552	
Underwriting income (loss)	626,733	451,451	(177,167)	474,573	695,200	
Income (loss) from continuing operations	839,346	765,425	(38,833)	798,482	1,045,959	
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	2,422	(16,476)	(51,559)	62,670	6,700	
Net income (loss)	841,768	748,949	(90,392)	861,152	1,052,659	
Net income (loss) available (attributable) to RenaissanceRe common shareholders	665,676	566,014	(92,235)	702,613	838,858	
Income (loss) from continuing operations available (attributable) to RenaissanceRe common shareholders per common share – diluted	14.82	11.56	(0.82)	11.18	13.29	
Net income (loss) available (attributable) to RenaissanceRe common shareholders per common share – diluted	14.87	11.23	(1.84)	12.31	13.40	
Dividends per common share	1.12	1.08	1.04	1.00	0.96	
Weighted average common shares outstanding – diluted	44,128	49,603	50,747	55,641	61,210	
Return on average common equity	20.5	% 17.7	% (3.0)	% 21.7	% 30.2	%

Edgar Filing: RENAISSANCERE HOLDINGS LTD - Form ARS

Combined ratio	43.8	% 57.8	% 118.6	% 45.1	% 21.2	%
At December 31, Balance Sheet Data:	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	
Total investments	\$6,821,712	\$6,355,394	6,202,001	\$6,100,212	\$6,015,259	
Total assets	8,179,131	7,928,628	7,744,912	8,138,278	7,926,212	
Reserve for claims and claim expenses	1,563,730	1,879,377	1,992,354	1,257,843	1,344,433	
Unearned premiums	477,888	399,517	347,655	286,183	317,592	
Debt	249,430	349,339	349,247	549,155	300,000	
Capital leases	27,138	27,428	25,366	25,706	26,014	
Preferred shares	400,000	400,000	550,000	550,000	650,000	
Total shareholders' equity attributable to RenaissanceRe	3,904,384	3,503,065	3,605,193	3,936,325	3,840,786	
Common shares outstanding	43,646	45,542	51,543	54,110	61,745	
Book value per common share	\$80.29	\$68.14	\$59.27	\$62.58	\$51.68	
Accumulated dividends	13.12	12.00	10.92	9.88	8.88	
Book value per common share plus accumulated dividends	\$93.41	\$80.14	\$70.19	\$72.46	\$60.56	
Change in book value per common share plus change in accumulated dividends	19.5	% 16.8	% (3.6	)% 23.0	% 35.9	%





## ITEM 7. MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

The following is a discussion and analysis of our results of operations for 2013, compared to 2012, and 2012, compared to 2011, respectively. The following also includes a discussion of our liquidity and capital resources at December 31, 2013. This discussion and analysis should be read in conjunction with the audited consolidated financial statements and notes thereto included in this filing. This filing contains forward-looking statements that involve risks and uncertainties. Actual results may differ materially from the results described or implied by these forward-looking statements. See "Note on Forward-Looking Statements."

### OVERVIEW

RenaissanceRe was established in Bermuda in 1993 to write principally property catastrophe reinsurance and today is a leading global provider of reinsurance and insurance coverages and related services. Our aspiration is to be the world's best underwriter by matching well-structured risks with efficient sources of capital. Through our operating subsidiaries, we seek to produce superior returns for our shareholders by being a trusted, long-term partner to our customers for assessing and managing risk, and by delivering responsive solutions. We accomplish this by leveraging our core capabilities of risk assessment and information management, by investing in our capabilities to serve our customers across the cycles that have historically characterized our markets and by keeping our promises. Overall, our strategy focuses on superior customer relationships, superior risk selection and superior capital management. We provide value to our customers and joint venture partners in the form of financial security, innovative products, and responsive service. We are known as a leader in paying valid reinsurance claims promptly. We principally measure our financial success through long-term growth in tangible book value per common share plus the change in accumulated dividends, which we believe is the most appropriate measure of our Company's financial performance, and believe we have delivered superior performance in respect of this measure over time.

Our core products include property catastrophe reinsurance, which we primarily write through our principal operating subsidiary Renaissance Reinsurance, Syndicate 1458, and joint ventures, principally DaVinci, Upsilon RFO and Top Layer Re; specialty reinsurance written through Renaissance Reinsurance, RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks, RenaissanceRe Specialty U.S., Syndicate 1458 and DaVinci; and certain insurance products primarily written through Syndicate 1458 or on an excess and surplus lines basis. We believe that we are one of the world's leading providers of property catastrophe reinsurance. We also believe we have a strong position in certain specialty reinsurance lines of business and a growing presence in the Lloyd's marketplace. Our reinsurance and insurance products are principally distributed through intermediaries, with whom we seek to cultivate strong long-term relationships. We continually explore appropriate and efficient ways to address the risk needs of our clients. We have created, managed, and continue to manage capital vehicles and may create additional risk bearing vehicles in the future. As our product and geographical diversity increases, we may be exposed to new risks, uncertainties or sources of volatility.

Since a substantial portion of the reinsurance and insurance we write provides protection from damages relating to natural and man-made catastrophes, our results depend to a large extent on the frequency and severity of such catastrophic events, and the coverages we offer to customers affected by these events. We are exposed to significant losses from these catastrophic events and other exposures that we cover. Accordingly, we expect a significant degree of volatility in our financial results and our financial results may vary significantly from quarter-to-quarter or from year-to-year, based on the level of insured catastrophic losses occurring around the world.

Our revenues are principally derived from three sources: (1) net premiums earned from the reinsurance and insurance policies we sell; (2) net investment income and realized and unrealized gains from the investment of our capital funds and the investment of the cash we receive on the policies which we sell; and (3) other income received from our joint ventures, advisory services and various other items.

Our expenses primarily consist of: (1) net claims and claim expenses incurred on the policies of reinsurance and insurance we sell; (2) acquisition costs which typically represent a percentage of the premiums we write; (3) operating expenses which primarily consist of personnel expenses, rent and other operating expenses; (4) corporate expenses which include certain executive, legal and consulting





expenses, costs for research and development, and other miscellaneous costs, including those associated with operating as a publicly traded company; (5) redeemable noncontrolling interest, which represents the interest of third parties with respect to the net income (loss) of DaVinciRe and Medici; and (6) interest and dividend costs related to our debt and preference shares. We are also subject to taxes in certain jurisdictions in which we operate. Since the majority of our income is currently earned in Bermuda, which does not have a corporate income tax, the tax impact to our operations has historically been minimal, however, in the future, our net tax exposure may increase as our operations expand geographically.

The underwriting results of an insurance or reinsurance company are discussed frequently by reference to its net claims and claim expense ratio, underwriting expense ratio, and combined ratio. The net claims and claim expense ratio is calculated by dividing net claims and claim expenses incurred by net premiums earned. The underwriting expense ratio is calculated by dividing underwriting expenses (acquisition expenses and operational expenses) by net premiums earned. The combined ratio is the sum of the net claims and claim expense ratio and the underwriting expense ratio. A combined ratio below 100% generally indicates profitable underwriting prior to the consideration of investment income. A combined ratio over 100% generally indicates unprofitable underwriting prior to the consideration of investment income. We also discuss our net claims and claim expense ratio on an accident year basis. This ratio is calculated by taking net claims and claim expenses, excluding development on net claims and claim expenses from events that took place in prior fiscal years, divided by net premiums earned.

#### Segments

In conjunction with changes in our management structure during 2013, including the appointment of a new Chief Executive Officer, and changes in the mix of our reinsurance business, we revised our reportable segments to: (1) Catastrophe Reinsurance, which includes catastrophe reinsurance and certain property catastrophe joint ventures managed by our ventures unit; (2) Specialty Reinsurance, which includes specialty reinsurance and certain specialty joint ventures managed by our ventures unit; and (3) Lloyd's, which includes reinsurance and insurance business written through Syndicate 1458. Previously, we disclosed Reinsurance and Lloyd's as our reportable segments. All prior periods presented have been reclassified to conform to this presentation.

In addition, our Other category primarily reflects our strategic investments; investments unit; corporate expenses; capital servicing costs; noncontrolling interests; results of our discontinued operations; and the remnants of our Bermuda-based insurance operations not sold pursuant to our stock purchase agreement with QBE. Refer to "Part I, Item 1. Business, Overview and Segments" for more information about our segments.

#### Catastrophe Reinsurance Segment

Property catastrophe reinsurance is our traditional core business and is principally written for our own account, for DaVinci and for other joint ventures such as Upsilon RFO. We believe we are one of the world's leading providers of this coverage, based on total catastrophe gross premiums written. This coverage protects against large natural catastrophes, such as earthquakes, hurricanes and tsunamis, as well as claims arising from other natural and man-made catastrophes such as winter storms, freezes, floods, fires, wind storms, tornadoes, explosions and acts of terrorism. We offer this coverage to insurance companies and other reinsurers primarily on an excess of loss basis. This means that we begin paying when our customers' claims from a catastrophe exceed a certain retained amount. In recent periods, our catastrophe-exposed proportional reinsurance product offerings have grown and may continue to grow in the future.

Our principal property catastrophe reinsurance products include catastrophe excess of loss reinsurance and excess of loss retrocessional reinsurance. Our catastrophe reinsurance premiums are prone to significant volatility due to the timing of contract inception and also due to the business being characterized by a relatively small number of relatively large transactions.



### Specialty Reinsurance Segment

Our Specialty Reinsurance segment writes, for our own account and for DaVinci, certain targeted classes of business where we believe we have a sound basis for underwriting and pricing the risk that we assume. Our portfolio includes various classes of business, such as aviation, casualty clash, catastrophe exposed personal lines property, catastrophe exposed workers' compensation, crop, energy, financial, mortgage guaranty, political risk, surety, terrorism, trade credit, certain other casualty lines including directors and officers liability, general liability, medical malpractice and professional indemnity, and other specialty lines of reinsurance that we collectively refer to as specialty reinsurance. We believe that we are seen as a market leader in certain of these classes of business. We are seeking to expand our specialty reinsurance operations over time. In 2013, we organized RenaissanceRe Underwriting Managers U.S., a specialty reinsurance agency domiciled in Connecticut, to provide specialty treaty reinsurance solutions on both a quota share and excess of loss basis, as well as to write business on behalf of RenaissanceRe Specialty U.S., a Bermuda-domiciled reinsurer launched in June 2013 which operates subject to U.S. federal income tax, and Syndicate 1458. However, we cannot assure you that we will succeed in growing these operations or that any growth we do attain will be profitable and contribute meaningfully to our results or financial condition, particularly in light of current and forecasted market conditions. Our specialty reinsurance business may be significantly impacted by a comparably small number of relatively large transactions.

### Lloyd's Segment

Our Lloyd's segment includes insurance and reinsurance business written for our own account through Syndicate 1458. The syndicate enhances our underwriting platform by providing access to Lloyd's extensive distribution network and worldwide licenses. RenaissanceRe CCL, an indirect wholly owned subsidiary of RenaissanceRe, is the sole corporate member of Syndicate 1458. RSML, a wholly owned subsidiary of RenaissanceRe, is the managing agent for Syndicate 1458. We anticipate that Syndicate 1458's absolute and relative contributions to our consolidated results of operations will have a meaningful impact over time, although we cannot assure you we will succeed in executing our growth strategy in respect of Syndicate 1458, or that its results will be favorable.

Syndicate 1458 generally targets lines of business where we believe we can adequately quantify the risks assumed. We also seek to identify market dislocations and to write new lines of business whose risk and return characteristics are attractive and add to our portfolio of risks. Furthermore, we seek to manage the correlations of this business with our overall portfolio, including our aggregate exposure to single and aggregated catastrophe events. We believe that our underwriting and analytical capabilities have positioned us well to manage this business.

Syndicate 1458 offers a range of property and casualty insurance and reinsurance products including, but not limited to, direct and facultative property, property catastrophe, agriculture, medical malpractice, general liability and professional indemnity. Syndicate 1458 may seek to expand its coverages and capacity over time. As with our catastrophe and specialty reinsurance businesses, Syndicate 1458 frequently provides coverage for relatively large limits or exposures, and thus it is subject to potential significant claims volatility.

### Other

Our Other category primarily includes the results of: (1) our share of strategic investments in certain markets we believe offer attractive risk-adjusted returns or where we believe our investment adds value, and where, rather than assuming exclusive management responsibilities ourselves, we partner with other market participants; (2) our investment unit which manages and invests the funds generated by our consolidated operations; (3) corporate expenses, capital services costs and noncontrolling interests; (4) the results of our discontinued operations; and (5) the remnants of our Bermuda-based insurance operations.

### New Business

From time to time we consider diversification into new ventures, either through organic growth, the formation of new joint ventures, or the acquisition of or the investment in other companies or books of business of other companies. This potential diversification includes opportunities to write targeted, additional classes of risk-exposed business, both directly for our own account and through possible new joint venture opportunities. We also regularly evaluate potential strategic opportunities that we believe might utilize our skills, capabilities, proprietary technology and relationships to support possible expansion







into further risk-related coverages, services and products. Generally, we focus on underwriting or trading risks where reasonably sufficient data may be available, and where our analytical abilities may provide us a competitive advantage, so that we may seek to model estimated probabilities of losses and returns in accordance with our approach in respect of our then current portfolio of risks.

We regularly review potential strategic transactions and investments that might improve our portfolio of business, enhance or focus our strategies, expand our distribution or capabilities, or to seek other benefits. In evaluating potential new ventures or investments, we generally seek an attractive estimated return on equity, the ability to develop or capitalize on a competitive advantage, and opportunities which we believe will not detract from our core operations. While we regularly review potential strategic transactions and investments, and periodically engage in discussions regarding possible transactions and investments, there can be no assurance that we will complete any such transaction or investment, or that any such transaction or investment would be successful or materially enhance our results of operations or financial condition. We believe that our ability to potentially attract investment and operational opportunities is supported by our strong reputation and financial resources, and by the capabilities and track record of our ventures unit.

#### Risk Management

We seek to develop and effectively utilize sophisticated computer models and other analytical tools to assess and manage the risks that we underwrite and attempt to optimize our portfolio of reinsurance and insurance contracts and other financial risks. Our policies, procedures, tools and resources to monitor and assess our operational risks companywide, as well as our global enterprise-wide risk management practices, are overseen by our Chief Risk Officer, who reports directly to our Chief Financial Officer.

Since 1993, we have developed and continuously seek to improve our proprietary, computer-based pricing and exposure management system, REMS©. We believe that REMS©, as updated from time to time, is a more robust underwriting and risk management system than is currently commercially available elsewhere in the reinsurance industry and offers us a significant competitive advantage. REMS© was originally developed to analyze catastrophe risks, though we continuously seek ways to enhance the system in order to analyze other classes of risk. For information related to Risk Management, refer to “Part I, Item 1. Business, Underwriting and Enterprise Risk Management”.

#### Discontinued Operations

##### REAL

On August 30, 2013, we entered into a purchase agreement with Munich to sell REAL. REAL offered certain derivative-based risk management products primarily to address weather and energy risk and engaged in hedging and trading activities related to those transactions. On October 1, 2013, we closed the sale of REAL to Munich. We have classified the assets and liabilities associated with this transaction as held for sale and, at December 31, 2013, there were no remaining assets or liabilities related to REAL included on our consolidated balance sheet. The financial results for these operations have been presented in our consolidated financial statements as “discontinued operations” for all periods presented. Except as explicitly described as held for sale or as discontinued operations, and unless otherwise noted, all discussions and amounts presented herein relate to our continuing operations. Prior years presented have been reclassified to conform to this new presentation.

Consideration for the transaction was \$60.0 million, paid in cash at closing, subject to post-closing adjustments for certain tax and other items. We recorded a loss on sale of \$8.8 million in conjunction with the sale, including related direct expenses to date.

#### U.S.-Based Insurance Operations

During the fourth quarter of 2010, we made the strategic decision to divest substantially all of our U.S.-based insurance operations in order to focus on the business encompassed within our then Reinsurance and Lloyd’s segments and our other businesses.

On November 18, 2010, we entered into a stock purchase agreement with QBE to sell substantially all of our U.S.-based insurance operations, including our U.S. property and casualty business underwritten through managing general agents, our crop insurance business underwritten through Agro National Inc.





(“Agro National”), our commercial property insurance operations and our claims operations. We have classified the assets and liabilities associated with this transaction as held for sale and, at December 31, 2013, there were no remaining assets or liabilities related to our former U.S.-based insurance operations included on our consolidated balance sheet. The financial results for these operations have been presented as discontinued operations in our Consolidated Statements of Operations.

Consideration for the transaction was book value at December 31, 2010, for the aforementioned businesses, payable in cash at closing and subject to adjustment for certain tax and other items. The transaction closed on March 4, 2011 and we received net consideration of \$269.5 million.

Pursuant to the stock purchase agreement, RenaissanceRe’s U.S.-based insurance operations sold to QBE were subject to a post-closing review following December 31, 2011 of the net reserve for claims and claim expenses for loss events occurring on or prior to December 31, 2010 (the “Reserve Collar”). Effective May 23, 2012, RenaissanceRe and QBE reached an agreement in respect of the Reserve Collar, and RenaissanceRe paid QBE the sum of \$9.0 million on June 1, 2012, representing full and final settlement of the Reserve Collar. See “Note 3. Discontinued Operations in our Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements” for additional information.

#### SUMMARY OF CRITICAL ACCOUNTING ESTIMATES

##### Claims and Claim Expense Reserves

##### General Description

We believe the most significant accounting judgment made by management is our estimate of claims and claim expense reserves. Claims and claim expense reserves represent estimates, including actuarial and statistical projections at a given point in time, of the ultimate settlement and administration costs for unpaid claims and claim expenses arising from the insurance and reinsurance contracts we sell. We establish our claims and claim expense reserves by taking claims reported to us by insureds and ceding companies, but which have not yet been paid (“case reserves”), adding the costs for additional case reserves (“additional case reserves”) which represent our estimates for claims previously reported to us which we believe may not be adequately reserved as of that date, and adding estimates for the anticipated cost of IBNR.

The following table summarizes our claims and claim expense reserves by line of business and split between case reserves, additional case reserves and IBNR:

At December 31, 2013	Case Reserves	Additional Case Reserves	IBNR	Total
(in thousands)				
Catastrophe Reinsurance	\$430,166	\$177,518	\$173,303	\$780,987
Specialty Reinsurance	113,188	81,251	311,829	506,268
Lloyd’s	45,355	14,265	158,747	218,367
Other	14,915	2,324	40,869	58,108
Total	\$603,624	\$275,358	\$684,748	\$1,563,730
At December 31, 2012				
(in thousands)				
Catastrophe Reinsurance	\$706,264	\$222,208	\$255,786	\$1,184,258
Specialty Reinsurance	111,234	80,971	286,108	478,313
Lloyd’s	29,260	10,548	109,662	149,470
Other	17,016	8,522	41,798	67,336
Total	\$863,774	\$322,249	\$693,354	\$1,879,377



Activity in the liability for unpaid claims and claim expenses is summarized as follows:

Year ended December 31, (in thousands)	2013	2012	2011
Net reserves as of January 1	\$1,686,865	\$1,588,325	\$1,156,132
Net incurred related to:			
Current year	315,241	483,180	993,168
Prior years	(143,954)	(157,969)	(131,989)
Total net incurred	171,287	325,211	861,179
Net paid related to:			
Current year	32,212	84,056	299,299
Prior years	363,235	142,615	129,687
Total net paid	395,447	226,671	428,986
Net reserves as of December 31	1,462,705	1,686,865	1,588,325
Reinsurance recoverable as of December 31	101,025	192,512	404,029
Gross reserves as of December 31	\$1,563,730	\$1,879,377	\$1,992,354

Our reserving methodology for each line of business uses a loss reserving process that calculates a point estimate for the Company's ultimate settlement and administration costs for claims and claim expenses. We do not calculate a range of estimates. We use this point estimate, along with paid claims and case reserves, to record our best estimate of additional case reserves and IBNR in our consolidated financial statements. Under GAAP, we are not permitted to establish estimates for catastrophe claims and claim expense reserves until an event occurs that gives rise to a loss. Reserving for our reinsurance claims involves other uncertainties, such as the dependence on information from ceding companies, which among other matters, includes the time lag inherent in reporting information from the primary insurer to us or to our ceding companies and differing reserving practices among ceding companies. The information received from ceding companies is typically in the form of bordereaux, broker notifications of loss and/or discussions with ceding companies or their brokers. This information can be received on a monthly, quarterly or transactional basis and normally includes estimates of paid claims and case reserves. We sometimes also receive an estimate or provision for IBNR. This information is often updated and adjusted from time to time during the loss settlement period as new data or facts in respect of initial claims, client accounts, industry or event trends may be reported or emerge in addition to changes in applicable statutory and case laws.

Our estimates of losses from large events are based on factors including currently available information derived from the Company's claims information from certain customers and brokers, industry assessments of losses from the events, proprietary models, and the terms and conditions of our contracts. The uncertainty of our estimates for certain of these large events is additionally impacted by the preliminary nature of the information available, the magnitude and relative infrequency of the events, the expected duration of the respective claims development period, inadequacies in the data provided to the relevant date by industry participants and the potential for further reporting lags or insufficiencies (particularly in respect of our current reserves arising from the Chilean, 2010 New Zealand, 2011 New Zealand and Tohoku Earthquakes); and in the case of Storm Sandy and the Thailand Floods, significant uncertainty as to the form of the claims and legal issues, under the relevant terms of insurance and reinsurance contracts. In addition, a significant portion of the net claims and claim expenses associated with Storm Sandy and the New Zealand and Tohoku Earthquakes are concentrated with a few large clients and therefore the loss estimates for these events may vary significantly based on the claims experience of those clients. Loss reserve estimation in respect of our retrocessional contracts poses further challenges compared to directly assumed reinsurance. A significant portion of our reinsurance recoverable relates to the New Zealand and Tohoku Earthquakes. There is inherent uncertainty and complexity in evaluating loss reserve levels and reinsurance recoverable amounts, due to the nature of the losses relating to earthquake events, including that loss development time frames tend to take longer with respect to earthquake events. The contingent nature of business interruption and other exposures will also impact losses in a

meaningful way, especially in respect of our current reserves with regard to Storm Sandy, the Tohoku Earthquake and the Thailand Floods, which we believe may give rise to significant complexity in respect of claims handling, claims





adjustment and other coverage issues, over time. Given the magnitude and relatively recent occurrence of these large events, meaningful uncertainty remains regarding total covered losses for the insurance industry and, accordingly, several of the key assumptions underlying our loss estimates. In addition, our actual net losses from these events may increase if our reinsurers or other obligors fail to meet their obligations.

Because of the inherent uncertainties discussed above, we have developed a reserving philosophy which attempts to incorporate prudent assumptions and estimates, and we have generally experienced favorable net development on prior year reserves in the last several years. However, there is no assurance that this will occur in future periods.

#### Prior Year Development of Reserve for Net Claims and Claim Expenses

Our estimates of claims and claim expense reserves are not precise in that, among other matters, they are based on predictions of future developments and estimates of future trends and other variable factors. Some, but not all, of our reserves are further subject to the uncertainty inherent in actuarial methodologies and estimates. Because a reserve estimate is simply an insurer's estimate at a point in time of its ultimate liability, and because there are numerous factors which affect reserves and claims payments that cannot be determined with certainty in advance, our ultimate payments will vary, perhaps materially, from our estimates of reserves. If we determine in a subsequent period that adjustments to our previously established reserves are appropriate, such adjustments are recorded in the period in which they are identified.

As detailed in the table and discussed in further detail below, changes to prior year estimated claims reserves increased our net income by \$144.0 million during the year ended December 31, 2013, (2012 - increased our net income by \$158.0 million, 2011 - decreased our net loss by \$132.0 million), excluding the consideration of changes in reinstatement premium, profit commissions, redeemable noncontrolling interest - DaVinciRe, equity in net claims and claim expenses of Top Layer Re and income tax.

Year ended December 31, (in thousands)	2013	2012	2011
Catastrophe	\$102,037	\$110,568	\$59,137
Specialty	34,111	34,146	77,761
Lloyd's	8,256	16,202	(478 )
Other	(450 )	(2,947 )	(4,431 )
Total favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses	\$143,954	\$157,969	\$131,989

Our reserving techniques, assumptions and processes differ between our Catastrophe Reinsurance, Specialty Reinsurance and Lloyd's segments. Following is a discussion of the risks we insure and reinsure, the reserving techniques, assumptions and processes we follow to estimate our claims and claim expense reserves, our current estimates versus our initial estimates of our claims reserves, and the sensitivity analysis we apply with respect to our key reserving judgments for each of our segments.

#### Catastrophe Reinsurance Segment

Within our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment, we principally write property catastrophe excess of loss reinsurance contracts to insure insurance and reinsurance companies against natural and man-made catastrophes. Under these contracts, we indemnify an insurer or reinsurer when its aggregate paid claims and claim expenses from a single occurrence of a covered peril exceed the attachment point specified in the contract, up to an amount per loss specified in the contract. In recent periods, our catastrophe-exposed proportional reinsurance product offerings have grown and may continue to grow in the future. Our most significant exposure is to losses from earthquakes and hurricanes and other windstorms, although we are also exposed to claims arising from other catastrophes, such as tsunamis, freezes, floods, fires, tornadoes, explosions and acts of terrorism. Our predominant exposure under such coverage is to property damage. However, other risks, including business interruption and other non-property losses, may also be covered under our property catastrophe reinsurance contracts when arising from a covered peril. Our coverages are offered on either a worldwide basis or are limited to selected geographic areas.





Coverage can also vary from “all property” perils to limited coverage on selected perils, such as “earthquake only” coverage. We also enter into retrocessional contracts that provide property catastrophe coverage to other reinsurers or retrocedants. This coverage is generally in the form of excess of loss retrocessional contracts and may cover all perils and exposures on a worldwide basis or be limited in scope to selected geographic areas, perils and/or exposures. The exposures we assume from retrocessional business can change within a contract term as the underwriters of a retrocedant may alter their book of business after the retrocessional coverage has been bound. We also offer dual trigger reinsurance contracts which require us to pay claims based on claims incurred by insurers and reinsurers in addition to the estimate of insured industry losses as reported by referenced statistical reporting agencies.

Our property catastrophe reinsurance business is generally characterized by loss events of low frequency and high severity. Initial reporting of paid and incurred claims in general, tends to be relatively prompt. We consider this business “short-tail” as compared to the reporting of claims for “long-tail” products, which tends to be slower. However, the timing of claims payment and reporting also varies depending on various factors, including: whether the claims arise under reinsurance of primary insurance companies or reinsurance of other reinsurance companies; the nature of the events (e.g., hurricanes, earthquakes or terrorism); the geographic area involved; post-event inflation which may cause the cost to repair damaged property to increase significantly from current estimates, or for property claims to remain open for a longer period of time, due to limitations on the supply of building materials, labor and other resources; complex policy coverage and other legal issues; and the quality of each client’s claims management and reserving practices. Management’s judgments regarding these factors are reflected in our reserve for claims and claim expenses.

Reserving for most of our property catastrophe reinsurance business does not involve the use of traditional actuarial techniques. Rather, claims and claim expense reserves are estimated by management after a catastrophe occurs by completing an in-depth analysis of the individual contracts which may potentially be impacted by the catastrophic event. The in-depth analysis generally involves: 1) estimating the size of insured industry losses from the catastrophic event; 2) reviewing our portfolio of reinsurance contracts to identify those contracts which are exposed to the catastrophic event; 3) reviewing information reported by customers and brokers; 4) discussing the event with our customers and brokers; and 5) estimating the ultimate expected cost to settle all claims and administrative costs arising from the catastrophic event on a contract-by-contract basis and in aggregate for the event. Once an event has occurred, during the then current reporting period we record our best estimate of the ultimate expected cost to settle all claims arising from the event. Our estimate of claims and claim expense reserves is then determined by deducting cumulative paid losses from our estimate of the ultimate expected loss for an event and our estimate of IBNR is determined by deducting cumulative paid losses, case reserves and additional case reserves from our estimate of the ultimate expected loss for an event. Once we receive a notice of loss or payment request under a catastrophe reinsurance contract, we are generally able to process and pay such claims promptly.

Because the events from which claims arise under policies written by our property catastrophe reinsurance business are typically prominent, public occurrences such as hurricanes and earthquakes, we are often able to use independent reports as part of our loss reserve estimation process. We also review catastrophe bulletins published by various statistical reporting agencies to assist us in determining the size of the industry loss, although these reports may not be available for some time after an event. In addition to the loss information and estimates communicated by cedants and brokers, we also use industry information which we gather and retain in our REMS© modeling system. The information stored in our REMS© modeling system enables us to analyze each of our policies in relation to a loss and compare our estimate of the loss with those reported by our policyholders. The REMS© modeling system also allows us to compare and analyze individual losses reported by policyholders affected by the same loss event. Although the REMS© modeling system assists with the analysis of the underlying loss and provides us with the information and ability to perform increased analysis, the estimation of claims resulting from catastrophic events is inherently difficult because of the variability and uncertainty associated with property catastrophe claims and the unique characteristics of each loss.

For smaller events including localized severe weather events such as windstorms, hail, ice, snow, flooding, freezing and tornadoes, which are not necessarily prominent, public occurrences, we initially place greater reliance on

catastrophe bulletins published by statistical reporting agencies to assist us in determining what events occurred during the reporting period than we do for large events. This includes reviewing

70



catastrophe bulletins published by Property Claim Services for U.S. catastrophes. We set our initial estimates of reserves for claims and claim expenses for these smaller events based on a combination of our historical market share for these types of losses and the estimate of the total insured industry property losses as reported by statistical reporting agencies, although we may make significant adjustments based on our current exposure to the geographic region involved as well as the size of the loss and the peril involved. This approach supplements our approach for estimating losses for larger catastrophes, which as discussed above, includes discussions with brokers and ceding companies, reviewing individual contracts impacted by the event, and modeling the loss in our REMS© system. Approximately one year from the date of loss for these small events, we estimate IBNR for these events by using the paid Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method. The loss development factors for the paid Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method are selected based on a review of our historical experience and these factors are reviewed at least annually. There were no changes to our paid loss development factors over the last three years.

In general, our property catastrophe reinsurance reserves for our more recent reinsured catastrophic events are subject to greater uncertainty and, therefore, greater potential variability, and are likely to experience material changes from one period to the next. This is due to the uncertainty as to the size of the industry losses from the event, uncertainty as to which contracts have been exposed to the catastrophic event, uncertainty due to complex legal and coverage issues that can arise out of large or complex catastrophic events such as the events of September 11, 2001, Hurricane Katrina and Storm Sandy, and uncertainty as to the magnitude of claims incurred by our customers. As our property catastrophe reinsurance claims age, more information becomes available and we believe our estimates become more certain, although there is no assurance this trend will continue in the future.

#### Prior Year Development of Reserve for Net Claims and Claim Expenses

Within our property catastrophe reinsurance business, we seek to review substantially all of our claims and claim expense reserves quarterly. Our quarterly review procedures include identifying events that have occurred up to the latest balance sheet date, determining our best estimate of the ultimate expected cost to settle all claims and administrative costs associated with those new events which have arisen during the reporting period, reviewing the ultimate expected cost to settle claims and administrative costs associated with those events which occurred during previous periods, and considering new estimation techniques, such as additional actuarial methods or other statistical techniques, that can assist us in developing a best estimate. This process is judgmental in that it involves reviewing changes in paid and reported losses each period and adjusting our estimates of the ultimate expected losses for each event if there are developments that are different from our previous expectations. If we determine that adjustments to an earlier estimate are appropriate, such adjustments are recorded in the period in which they are identified. As noted above, the level of our claims and claim expenses associated with certain catastrophes can be very large. As a result, small percentage changes in the estimated ultimate claims from large catastrophe events can significantly impact our reserves for claims and claim expenses in subsequent periods.





The following table details the development of our liability for unpaid claims and claim expenses for the Catastrophe Reinsurance segment for the year ended December 31, 2013 split between catastrophe net claims and claim expenses and attritional net claims and claim expenses:

Year ended December 31, 2013	Catastrophe Reinsurance Segment
(in thousands)	
Catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	
Large catastrophe events	
Storm Sandy (2012)	\$44,460
Tohoku Earthquake and Tsunami (2011)	18,033
Hurricanes Gustav & Ike (2008)	16,261
New Zealand Earthquake (2011)	10,944
Windstorm Kyrill (2007)	8,244
Hurricane Isaac (2012)	(2,610 )
New Zealand Earthquake (2010)	(11,040 )
Other	776
Total large catastrophe events	85,068
Small catastrophe events	
U.S. PCS 83 Wind and Thunderstorm (2012)	3,500
U.S. PCS 76 Wind and Thunderstorm (2012)	300
U.S. PCS 70 Wind and Thunderstorm (2012)	(8,225 )
Other	21,394
Total small catastrophe events	16,969
Total favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses	\$102,037

The favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses within our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment in 2013 of \$102.0 million was primarily due to \$44.5 million, \$18.0 million, \$16.3 million and \$10.9 million of favorable development related to reductions in the expected ultimate net loss for Storm Sandy, the Tohoku Earthquake, the 2008 Hurricanes and the 2011 New Zealand Earthquake, respectively, as reported claims came in better than expected, and \$34.2 million of net favorable development related to a number of other catastrophes principally the result of reported claims coming in less than expected, resulting in decreases to the ultimate claims for these events through the application of our formulaic actuarial reserving methodology. Partially offsetting the reductions noted above was adverse development on the 2010 New Zealand Earthquake, U.S. PCS 70 and Hurricane Isaac of \$11.0 million, \$8.2 million and \$2.6 million, respectively, associated with an increase in reported gross ultimate losses.



The following table details the development of our liability for unpaid claims and claim expenses for our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment for the year ended December 31, 2012:

Year ended December 31, 2012	Catastrophe Reinsurance Segment
(in thousands)	
Catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	
Large catastrophe events	
Chile Earthquake (2010)	\$24,575
Hurricanes Gustav & Ike (2008)	17,541
U.K. Floods (2007)	17,271
Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma (2005)	6,420
Hurricane Irene (2011)	4,630
Thailand Floods (2011)	3,933
Tohoku Earthquake and Tsunami (2011)	3,896
Windstorm Kyrill (2007)	3,417
New Zealand Earthquake (2010)	(3,570 )
New Zealand Earthquake (2011)	(17,912 )
Other	2,542
Total large catastrophe events	62,743
Small catastrophe events	
Danish Floods (2011)	5,000
U.S. PCS 63 Winter Storm (2011)	5,000
U.S. PCS 42 Winter Storm (2011)	2,560
U.S. PCS 53 Winter Storm (2011)	2,558
Other	32,707
Total small catastrophe events	47,825
Total favorable development of prior accident years claims and claim expenses	\$ 110,568

The favorable development of prior accident years claims and claim expenses within our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment in 2012 of \$110.6 million was primarily due to net reductions of \$84.2 million arising from the estimated ultimate claims of large catastrophe events, including the 2010 Chilean Earthquake, the 2008 Hurricanes, the 2007 U.K. Flooding, the 2005 Hurricanes, Hurricane Irene of 2011, the 2011 Thailand Floods and the Tohoku Earthquake, as reported claims came in better than expected. The remainder of the favorable development of prior accident years claims and claim expenses of \$47.8 million was due to a reduction in ultimate claims on a number of relatively small catastrophes, all principally the result of reported claims coming in less than expected, principally resulting in formulaic decreases to the ultimate claims for these events. Partially offsetting the reductions noted above was a \$17.9 million and \$3.6 million increase in net claims and claim expenses from the 2011 and 2010 New Zealand Earthquake, respectively, primarily as a result of increased cedant gross ultimate loss estimates.



The following table details the development of our liability for unpaid claims and claim expenses for our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment reinsurance unit for the year ended December 31, 2011:

Year ended December 31, 2011	Catastrophe Reinsurance Segment
(in thousands)	
Catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	
Large catastrophe events	
Tropical Cyclone Tasha (2010)	\$ 13,922
Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma (2005)	10,008
Chilean Earthquake (2010)	8,455
World Trade Center (2001)	4,701
Hurricanes Charley, Francis, Ivan and Jeanne (2004)	4,076
U.K. Floods (2007)	3,635
Windstorm Kyrill (2007)	2,494
New Zealand Earthquake (2010)	(15,179 )
Total large catastrophe events	32,112
Small catastrophe events	
U.S. PCS 21 Wildland Fire (2007)	4,554
U.S. PCS 33 Great Midwest Storm (2010)	3,125
U.S. PCS 31 Wind and Thunderstorm (2010)	3,039
U.S. PCS 96 Wind and Thunderstorm (2010)	2,288
Other	14,019
Total small catastrophe events	27,025
Total favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses	\$ 59,137

The favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses within our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment in 2011 of \$59.1 million was due to net reductions of \$47.3 million arising from the estimated ultimate claims of large catastrophe events, including the 2005 Hurricanes and the World Trade Center, for which the claims are principally paid and the amount of additional reported claims has slowed considerably and therefore the ultimate claims were reduced, and Tropical Cyclone Tasha and the Chilean Earthquake, as reported claims came in better than expected in 2011. Partially offsetting the above reductions in estimated ultimate claims during 2011, we increased our estimated ultimate claims for the 2010 New Zealand Earthquake by \$15.2 million due to additional claims reporting information being available to us. The remainder of the favorable development of prior accident years claims and claim expenses of \$27.0 million was due to a reduction in ultimate claims on a large number of relatively small catastrophes, all principally the result of reported claims coming in less than expected, resulting in formulaic decreases to the ultimate claims and claim expenses for these events.

#### Actual Results vs. Initial Estimates

The table below summarizes our initial assumptions and changes in those assumptions for claims and claim expense reserves within our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment. As discussed above, the key assumption in estimating reserves for our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment is our estimate of ultimate claims and claim expenses. The table shows our initial estimates of ultimate claims and claim expenses for each accident year and how these initial estimates have developed over time. The initial estimate of accident year claims and claim expenses represents our estimate of the ultimate settlement and administration costs for claims incurred from catastrophic events occurring during a particular accident year, and as reported as of December 31 of that year. The re-estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses as of December 31, 2011, 2012 and 2013, represent our revised estimates as reported as of those dates. The cumulative favorable (adverse) development shows how our most recent estimates as reported at December 31, 2013 differ from

our initial accident year estimates. Favorable development implies that our current estimates are

74





lower than our initial estimates while adverse development implies that our current estimates are higher than our original estimates. Total reserves as of December 31, 2013 reflect the unpaid portion of our estimates of gross ultimate claims and claim expenses. The table is presented on a gross basis and therefore does not include the benefit of reinsurance recoveries. It also does not consider the impact of loss related premium or redeemable noncontrolling interest – DaVinciRe.

## Actual vs. Initial Estimated Property Catastrophe Reinsurance Claims and Claim Expense Reserve Analysis

Accident Year	Initial Estimate of Accident Year Claims and Claim Expenses	Re-estimated Claims and Claim Expenses as of December 31,			Cumulative Favorable (Adverse) Development	% Decrease (Increase) from Initial Ultimate	Claims and Expense Reserves as of December 31, 2013	% of Claims and Claim Expenses Unpaid as of December 31, 2013
		2011	2012	2013				
1994	\$100,816	\$137,498	\$137,130	\$137,093	\$(36,277)	(36.0)%	\$274	0.2%
1995	72,561	61,345	61,345	61,404	11,157	15.4%	15	—%
1996	67,671	45,209	45,219	45,217	22,454	33.2%	11	—%
1997	43,050	9,040	9,041	9,041	34,009	79.0%	5	0.1%
1998	129,171	151,951	152,038	152,016	(22,845)	(17.7)%	546	0.4%
1999	267,981	198,257	197,849	197,703	70,278	26.2%	236	0.1%
2000	54,600	17,803	17,787	17,747	36,853	67.5%	12	0.1%
2001	257,285	205,078	201,140	200,558	56,727	22.0%	7,229	3.6%
2002	155,573	65,436	65,118	65,008	90,565	58.2%	164	0.3%
2003	126,312	69,057	67,608	67,398	58,914	46.6%	6	—%
2004	762,392	815,773	815,915	814,704	(52,312)	(6.9)%	595	0.1%
2005	1,473,974	1,272,485	1,263,198	1,260,825	213,149	14.5%	2,532	0.2%
2006	121,754	60,313	58,392	57,456	64,298	52.8%	1,301	2.3%
2007	245,892	138,329	116,568	107,872	138,020	56.1%	8,626	8.0%
2008	599,481	481,878	455,909	436,055	163,426	27.3%	18,183	4.2%
2009	90,800	47,189	42,288	40,905	49,895	55.0%	3,207	7.8%
2010	385,207	355,564	321,522	332,845	52,362	13.6%	151,665	45.6%
2011	1,243,138	1,243,138	1,246,752	1,218,178	24,960	2.0%	336,835	27.7%
2012	345,776	—	345,776	284,279	61,497	17.8%	153,528	54.0%
2013	133,187	—	—	133,187	—	—%	96,017	72.1%
	\$6,676,621	\$5,375,343	\$5,620,595	\$5,639,491	\$1,037,130	15.8%	\$780,987	13.8%

As quantified in the table above, since the inception of the Company in 1993, while we have experienced adverse development from time to time, on a cumulative basis we have experienced \$1,037.1 million of net favorable development on the run-off of our gross reserves within our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment. This represents 15.8% of our initial estimated gross claims and claim expenses for accident years 2012 and prior of \$6.5 billion and is calculated based on our estimates of claims and claim expense reserves as of December 31, 2013, compared to our initial estimates of ultimate claims and claim expenses, as of the end of each accident year. As described above, given the complexity in reserving for claims and claims expenses associated with catastrophe losses for property catastrophe excess of loss reinsurance contracts, we have experienced development, both favorable and unfavorable, in any given accident year. For example, our 2005 accident year developed favorably by \$213.1 million, which is 14.5% better than our initial estimates of claims and claim expenses for the 2005 accident year as estimated as of December 31, 2005,

while our 2004 accident year developed unfavorably by \$52.3 million, or negative 6.9%. On a net basis, our cumulative favorable or unfavorable development is generally reduced by offsetting changes in our reinsurance recoverables, as well as changes to loss related premiums such as reinstatement premiums, and redeemable noncontrolling interest for changes in claims and claim expenses that impact DaVinciRe, all of which generally move in the opposite direction to changes in our ultimate claims and claim expenses.



The percentage of claims unpaid at December 31, 2013 for each accident year reflects both the speed at which claims and claim expenses for each accident year have been paid and our estimate of claims and claim expenses for that accident year. As seen above, claims and claim expenses for the 2005 and prior accident years have generally been paid, with the exception of 2001 which has 3.6% remaining unpaid. This is driven in part by the mix of our business, which primarily included property catastrophe excess of loss reinsurance for personal lines property coverage, rather than commercial property coverage or retrocessional coverage, and the speed of the settlement and payment of claims by our underlying cedants. In contrast, our 2001 accident year, which includes losses from the events of September 11, 2001, includes a higher mix of commercial business and retrocessional coverage where the underlying claims of our cedants tend to be settled and paid more slowly. In addition, our 2007 accident year has also paid out more slowly due to increased complexity surrounding claims of our underlying cedants as a result of the notable losses during 2007, including European windstorm Kyrill. As noted in the table above, the percentage of claims and claims expenses unpaid as of December 31, 2013 related to more recent years, such as 2010 through 2013, range from 45.6% to 72.1%, with higher percentages driven by the recency of these accident years, combined with the complexity surrounding claims of our underlying cedants and the nature of the events, such as the 2010 and 2011 New Zealand Earthquakes, the Tohoku Earthquake, the Thailand Floods and Storm Sandy.

#### Sensitivity Analysis

The table below shows the impact on our ultimate claims and claim expenses, net income and shareholders' equity as of and for the year ended December 31, 2013 of reasonably likely changes to our estimates of ultimate losses for claims and claim expenses incurred from catastrophic events within our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment. The reasonably likely changes are based on an historical analysis of the period-to-period variability of our ultimate costs to settle claims from catastrophic events, giving due consideration to changes in our reserving practices over time. In general, our claim reserves for our more recent catastrophic events are subject to greater uncertainty and, therefore, greater variability and are likely to experience material changes from one period to the next. This is due to the uncertainty as to the size of the industry losses from the event, uncertainty as to which contracts have been exposed to the catastrophic event, and uncertainty as to the magnitude of claims incurred by our clients. As our claims age, more information becomes available and we believe our estimates become more certain, although there is no assurance this trend will continue in the future. As a result, the sensitivity analysis below is based on the age of each accident year, our current estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses for the catastrophic events occurring in each accident year, and the reasonably likely variability of our current estimates of claims and claim expenses by accident year. The impact on net income and shareholders' equity assumes no increase or decrease in reinsurance recoveries, loss related premium or redeemable noncontrolling interest – DaVinciRe.

#### Property Catastrophe Reinsurance Claims and Claim Expense Reserve Sensitivity Analysis

(in thousands, except percentages)	Ultimate Claims and Claim Expenses at December 31, 2013	\$ Impact of Change on Ultimate Claims and Claim Expenses at December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Reserve for Claims and Claim Expenses at December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Net Income for the Year Ended December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Shareholders' Equity at December 31, 2013
Higher	\$ 6,145,076	\$ 505,585	32.3	% (60.1	)% (12.9
Recorded	5,639,491	—	—	% —	% —
Lower	\$ 5,133,906	\$(505,585)	(32.3	)% 60.1	% 12.9

We believe the changes we made to our estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses represent reasonably likely outcomes based on our experience to date and our future expectations. While we believe these are reasonably likely

outcomes, we do not believe the reader should consider the above sensitivity analysis an actuarial reserve range. In addition, the sensitivity analysis only reflects reasonably likely changes in our underlying assumptions. It is possible that our estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses could be significantly higher or lower than the sensitivity analysis described above. For example, we could



be liable for events for which we have not estimated claims and claim expenses or for exposures we do not currently believe are covered under our policies. These changes could result in significantly larger changes to our estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses, net income and shareholders' equity than those noted above. We also caution the reader that the above sensitivity analysis is not used by management in developing our reserve estimates and is also not used by management in managing the business.

#### Specialty Reinsurance Segment

Within our Specialty Reinsurance segment, we write a number of reinsurance lines such as aviation, casualty clash, catastrophe exposed personal lines property, catastrophe exposed workers' compensation, crop, energy, financial, mortgage guaranty, political risk, surety, terrorism, trade credit, certain other casualty lines including directors and officers liability, general liability, medical malpractice and professional indemnity, and other specialty lines of reinsurance that we collectively refer to as specialty reinsurance. We offer our specialty reinsurance products principally on an excess of loss basis, as described above with respect to our property catastrophe reinsurance products, and we also provide specialty protection or proportional coverage which we expect to grow on an absolute or relative basis within this segment in the future. In a proportional reinsurance arrangement (also referred to as quota share reinsurance or pro-rata reinsurance), the reinsurer shares a proportional part of the original premiums and losses of the reinsured. We offer our specialty reinsurance products to insurance companies and other reinsurance companies and provide coverage for specific geographic regions or on a worldwide basis.

Our Specialty Reinsurance segment can generally be characterized as providing coverage for low frequency and high severity losses, similar to our property catastrophe reinsurance business. As with our property catastrophe reinsurance business, our specialty reinsurance contracts frequently provide coverage for relatively large limits or exposures. As a result of the foregoing, our specialty reinsurance business is subject to significant claims volatility. In periods of low claims frequency or severity, our results will generally be favorably impacted while in periods of high claims frequency or severity our results will generally be negatively impacted. We have more recently positioned RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks to accept a wider range of quota share risks, facilitating our efforts to expand trading relationships with core clients via a separate, highly-rated balance sheet. While we remain focused on underwriting discipline, and are seeking to remain focused on opportunities amenable to stochastic representation and supported by strong data and analytics, this expanded product suite through RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks may pose new, unmodelled or unforeseen risks for which we may not be adequately compensated and may also result in a higher level of attritional claims and claim expenses.

Our processes and methodologies in respect of loss estimation for the coverages we offer through our specialty reinsurance operation differ from those used for our property catastrophe-oriented coverages. For example, our specialty reinsurance coverages are more likely to be impacted by factors such as long-term inflation and changes in the social and legal environment, which we believe gives rise to greater uncertainty in our claims reserves. Moreover, in reserving for our specialty reinsurance coverages we do not have the benefit of a significant amount of our own historical experience in certain lines of business and may have little or no related corporate reserving history in new lines of business. We believe this makes our Specialty Reinsurance segment reserving subject to greater uncertainty than our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment.

When initially developing our reserving techniques for our specialty reinsurance coverages, we considered estimating reserves utilizing several actuarial techniques such as paid and reported loss development methods. We elected to use the Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method because this method is appropriate for lines of business, such as our specialty reinsurance business, where there is a lack of historical claims experience. This method allows for greater weight to be applied to expected results in periods where little or no actual experience is available, and, hence, is less susceptible to the potential pitfall of being excessively swayed by one year or one quarter of actual paid and/or reported loss data. This method uses initial expected loss ratio expectations to the extent that the expected paid or reported losses are zero, and it assumes that past experience is not fully representative of the future. As our reserves for claims and claim expenses age, and actual claims experience becomes available, this method places less weight on expected experience and places more weight on actual experience. This experience, which represents the difference between expected reported claims and actual reported claims is reflected in the respective reporting period as a change

in estimate. We reevaluate our actuarial reserving techniques on a periodic basis.

77





The utilization of the Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method requires us to estimate an expected ultimate claims and claim expense ratio and select an expected loss reporting pattern. We select our estimates of the expected ultimate claims and claim expense ratios and expected loss reporting patterns by reviewing industry results for similar business and adjusting for the terms of the coverages we offer. The estimated expected claims and claim expense ratio may be modified to the extent that reported losses at a given point in time differ from what would be expected based on the selected loss reporting pattern. Our estimate of IBNR is the product of the premium we have earned, the initial expected ultimate claims and claim expense ratio and the percentage of estimated unreported losses. In addition, certain of our specialty reinsurance coverages may be impacted by natural and man-made catastrophes. We estimate claim reserves for these losses after the event giving rise to these losses occurs, following a process that is similar to our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment described above.

#### Prior Year Development of Reserve for Net Claims and Claim Expenses

Within our specialty reinsurance business, we seek to review substantially all of our claims and claim expense reserves quarterly. Typically, our quarterly review procedures include reviewing paid and reported claims in the most recent reporting period, reviewing the development of paid and reported claims from prior periods, and reviewing our overall experience by underwriting year and in the aggregate. We monitor our expected ultimate claims and claim expense ratios and expected loss reporting assumptions on a quarterly basis and compare them to our actual experience. These actuarial assumptions are generally reviewed annually, based on input from our actuaries, underwriters, claims personnel and finance professionals, although adjustments may be made more frequently if needed. Assumption changes are made to adjust for changes in the pricing and terms of coverage we provide, changes in industry results for similar business, as well as our actual experience, to the extent we have enough data to rely on our own experience. If we determine that adjustments to an earlier estimate are appropriate, such adjustments are recorded in the period in which they are identified.

The following table details the development of our liability for unpaid claims and claim expenses for our Specialty Reinsurance segment for the year ended December 31, 2013 split between catastrophe net claims and claim expenses and attritional net claims and claim expenses:

Year ended December 31, 2013	Specialty Reinsurance Segment
(in thousands)	
Catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	
Large catastrophe events	
Tohoku Earthquake and Tsunami (2011)	\$1,000
New Zealand Earthquake (2010)	(300 )
Other	1,763
Total large catastrophe events	2,463
Total catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	\$2,463
Attritional net claims and claim expenses	
Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method - actual reported claims less than expected claims	\$21,216
Actuarial assumption changes	10,432
Total attritional net claims and claim expenses	\$31,648
Total favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses	\$34,111

The favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses within our Specialty Reinsurance segment in 2013 of \$34.1 million was primarily driven by \$10.4 million associated with actuarial assumption changes in the first quarter of 2013, principally in our casualty clash and casualty risk lines of business, and primarily as a result of revised initial expected claims ratios and claim development factors due to actual experience coming in better than expected and \$23.7 million related to actual reported loss activity coming in better than expected, as a result of

the application of our formulaic actuarial reserving methodology.

78



The following table details the development of our liability for unpaid net claims and claim expenses for our Specialty Reinsurance segment for the year ended December 31, 2012 split between catastrophe net claims and claim expenses and attritional net claims and claim expenses:

Year ended December 31, 2012	Specialty Reinsurance Segment
(in thousands)	
Catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	
Large catastrophe events	
Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma (2005)	\$3,000
Total catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	\$3,000
Attritional net claims and claim expenses	
Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method - actual reported claims less than expected claims	\$16,747
Actuarial assumption changes	14,399
Total attritional net claims and claim expenses	\$31,146
Total favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses	\$34,146

The favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses within our Specialty Reinsurance segment in the year ended December 31, 2012 of \$34.1 million includes \$14.4 million associated with actuarial assumption changes, principally in our casualty and medical malpractice lines of business, and primarily as a result of revised initial expected claims ratios and claim development factors due to actual experience coming in better than expected, \$16.7 million related to actual reported loss activity coming in better than expected, as a result of the application of our formulaic actuarial reserving methodology, and \$3.0 million due to a reduction in ultimate losses on the 2005 Hurricanes.

The following table details the development of our liability for unpaid net claims and claim expenses for our Specialty Reinsurance segment for the year ended December 31, 2011 split between catastrophe net claims and claim expenses and attritional net claims and claim expenses:

Year ended December 31, 2011	Specialty Reinsurance Segment
(in thousands)	
Catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	
Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma (2005)	\$6,215
Chilean Earthquake (2010)	4,688
Tropical Cyclone Tasha (2010)	3,000
Total catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	\$13,903
Attritional net claims and claim expenses	
Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method - actual reported claims less than expected claims	\$37,058
Actuarial assumption changes	26,800
Total attritional net claims and claim expenses	\$63,858
Total favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses	\$77,761

The favorable development on prior year reserves in 2011 within our Specialty Reinsurance segment of \$77.8 million includes \$26.8 million associated with actuarial assumption changes, principally in our workers' compensation quota share and risk, property risk and energy risk lines of business, and primarily as a result of revised initial expected claims ratios and claim development factors due to actual experience coming in better than expected, \$13.9 million

due to reductions in case reserves and additional case reserves for certain large catastrophe events and the remainder of \$37.1 million due to reported claims

79



coming in better than expected in 2011 on prior accident years events, as a result of the application of our formulaic actuarial reserving methodology.

#### Actual Results vs. Initial Estimates

The table below summarizes our key actuarial assumptions in reserving for our Specialty Reinsurance segment. As noted above, the key actuarial assumptions include the estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios and the estimated loss reporting patterns. The table shows our initial estimates of the ultimate claims and claim expense ratio by underwriting year. The table shows how our initial estimates of these ratios have developed over time, with the re-estimated ratios reflecting a combination of the amount and timing of paid and reported losses compared to our initial estimates. The initial estimate is based on the actuarial assumptions that were in place at the end of that year. A decrease in the ultimate claims and claim expense ratio implies that our current estimates are lower than our initial estimates while an increase in the ultimate claims and claim expense ratio implies that our current estimates are higher than our initial estimates. The result would be a corresponding favorable impact on shareholders' equity and net income or a corresponding unfavorable impact on shareholders' equity and net income, respectively. The table also shows how our initial estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios have changed from one underwriting year to the next. The table below reflects a summary of the weighted average assumptions for all classes of business written within our Specialty Reinsurance segment. The table is presented on a gross loss basis and therefore does not include the benefit of reinsurance recoveries or loss related premium.

#### Actual vs. Initial Estimated Specialty Reinsurance Claims and Claim Expense Reserve Analysis – Estimated Ultimate Claims and Claim Expense Ratio

Underwriting Year	Estimated Ultimate Claims and Claim Expenses Ratio			
	Initial Estimate	Re-estimate at		
		December 31, 2011	December 31, 2012	December 31, 2013
2002	77.2%	20.5%	19.6%	19.7%
2003	76.8%	26.2%	25.3%	25.4%
2004	78.2%	37.1%	37.2%	36.8%
2005	78.2%	29.1%	28.1%	28.3%
2006	76.6%	31.2%	29.3%	26.3%
2007	62.9%	55.6%	56.1%	55.8%
2008	57.9%	75.4%	64.5%	64.1%
2009	55.4%	36.9%	34.2%	29.5%
2010	56.5%	67.9%	61.3%	57.4%
2011	58.7%	67.5%	59.9%	49.2%
2012	56.3%	—%	82.6%	59.8%
2013	57.6%	—%	—%	59.7%

The table above shows our initial estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios for attritional losses for each new underwriting year within our Specialty Reinsurance segment. Until 2007, our initial estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios remained relatively constant between 76.6% in 2006 and 78.2% in 2004 and 2005. This reflects the fact that management had not made significant changes to its initial estimates of expected ultimate claims and claim expense ratios from one underwriting year to the next. The decrease in the initial estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratio from 2006 and prior, to 2007 through 2013, reflects assumption changes made for certain classes of business where our experience, and the industry experience in general, has been better than expected and, as a result, we decreased our initial estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratio for these classes of business.

As each underwriting year has developed, our re-estimated expected ultimate claims and claim expense ratios have changed. In particular, our re-estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios decreased significantly from the initial estimates for the 2002 through 2006 underwriting years. This was principally due to our 2005 reserve review. During our 2005 reserve review, we further segmented the specialty







business with the aim of grouping risks into more homogeneous categories which respond to the evolution of actual exposures. This became possible as the volume of this business increased over the three preceding years. This further segmentation required the selection of loss reporting patterns to be applied to these new groups. We also updated our assumptions for our original loss reporting patterns based on a combination of new industry information and actual experience accumulated over the three preceding years. The assumptions for the new loss reporting patterns were applied to all prior underwriting years. In addition, we made explicit allowances for commuted contracts whereas previously these were considered in the overall reserving assumptions. We also reviewed substantially all of our case reserves and additional case reserves. The result of the foregoing was a decrease in our specialty reinsurance re-estimated ultimate claims and claim expense reserves in 2005. Subsequent to this reserve review, the results of our specialty book of business have been mixed. The 2006 underwriting year includes favorable development as actual paid and reported losses during 2006 have overall been less than expected, which has resulted in a reduction in our expected ultimate claims and claim expense ratio for this year. However, the 2008, 2010, and 2012 underwriting years have performed worse than expected and our current estimates are higher than our initial estimates. This is due in part to the losses in our casualty clash line of business in 2008, associated with exposure to the deterioration of the credit and capital markets in 2008 as well as the Madoff matter discovered in the fourth quarter of 2008. In comparison, our 2010 and 2011 underwriting years were impacted by a number of relatively large catastrophe events, including the 2010 New Zealand and Chilean Earthquakes in 2010, and in 2011, the 2011 New Zealand and Tohoku Earthquakes, the large U.S. tornadoes, the Australian Floods, losses arising from certain aggregate contracts, Hurricane Irene and the Thailand Floods (collectively referred to as the “2011 Large Losses”). In addition, our 2012 underwriting year was impacted by Storm Sandy. As noted above, our specialty reinsurance business is in general characterized by events of low frequency and high severity which results in actual experience that can be significantly better or worse than long-term trends or industry results for similar business may imply.

As noted above, some of our specialty reinsurance contracts are exposed to net claims and claim expenses from large natural and man-made catastrophes. Net claims and claim expenses from these large catastrophes are reserved for after the events which gave rise to the claims in a manner which is consistent with our property catastrophe reinsurance reserving practices as discussed above. The large catastrophes occurring during the period from 2002 to 2013 impacting our Specialty Reinsurance segment principally include Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma, which occurred in 2005. Our estimate of ultimate net claims and claim expenses from Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma, within our Specialty Reinsurance segment, net of reinsurance recoveries and assumed and ceded loss related premium, totaled \$48.3 million at December 31, 2013 (2012 - \$48.6 million, 2011 - \$51.6 million).

#### Sensitivity Analysis

The table below quantifies the impact on our reserves for claims and claim expenses, net income and shareholders' equity as of and for the year ended December 31, 2013 of reasonably likely changes to the actuarial assumptions used to estimate our December 31, 2013 claims and claim expense reserves within our Specialty Reinsurance segment. The table quantifies reasonably likely changes in our initial estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios and estimated loss reporting patterns. The changes to the initial estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios represent percentage increases or decreases to our current estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios. The change to the reporting patterns represent claims reporting that is both faster and slower than our current estimated claims reporting patterns. The impact on net income and shareholders' equity assumes no increase or decrease in reinsurance recoveries, loss related premium or redeemable noncontrolling interest – DaVinciRe.



## Specialty Reinsurance Claims and Claim Expense Reserve Sensitivity Analysis

(in thousands, except percentages)	Estimated Loss Reporting Pattern	\$ Impact of Change on Reserves for Claims and Claim Expenses at December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Reserve for Claims and Claim Expenses at December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Net Income for the Year Ended December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Shareholders' Equity at December 31, 2013
Increase expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Slower reporting	\$ 178,230	11.4	% (21.2)	)% (4.6)
Increase expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Expected reporting	77,957	5.0	% (9.3)	)% (2.0)
Increase expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Faster reporting	(8,454)	) (0.5)	)% 1.0	% 0.2
Expected claims and claim expense ratio	Slower reporting	80,218	5.1	% (9.5)	)% (2.1)
Expected claims and claim expense ratio	Expected reporting	—	—	% —	% —
Expected claims and claim expense ratio	Faster reporting	(69,129)	) (4.4)	)% 8.2	% 1.8
Decrease expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Slower reporting	(17,794)	) (1.1)	)% 2.1	% 0.5
Decrease expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Expected reporting	(77,957)	) (5.0)	)% 9.3	% 2.0
Decrease expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Faster reporting	(129,804)	) (8.3)	)% 15.4	% 3.3

We believe that ultimate claims and claim expense ratios 25.0 percentage points above or below our estimated assumptions constitute reasonably likely outcomes based on our experience to date and our future expectations. In addition, we believe that the adjustments that we made to speed up or slow down our estimated loss reporting patterns are reasonably likely changes. While we believe these are reasonably likely changes, we do not believe the reader should consider the above sensitivity analysis an actuarial reserve range. In addition, we caution the reader that the above sensitivity analysis only reflects reasonably likely changes. It is possible that our initial estimated claims and claim expense ratios and loss reporting patterns could be significantly different from the sensitivity analysis described above. For example, we could be liable for events which we have not estimated reserves for or for exposures we do not currently think are covered under our contracts. These changes could result in significantly larger changes to reserves for claims and claim expenses, net income and shareholders' equity than those noted above. We also caution the reader that the above sensitivity analysis is not used by management in developing our reserve estimates and is also not used by management in managing the business.

## Lloyd's Segment

Within our Lloyd's segment, we write property catastrophe excess of loss reinsurance contracts to insure insurance and reinsurance companies against natural and man-made catastrophes, and write a number of specialty reinsurance lines, insurance policies and quota share reinsurance that involves understanding the characteristics of the underlying insurance policy.

We use the Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method to estimate claims and claim expenses within our Lloyd's segment for our specialty reinsurance and insurance lines of business. The comments discussed above relating to our reserving techniques and processes for our Specialty Reinsurance segment apply to the specialty reinsurance and insurance lines of business within our Lloyd's segment. In addition, certain of our coverages may be impacted by natural and man-made catastrophes. We estimate claim reserves for these losses after the event giving rise to these losses occurs, following a process that is similar to our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment as noted above.



### Prior Year Development of Reserve for Net Claims and Claim Expenses

The following table details the development of our liability for unpaid claims and claim expenses for our Lloyd's segment for the year ended December 31, 2013 split between catastrophe net claims and claim expenses and attritional net claims and claim expenses:

Year ended December 31, 2013	Lloyd's Segment
(in thousands)	
Catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	
Large catastrophe events	
Storm Sandy (2012)	\$3,825
Other	1,442
Total large catastrophe events	5,267
Total catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	\$5,267
Attritional net claims and claim expenses	
Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method - actual reported claims less than expected claims	\$3,263
Actuarial assumption changes	(274)
Total attritional net claims and claim expenses	\$2,989
Total favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses	\$8,256

The favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses within our Lloyd's segment of \$8.3 million during 2013 was principally driven by a \$5.3 million decrease in the estimated ultimate net claims and claim expenses related to large catastrophes, including \$3.8 million related to Storm Sandy, and \$3.3 million related to reported claims coming in lower than expected on prior accident years events as a result of the application of our formulaic actuarial reserving methodology and partially offset by adverse development of \$0.3 million related to assumption changes.

Year ended December 31, 2012	Lloyd's Segment
(in thousands)	
Catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	
Large catastrophe events	
Thailand Floods (2011)	\$5,500
Hurricane Irene (2011)	2,500
Other	1,476
Total large catastrophe events	9,476
Total catastrophe net claims and claim expenses	\$9,476
Attritional net claims and claim expenses	
Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method - actual reported claims less than expected claims	\$8,011
Actuarial assumption changes	(1,285)
Total attritional net claims and claim expenses	\$6,726
Total favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses	\$16,202

The favorable development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses within our Lloyd's segment of \$16.2 million during 2012 was principally due to favorable development of \$8.0 million due to reported claims coming in lower than expected on a number of prior accident years events, as a result of the application of the Company's formulaic actuarial reserving methodology, \$5.5 million related to the 2011 Thailand Floods, \$2.5 million related to Hurricane Irene, and \$1.5 million due to lower than expected







reported claims for catastrophe losses within our Lloyd's segment's property catastrophe reinsurance book of business, partially offset by \$1.3 million of adverse development related to actuarial assumption changes.

The Company commenced its Lloyd's operations in mid-2009 and the prior accident years reserve development in this segment for the year ended December 31, 2011 amounted to \$0.5 million which principally related to the 2010 New Zealand Earthquake.

#### Actual Results vs. Initial Estimates

The table below summarizes our initial assumptions and changes in those assumptions for catastrophe claims and claim expense reserves associated with our property catastrophe reinsurance business within our Lloyd's segment. Similar to our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment, the key assumption in estimating reserves for property catastrophe reinsurance losses in our Lloyd's segment is our estimate of the ultimate claims and claim expenses. The table shows our initial estimates of ultimate claims and claim expenses for each accident year and how these initial estimates have developed over time. The initial estimate of accident year claims and claim expenses represents our estimate of the ultimate settlement and administration costs for claims incurred from catastrophic events occurring during a particular accident year, and as reported as of December 31 of that year. The re-estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses represent our revised estimates as reported as at the respective year end. The cumulative favorable (adverse) development shows how our most recent estimates as reported at December 31, 2013 differ from our initial accident year estimates. Favorable development implies that our current estimates are lower than our initial estimates while adverse development implies that our current estimates are higher than our original estimates. Total reserves as of December 31, 2013 reflect the unpaid portion of our estimates of ultimate claims and claim expenses. The table is presented on a gross basis and therefore does not include the benefit of reinsurance recoveries or loss related premium such as reinstatement premium.

#### Actual vs. Initial Estimated Lloyd's Segment Catastrophe Claims and Claim Expense Reserve Analysis for Property Catastrophe Reinsurance Business

(in thousands, except percentages)

Accident Year	Initial Estimate of Accident Year Claims and Expenses	Re-estimated Claims and Claim Expenses as of December 31,			Cumulative Favorable (Adverse) Development	% Decrease (Increase) from Initial Ultimate	Claims and Claim Expense Reserves at December 31, 2013	% of Claims and Claim Expenses Unpaid at December 31, 2013
		2011	2012	2013				
2010	\$5,277	\$5,986	\$6,310	\$6,018	\$(741)	(14.0)%	\$5,491	91.2%
2011	30,121	30,121	24,037	23,565	6,556	21.8%	2,404	10.2%
2012	10,957	—	10,957	8,770	2,187	20.0%	6,334	72.2%
2013	5,977	—	—	5,977	—	—%	5,929	99.2%
	\$52,332	\$36,107	\$41,304	\$44,330	\$8,002	17.3%	\$20,158	45.5%

As quantified in the table above, since our Lloyd's segment commenced writing business in mid-2009, we have experienced \$8.0 million of net favorable development on our gross reserves related to catastrophe events for our property catastrophe reinsurance business within our Lloyd's segment. As described above and similar to our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment, given the complexity in reserving for claims and claims expenses associated with catastrophe losses for property catastrophe reinsurance business, we have experienced development, both favorable and unfavorable, in any given accident year. For example, our 2011 accident year has developed favorably by \$6.6 million, which is 21.8% better than our initial estimates of claims and claim expenses for the 2011 accident year as estimated as of December 31, 2011, while our 2010 accident year has developed unfavorably by \$0.7 million, or negative 14.0%. On a net basis, our cumulative favorable or unfavorable development is generally reduced by

offsetting changes in our reinsurance recoverables, as well as changes to loss related premiums such as reinstatement premiums, all of which generally move in the opposite direction to changes in our ultimate claims and claim expenses.



The percentage of claims unpaid at December 31, 2013 for each accident year reflects both the speed at which claims and claim expenses for each accident year have been paid and our estimate of claims and claim expenses for that accident year. This is driven in part by the mix of our business and the speed of the settlement and payment of claims by our underlying cedants.

#### Actual vs. Initial Estimated Lloyd's Segment Attritional Claims and Claim Expense Reserve Analysis – Estimated Ultimate Claims and Claim Expense Ratio

The table below summarizes our key actuarial assumptions in reserving for attritional losses for our specialty reinsurance and insurance lines of business in our Lloyd's segment. As noted above, the key actuarial assumptions include the estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios and the estimated loss reporting patterns. The table shows our initial estimates of the ultimate claims and claim expense ratio by underwriting year. The initial estimate is based on the actuarial assumptions that were in place at the end of that year. A decrease in the ultimate claims and claim expense ratio implies that our current estimates are lower than our initial estimates while an increase in the ultimate claims and claim expense ratio implies that our current estimates are higher than our initial estimates. The result would be a corresponding favorable impact on shareholders' equity and net income or a corresponding unfavorable impact on shareholders' equity and net income, respectively. The table below reflects a summary of the weighted average assumptions for all classes of specialty reinsurance and insurance business in our Lloyd's segment for which we reserve for attritional losses using the Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method. The table is presented on a gross loss basis and therefore does not include the benefit of reinsurance recoveries or loss related premium such as reinstatement premium.

Underwriting Year	Estimated Ultimate Claims and Claim Expenses Ratio				
	Initial Estimate	Re-estimate at December 31, 2011	December 31, 2012	December 31, 2013	
2010	63.3%	56.5%	53.5%	50.2	%
2011	66.0%	83.0%	60.6%	55.1	%
2012	58.4%	—%	87.4%	69.5	%
2013	60.6%	—%	—%	67.9	%

The table above shows our initial estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios for attritional losses for each new underwriting year within specialty insurance and reinsurance in our Lloyd's segment. The principal reason for changes from one underwriting year to the next is changes in the mix and relative volume of business.

As each underwriting year has developed, our re-estimated expected ultimate claims and claim expense ratios have changed. In particular, our re-estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratios decreased from the initial estimates for the 2010 and 2011 underwriting years and increased for the 2012 and 2013 underwriting years. The decrease in the re-estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratio for the 2010 and 2011 underwriting years at December 31, 2013 was principally due to the application of our formulaic actuarial reserving methodology with the reductions being due to actual paid and reported claim activity being more favorable to date than what was originally anticipated when setting the initial reserves combined with reductions to estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses on certain large events. However, the increase in the re-estimated ultimate claims and claim expense ratio for the 2012 and 2013 underwriting years at December 31, 2013 was the result of those underwriting years performing worse than expected, due in part to experiencing claims and claim expenses related to large property losses, including Storm Sandy in 2012, and a number of smaller property-related loss events in 2013. As noted above, our specialty reinsurance and insurance lines of business are in general characterized by events of low frequency and high severity which results in actual experience that can be significantly better or worse than long-term trends or industry results for similar business may imply.



## Sensitivity Analysis

The table below shows the impact on our ultimate claims and claim expenses, net income and shareholders' equity as of and for the year ended December 31, 2013 of reasonably likely changes to our estimates of ultimate losses for claims and claim expenses incurred from catastrophic events associated with property catastrophe reinsurance business within our Lloyd's segment. The reasonably likely changes are based on a historical analysis of the period-to-period variability of our ultimate costs to settle claims from catastrophic events, giving due consideration to changes in our reserving practices over time. In general, our claim reserves for our more recent catastrophic events are subject to greater uncertainty and, therefore, greater variability and are likely to experience material changes from one period to the next. This is due to the uncertainty as to the size of the industry losses from the event, uncertainty as to which contracts have been exposed to the catastrophic event, and uncertainty as to the magnitude of claims incurred by our clients. As our claims age, more information becomes available and we believe our estimates become more certain, although there is no assurance this trend will continue in the future. As a result, the sensitivity analysis below is based on the age of each accident year, our current estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses for the catastrophic events occurring in each accident year, and the reasonably likely variability of our current estimates of claims and claim expenses by accident year.

## Lloyd's Segment Property Catastrophe Reinsurance Claims and Claim Expense Reserve Sensitivity Analysis

(in thousands, except percentages)	Ultimate Claims and Claim Expenses at December 31, 2013	\$ Impact of Change on Ultimate Claims and Claim Expenses at December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Reserve for Claims and Claim Expenses at December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Net Income for the Year Ended December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Shareholders' Equity at December 31, 2013
Higher	\$53,657	\$9,327	0.6	% (1.1	)% (0.2
Recorded	44,330	—	—	% —	% —
Lower	\$35,003	\$(9,327	) (0.6	)% 1.1	% 0.2

We believe the changes we made to our estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses represent reasonably likely outcomes based on our experience to date and our future expectations. While we believe these are reasonably likely outcomes, we do not believe the reader should consider the above sensitivity analysis an actuarial reserve range. In addition, the sensitivity analysis only reflects reasonably likely changes in our underlying assumptions. It is possible that our estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses could be significantly higher or lower than the sensitivity analysis described above. For example, we could be liable for events for which we have not estimated claims and claim expenses or for exposures we do not currently believe are covered under our policies. These changes could result in significantly larger changes to our estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses, net income and shareholders' equity than those noted above. We also caution the reader that the above sensitivity analysis is not used by management in developing our reserve estimates and is also not used by management in managing the business.





## Lloyd's Segment Attritional Claims and Claim Expense Reserve Sensitivity Analysis

(in thousands, except percentages)	Estimated Loss Reporting Pattern	\$ Impact of Change on Reserves for Claims and Claim Expenses at December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Reserves for Claims and Claim Expenses at December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Net Income for the Year Ended December 31, 2013	% Impact of Change on Shareholders' Equity at December 31, 2013
Increase expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Slower reporting	\$85,986	5.5	% (10.2)	)% (2.2)
Increase expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Expected reporting	38,456	2.5	% (4.6)	)% (1.0)
Increase expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Faster reporting	(15,373)	(1.0)	)% 1.8	% 0.4
Expected claims and claim expense ratio	Slower reporting	38,025	2.4	% (4.5)	)% (1.0)
Expected claims and claim expense ratio	Expected reporting	—	—	% —	% —
Expected claims and claim expense ratio	Faster reporting	(43,063)	(2.8)	)% 5.1	% 1.1
Decrease expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Slower reporting	(9,937)	(0.6)	)% 1.2	% 0.3
Decrease expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Expected reporting	(38,456)	(2.5)	)% 4.6	% 1.0
Decrease expected claims and claim expense ratio by 25%	Faster reporting	(70,753)	(4.5)	)% 8.4	% 1.8

We believe that ultimate claims and claim expense ratios 25.0 percentage points above or below our estimated assumptions constitute reasonably likely outcomes based on our experience to date and our future expectations. In addition, we believe that the adjustments that we made to speed up or slow down our estimated loss reporting patterns are reasonably likely changes. While we believe these are reasonably likely changes, we do not believe the reader should consider the above sensitivity analysis an actuarial reserve range. In addition, we caution the reader that the above sensitivity analysis only reflects reasonably likely changes. It is possible that our initial estimated claims and claim expense ratios and loss reporting patterns could be significantly different from the sensitivity analysis described above. For example, we could be liable for events which we have not estimated reserves for or for exposures we do not currently think are covered under our contracts. These changes could result in significantly larger changes to reserves for claims and claim expenses, net income and shareholders' equity than those noted above. We also caution the reader that the above sensitivity analysis is not used by management in developing our reserve estimates and is also not used by management in managing the business.

## Other

Included in the Other category are the remnants of our Bermuda-based insurance operations not sold pursuant to the stock purchase agreement with QBE. These operations are in run-off and no new business is being underwritten. Our outstanding claims and claim expense reserves for these operations include insurance policies and quota share reinsurance with respect to risks including: 1) commercial property, which principally included catastrophe-exposed commercial property products; 2) commercial multi-line, which included commercial property and liability coverage,

such as general liability, automobile liability and physical damage, building and contents, professional liability and various specialty products; and 3) personal lines property, which principally included homeowners personal lines property coverage and catastrophe exposed personal lines property coverage and totaled \$58.1 million at December 31, 2013.

We use the Bornhuetter-Ferguson actuarial method to estimate claims and claim expenses within the Other category for our property and casualty insurance and quota share reinsurance business. The comments discussed above relating to our reserving techniques and processes for our Specialty Reinsurance segment also apply to our Other category. In addition, certain of our coverages may be impacted by natural and



man-made catastrophes. We estimate claim reserves for these losses after the event giving rise to these losses occurs, following a process that is similar to our Catastrophe Reinsurance segment.

#### Development of Prior Year Liability for Unpaid Claims and Claim Expenses

The following table details the development of our liability for unpaid claims and claim expenses for our Other category split between large catastrophe events and attritional claims and claim expenses:

At December 31, (in thousands)	2013	2012	2011	
Attritional claims and claim expenses	\$ (2,179	) \$ 3,265	\$ 1,389	
Catastrophe events	1,729	1,171	4,243	
Loss portfolio transfer	—	(7,383	) —	
Actuarial assumption changes	—	—	(10,063	)
Total adverse development of prior accident years net claims and claim expenses	\$ (450	) \$ (2,947	) \$ (4,431	)

The net adverse development on prior accident years of \$0.5 million for 2013 within our Other category was principally the result of \$2.2 million related to the application of our formulaic actuarial reserving methodology with the increases being due to actual paid and reported claim activity coming in higher than what was originally anticipated when setting the initial reserves; partially offset by favorable development of \$1.7 million related to prior period large catastrophe events.

The net adverse development on prior accident years of \$2.9 million for 2012 within our Other category was principally the result of a loss portfolio transfer entered into by us on October 1, 2012, in respect of our contractor's liability book of business within RenaissanceRe Specialty Risks, whereby we paid consideration of \$36.5 million to transfer net liabilities of \$29.1 million, resulting in a loss of \$7.4 million which is recorded above as prior accident years attritional claims and claims expenses in our Other category, partially offset by reductions in reported losses on certain attritional loss contracts and favorable development related to catastrophe events, primarily the 2008 Hurricanes.

The net adverse development on prior accident years of \$4.4 million in 2011 within our Other category was principally due to the construction defect book of business, which experienced higher than expected reported losses, and was subsequently subject to a comprehensive actuarial review during the fourth quarter of 2011, which review resulted in an increase of \$10.1 million to the estimated ultimate claims and claim expenses related to this book of business due to changes in the actuarial assumptions. Partially offsetting the adverse development on prior accident years within the construction defect book of business, noted above, was favorable development of \$4.2 million related to large catastrophe events, of which \$4.6 million related to the 2005 Hurricanes, and \$1.4 million related to the application of our formulaic actuarial reserving methodology with the reductions being due to actual paid and reported claim activity being more favorable to date than what was originally anticipated when setting the initial reserves.

#### Reinsurance Recoverables

We enter into reinsurance agreements in order to help reduce our exposure to large losses and to help manage our risk portfolio. Amounts recoverable from reinsurers are estimated in a manner consistent with the claims and claim expense reserves associated with the related assumed reinsurance. For multi-year retrospectively rated contracts, we accrue amounts (either assets or liabilities) that are due to or from assuming companies based on estimated contract experience. If we determine that adjustments to earlier estimates are appropriate, such adjustments are recorded in the period in which they are determined.

The estimate of reinsurance recoverables can be more subjective than estimating the underlying claims and claim expense reserves as discussed under the heading "Claims and Claim Expense Reserves" above. In particular, reinsurance recoverables may be affected by deemed inuring reinsurance, industry losses reported by various statistical reporting services, and other factors. Reinsurance recoverables on dual trigger reinsurance contracts require us to estimate our ultimate losses applicable to these contracts as well as estimate the ultimate amount of insured losses for the industry

as a whole that will be reported by the applicable statistical reporting agency, as per the contract terms. In addition, the level of our additional case

88



reserves and IBNR reserves has a significant impact on reinsurance recoverables. These factors can impact the amount and timing of the reinsurance recoverables to be recorded.

The majority of the balance we have accrued as recoverable will not be due for collection until some point in the future. The amounts recoverable ultimately collected are open to uncertainty due to the ultimate ability and willingness of reinsurers to pay our claims, for reasons including insolvency and elective run-off, contractual dispute and various other reasons. In addition, because the majority of the balances recoverable will not be collected for some time, economic conditions as well as the financial and operational performance of a particular reinsurer may change, and these changes may affect the reinsurer's willingness and ability to meet their contractual obligations to us. To reflect these uncertainties, we estimate and record a valuation allowance for potential uncollectible reinsurance recoverable which reduces reinsurance recoverable and net income (loss).

We estimate our valuation allowance by applying specific percentages against each reinsurance recoverable based on our counterparty's credit rating. The percentages applied are based on historical industry default statistics developed by major rating agencies and are then adjusted by us based on industry knowledge and our judgment and estimates. We also apply case-specific valuation allowances against certain recoveries that we deem unlikely to be collected in full. We then evaluate the overall adequacy of the valuation allowance based on other qualitative and judgmental factors. The valuation allowance recorded against reinsurance recoverable was \$1.7 million at December 31, 2013 (2012 - \$4.5 million). The reinsurers with the three largest balances accounted for 28.2%, 19.9% and 11.0%, respectively, of our reinsurance recoverable balance at December 31, 2013 (2012 - 14.3%, 14.3% and 12.6%, respectively). The three largest company-specific components of the valuation allowance represented 14.2%, 12.5% and 3.1%, respectively, of our total valuation allowance at December 31, 2013 (2012 - 44.1%, 26.7% and 6.1%, respectively).

#### Fair Value Measurements and Impairments

##### Fair Value

The use of fair value to measure certain assets and liabilities with resulting unrealized gains or losses is pervasive within our financial statements. Fair value is defined under accounting guidance currently applicable to us to be the price that would be received upon the sale of an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between open market participants at the measurement date. We recognize the change in unrealized gains and losses arising from changes in fair value in our consolidated statements of operations, with the exception of changes in unrealized gains and losses on our fixed maturity investments available for sale, which are recognized as a component of accumulated other comprehensive income in shareholders' equity.

FASB ASC Topic Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures prescribes a fair value hierarchy that prioritizes the inputs to the respective valuation techniques used to measure fair value. The hierarchy gives the highest priority to unadjusted quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities (Level 1) and the lowest priority to valuation techniques that use at least one significant input that is unobservable (Level 3). The three levels of the fair value hierarchy are described below:

Fair values determined by Level 1 inputs utilize unadjusted quoted prices obtained from active markets for identical assets or liabilities for which we have access. The fair value is determined by multiplying the quoted price by the quantity held by us;

Fair values determined by Level 2 inputs utilize inputs other than quoted prices included in Level 1 that are observable for the asset or liability, either directly or indirectly. Level 2 inputs include quoted prices for similar assets and liabilities in active markets, and inputs other than quoted prices that are observable for the asset or liability, such as interest rates and yield curves that are observable at commonly quoted intervals, broker quotes and certain pricing indices; and

Level 3 inputs are based all or in part on significant unobservable inputs for the asset or liability, and include situations where there is little, if any, market activity for the asset or liability. In these cases, significant management assumptions can be used to establish management's best estimate of the assumptions used by other market participants in determining the fair value of the asset or liability.







In certain cases, the inputs used to measure fair value may fall into different levels of the fair value hierarchy. In such cases, the level in the fair value hierarchy within which the fair value measurement in its entirety falls has been determined based on the lowest level input that is significant to the fair value measurement of the asset or liability. Our assessment of the significance of a particular input to the fair value measurement in its entirety requires judgment, and we consider factors specific to the asset or liability.

In order to determine if a market is active or inactive for a security, we consider a number of factors, including, but not limited to, the spread between what a seller is asking for a security and what a buyer is bidding for the same security, the volume of trading activity for the security in question, the price of the security compared to its par value (for fixed maturity investments), and other factors that may be indicative of market activity.

Other than the transaction noted below, there have been no material changes in the Company's valuation techniques, nor have there been any transfers between Level 1 and Level 2, or Level 2 and 3 during the periods represented by these consolidated financial statements. As discussed in greater detail below, the Company transferred its investment in the common shares of Essent, a U.S. mortgage guaranty insurance company, from Level 3 to Level 1, effective October 31, 2013, the date which Essent became a publicly traded company on the NYSE. The fair value transferred from Level 3 to Level 1 was \$85.6 million.

Below is a summary of the assets and liabilities that are measured at fair value on a recurring basis and also represents the carrying amount of such assets and liabilities on our consolidated balance sheet:

At December 31, 2013	Total	Quoted Prices in Active Markets for Identical Assets (Level 1)	Significant Other Observable Inputs (Level 2)	Significant Unobservable Inputs (Level 3)
(in thousands)				
Fixed maturity investments				
U.S. treasuries	\$1,352,413	\$1,352,413	\$—	\$—
Agencies	186,050	—	186,050	—
Non-U.S. government (Sovereign debt)	334,580	—	334,580	—
Non-U.S. government-backed corporate	237,479	—	237,479	—
Corporate	1,803,415	—	1,775,835	27,580
Agency mortgage-backed	341,908	—	341,908	—
Non-agency mortgage-backed	257,938	—	257,938	—
Commercial mortgage-backed	314,236	—	314,236	—
Asset-backed	15,258	—	15,258	—
Total fixed maturity investments	4,843,277	1,352,413	3,463,284	27,580
Short term investments	1,044,779	—	1,044,779	—
Equity investments trading	254,776	254,776	—	—
Other investments				
Private equity partnerships	322,391	—	—	322,391
Senior secured bank loan funds	18,048	—	—	18,048
Catastrophe bonds	229,016	—	229,016	—
Hedge funds	3,809	—	—	3,809
Total other investments	573,264	—	229,016	344,248
Other assets and (liabilities)				
Derivatives (1)	4,758	823	6,425	(2,490 )
Other	(12,991 )	—	(12,991 )	—

Edgar Filing: RENAISSANCERE HOLDINGS LTD - Form ARS

Total other assets and (liabilities)	(8,233 )	823	(6,566 )	(2,490 )
	\$6,707,863	\$1,608,012	\$4,730,513	\$369,338

(1) See "Note 19. Derivative Instruments in our Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements" for additional information related to the fair value by type of contract, of derivatives entered into by us.

90



As at December 31, 2013, we have classified \$371.8 million and \$2.5 million of our assets and liabilities, respectively, at fair value on a recurring basis using Level 3 inputs. This represented 4.5% and 0.1% of our total assets and liabilities, respectively. Level 3 fair value measurements are based on valuation techniques that use at least one significant input that is unobservable. These measurements are made under circumstances in which there is little, if any, market activity for the asset or liability. We use valuation models or other pricing techniques that require a variety of inputs including contractual terms, market prices and rates, yield curves, credit curves, measures of volatility, prepayment rates and correlations of such inputs, some of which may be unobservable, to value these Level 3 assets and liabilities. Our assessment of the significance of a particular input to the fair value measurement in its entirety requires judgment. In making the assessment, we considered factors specific to the asset or liability. In certain cases, the inputs used to measure fair value of an asset or a liability may fall into different levels of the fair value hierarchy. In such cases, the level in the fair value hierarchy within which the fair value measurement in its entirety is classified is determined based on the lowest level input that is significant to the fair value measurement of the asset or liability.

See to “Note 6. Fair Value Measurements in our Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements” for additional information about fair value measurements.

#### Impairments

The amount and timing of asset impairment is subject to significant estimation techniques and asset impairment is a critical accounting estimate for us. The more significant impairment reviews we complete are for our equity method investments, goodwill and other intangible assets, and fixed maturity investments available for sale, as described in more detail below.

#### Investments in Other Ventures, Under Equity Method

Investments in which we have significant influence over the operating and financial policies of the investee are classified as investments in other ventures, under equity method, and are accounted for under the equity method of accounting. Under this method, we record our proportionate share of income or loss from such investments in our results for the period. Any decline in the value of investments in other ventures, under equity method, including goodwill and other intangible assets arising upon acquisition of the investee, considered by management to be other-than-temporary, is reflected in our consolidated statements of operations in the period in which it is determined. As of December 31, 2013, we had \$105.6 million (2012 - \$87.7 million) in investments in other ventures, under equity method on our consolidated balance sheets, including \$12.5 million of goodwill and \$16.7 million of other intangible assets (2012 - \$10.8 million and \$19.6 million). The carrying value of our investments in other ventures, under equity method, individually or in the aggregate, may, and likely will, differ from the realized value we may ultimately attain, perhaps significantly so.

In determining whether an equity method investment is impaired, we look at a variety of factors including the operating and financial performance of the investee, the investee’s future business plans and projections, recent transactions and market valuations of publicly traded companies where available, discussions with the investee’s management, and our intent and ability to hold the investment until it recovers in value. In doing this, we make assumptions and estimates in assessing whether an impairment has occurred and if, in the future, our assumptions and estimates made in assessing the fair value of these investments change, this could result in a material decrease in the carrying value of these investments. This would cause us to write-down the carrying value of these investments and could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations in the period the impairment charge is taken. We do not have any current plans to dispose of these investments, and cannot assure you that we will in the future consummate transactions in which we realize the value at which these holdings are reflected in our financial statements. During the year ended December 31, 2013, we recorded \$Nil (2012 - \$Nil, 2011 - \$Nil) other-than-temporary impairment charges related to investments in other ventures, under the equity method.



### Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets

Goodwill and other intangible assets acquired are initially recorded at fair value. Subsequent to initial recognition, finite lived other intangible assets are amortized over their estimated useful life, subject to impairment, and goodwill and indefinite lived other intangible assets are carried at the lower of cost or fair value. If goodwill or other intangible assets are impaired, they are written down to their estimated fair values with a corresponding expense reflected in our consolidated statements of operations.

We test goodwill and other intangible assets for impairment in the fourth quarter of each year, or more frequently if events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount may not be recoverable. For purposes of the annual impairment evaluation, goodwill is assigned to the applicable reporting unit of the acquired entities giving rise to the goodwill and other intangible assets and is tested based on the cash flows they produce. There are generally many assumptions and estimates underlying the fair value calculation. Principally, we identify the reporting unit or business entity that the goodwill or other intangible asset is attributed to, and review historical and forecasted operating and financial performance and other underlying factors affecting such analysis, including market conditions. Other assumptions used could produce significantly different results which may result in a change in the value of goodwill or our other intangible assets and related charge in our consolidated statements of operations. An impairment charge could be recognized in the event of a significant decline in the implied fair value of those operations where the goodwill or other intangible assets are applicable. As at December 31, 2013, excluding the amounts recorded in investments in other ventures, under equity method, as noted above, our consolidated balance sheets include \$5.9 million of goodwill (2012 - \$5.9 million) and \$2.3 million of other intangible assets (2012 - \$2.6 million). Impairment charges were \$Nil during the year ended December 31, 2013 (2012 - \$Nil, 2011 - \$5.2 million). In the future it is possible that we will hold more goodwill, which would increase the degree of judgment and uncertainty embedded in our financial statements, and potentially increase the volatility of our reported results.

### Fixed Maturity Investments Available For Sale

At December 31, 2013, we had \$34.2 million (2012 - \$83.4 million) of fixed maturity investments available for sale on our consolidated balance sheet. Included in accumulated other comprehensive income at December 31, 2013 was \$4.0 million of gross unrealized gains (2012 - \$12.1 million) and \$17 thousand of gross unrealized losses (2012 - \$103 thousand), related to our portfolio of fixed maturity investments available for sale. Our quarterly process for assessing whether declines in the fair value of our fixed maturity investments available for sale represent impairments that are other-than-temporary includes reviewing each fixed maturity investment available for sale that is impaired and determining: (i) if we have the intent to sell the debt security or (ii) if it is more likely than not that we will be required to sell the debt security before its anticipated recovery; and (iii) whether a credit loss exists, that is, where we expect that the present value of the cash flows expected to be collected from the security are less than the amortized cost basis of the security. For the year ended December 31, 2013 we recognized \$Nil (2012 - \$0.3 million, 2011 - \$0.6 million) of net other-than-temporary impairments in our consolidated statements of operations related to our portfolio of fixed maturity investments available for sale.

### Income Taxes

Income taxes have been provided in accordance with the provisions of FASB ASC Topic Income Taxes. Deferred tax assets and liabilities result from temporary differences between the amounts recorded in our consolidated financial statements and the tax basis of the Company's assets and liabilities. Such temporary differences are primarily due to net operating loss carryforwards and GAAP versus tax basis accounting differences related to interest expense, underwriting results, accrued expenses and investments. The effect on deferred tax assets and liabilities of a change in tax rates is recognized in income in the period that includes the enactment date. A valuation allowance against deferred tax assets is recorded if it is more likely than not that all, or some portion, of the benefits related to deferred tax assets will not be realized.

At December 31, 2013, our net deferred tax asset (prior to our valuation allowance) and valuation allowance were \$56.3 million (2012 - \$34.9 million) and \$56.1 million (2012 - \$35.1 million), respectively (see "Note 15. Taxation in our Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements" for additional information). At each balance sheet date, we assess the need to establish a valuation allowance that reduces the net deferred tax asset when it is more likely than not that all,



or some portion, of the deferred tax assets will not be realized. The

92



valuation allowance is based on all available information including projections of future GAAP taxable income from each tax-paying component in each tax jurisdiction. Losses incurred within our U.S. tax-paying subsidiaries in the fourth quarter of 2011 were significant enough to result in a cumulative GAAP taxable loss at the U.S. tax-paying subsidiaries for the three year period ended December 31, 2011. We reassess our valuation allowance on a quarterly basis and commencing with our reassessment effective December 31, 2011, we determined that it is more likely than not that we would not be able to recover our U.S. net deferred tax asset and as a result, recognized a full valuation allowance in the fourth quarter of 2011. At December 31, 2013, our U.S. tax-paying subsidiaries had a net deferred tax asset of \$43.9 million (2012 - \$24.6 million), for which a full valuation allowance has been provided as we continued to remain in a cumulative three year GAAP taxable loss position at our U.S. tax-paying subsidiaries throughout 2013, among other facts. In addition, our Ireland, U.K. and Singapore operations have each produced cumulative GAAP taxable losses, among other facts, and as a result, we continue to provide a valuation allowance against our net deferred tax assets for these operations.

The Company has unrecognized tax benefits of \$Nil as of December 31, 2013 (2012 - \$Nil). Interest and penalties related to unrecognized tax benefits, would be recognized in income tax expense. At December 31, 2013, interest and penalties accrued on unrecognized tax benefits were \$Nil (2012 - \$Nil). Income tax returns filed for tax years 2009 through 2012, 2009 through 2012, 2012 and 2012, are open for examination by the Internal Revenue Service, Irish tax authorities, U.K. tax authorities, and Singapore tax authorities, respectively. The Company does not expect the resolution of these open years to have a significant impact on its consolidated statements of operations and financial condition.



## SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

Year ended December 31, (in thousands, except per share amounts and percentages)	2013	2012	2011
Statements of operations highlights			
Gross premiums written	\$1,605,412	\$1,551,591	\$1,434,976
Net premiums written	1,203,947	1,102,657	1,012,773
Net premiums earned	1,114,626	1,069,355	951,049
Net claims and claim expenses incurred	171,287	325,211	861,179
Underwriting income (loss)	626,733	451,451	(177,167 )
Net investment income	208,028	165,725	146,871
Net realized and unrealized gains on investments	35,076	163,121	43,956
Income (loss) from continuing operations	839,346	765,425	(38,833 )
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	2,422	(16,476 )	(51,559 )
Net income (loss)	841,768	748,949	(90,392 )
Net income (loss) available (attributable) to RenaissanceRe common shareholders	665,676	566,014	